OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

---

2 EDWARD VII., 1902

VOL. LVI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE NINTH DAY OF APRIL, INCLUSIVE

PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL
HOUSE OF COMMONS

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1902

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER

P.C., G.C.M.G., K.C., D.C.L. (*Oxon.*)

AT THE OPENING OF THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE NINTH PARLIAMENT

1902

CABINET FORMED JULY 13, 1896

President of the Privy Council (Premier)	Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P. C., G. C. M. G., K.C., D.C.L. (*Oxon.*)
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Hon. Sir Richard J. Cartwright, G.C.M.G.
Secretary of State	Hon. R. W. Scott, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. F. W. Borden, B.A., M.D.
Postmaster General	Hon. Wm. Mulock, K.C., M.A., LL.D.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. Sydney Fisher, B.A.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. J. I. Tarte.
Minister of Finance	Hon. W. S. Fielding.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. Andrew G. Blair, K.C.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. Clifford Sifton, B.A., K.C.
Minister of Customs	Hon. Wm. Paterson.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. James Sutherland.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. M. E. Bernier.
Minister of Justice	Hon. C. Fitzpatrick, B.A., K.C.
Without Portfolio	Hon. W. Templeman.
(Not in the Cabinet.)	
Solicitor General	Hon. Henry George Carroll, LL.B.

Clerk of the Privy Council ..... John J. McGee.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur	Speaker.
Peter Macdonald, M.P.	Deputy Speaker.
Sir John G. Bourinot, K.C.M.G.	Clerk of the House.
Laplante, Mr. J. B. R	Clerk-Assistant.
Lieut.-Col. Henry Robert Smith	Serjeant-at-Arms.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

Albert Horton ..... Chief Reporter.

Stephen Abbott
E. Joseph Duggan
J. O. Marceau
Thos. P. Owens
Alphonse Desjardins
A. C. Campbell
George Simpson
..... Reporters.

Chas. W. Boyce ..... Assistant to Chief Reporter.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION, NINTH PARLIAMENT

1902

ALCORN, GEORGE OSCAR—Prince Edward.
ANGERS, CHARLES—Charlevoix.
ARCHAMBAULT, JOSEPH ELOI—Berthier.
AVERY, MELZAR—Addington.

BALL, GEORGES—Nicolet.
BARKER, SAMUEL—Hamilton.
BAZINET, CHARLES—Joliette.
BEITH, ROBERT—Durham, W.R.
BÉLAND, HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BELCOURT, NAPOLEON A.—Ottawa.
BELL, ADAM CARR—Pictou.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H.—Simcoe, E.R.
BERNIER, HON. MICHEL E.—St. Hyacinthe.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BIRKETT, THOMAS—Ottawa.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BLAIR, HON. ANDREW GEORGE—St. John (City).
BORDEN, HON. FREDERICK W.—King's, N.S.
BORDEN, ROBERT L.—Halifax.
BOURASSA, HENRI—Labelle.
BOURBONNAIS, AUGUSTIN—Soulanges.
BOYD, NATHANIEL—Macdonald.
BROCK, WILLIAM REES—Toronto Centre.
BRODER, ANDREW—Dundas.
BRODEUR, HON. LOUIS PHILIPPE—Rouville.
BROWN, JAMES P.—Chateauguay.
BRUCE, FRANK C.—Hamilton.
BRUNEAU, ARTHUR AIMÉ—Richelieu.
BRUNET, JAMES—Montreal, St. James.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.

CALVERT, WILLIAM SAMUEL—Middlesex, W.R.
CALVIN, HIRAM A.—Frontenac.
CAMPBELL, ARCHIBALD—York, Ont., W.R.
CARBONNEAU, ONÉSIPHORE—L'Islet.
CARGILL, HENRY—Bruce, E.R.
CARROLL, HON. HENRY G.—Kamouraska.
CARSCALLEN, ALEXANDER W.—Hastings, N.R.
CARTWRIGHT, HON. SIR RICHARD, G.C.M.G.—Oxford, S.R.
CASGRAIN, THOMAS CHASE—Montmorency.
CHAMPAGNE, LOUIS N.—Wright.
CHARLTON, JOHN—Norfolk, N.R.
CHRISTIE, THOMAS—Argenteuil.
CLANCY, JAMES—Bothwell.
CLARE, GEORGE A.—Waterloo, S.R.
CLARKE, EDWARD FREDERICK—Toronto, West.
COCHRANE, EDWARD—Northumberland, Ont., E.R.
COPP, ALBERT J. S.—Digby.
COSTIGAN, HON. JOHN—Victoria, N.B.
COWAN, MAHLON K.—Essex, S.R.
CULBERT, JOHN—Brockville.

DAVIS, THOMAS OSBORNE—Saskatchewan.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMEON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, LOUIS JULIEN—Lévis.
DEMERS, L. PHILIPPE—St. John and Iberville.
DOUGLAS, JAMES M.—Assiniboia, East.
DUGAS, FRANÇOIS O.—Montcalm.
DYMENT, ALBERT EDWARD—Algoma.

EARLE, THOMAS—Victoria, B.C.
EDWARDS, WILLIAM C.—Russell.
EMMERSON, HENRY R.—Westmoreland.
ERB, DILMAN KINSEY—Perth, S.R.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR C.—Two Mountains.

FARQUHARSON, DONALD—Queen's West, P.E.I.
FIELDING, HON. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queen's (N.S.)
FISHER, HON. SYDNEY ARTHUR—Brome.
FITZPATRICK, HON. CHARLES—Quebec County.
FLINT, THOMAS BARNARD—Yarmouth.
FORTIER, EDMOND—Lotbinière.
FOWLER, GEORGE W.—King's, N.B.
FRASER, DUNCAN C.—Guysborough.

GALLERY, DANIEL, Montreal, St. Anne.
GALLIHER, WILLIAM ALFRED—Yale and Cariboo.
GANONG, GILBERT W.—Charlotte.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GEOFFRION, VICTOR—Chambly and Verchères.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLY—Welland.
GIBSON, ALEXANDER, JR.—York, N.B.
GILMOUR, JAMES—Middlesex, E.R.
GIRARD, JOSEPH—Chicoutimi and Saguenay.
GOULD, ISAAC J.—Ontario, W.R.
GOURLEY, SEYMOUR E.—Colchester.
GUTHRIE, HUGH—Wellington, S.R.

HACKETT, EDWARD—Prince West, P.E.I.
HAGGART, HON. JOHN GRAHAM—Lanark, S.R.
HALE, FREDERICK H.—Carleton, N.B.
HALLIDAY, JAMES—Bruce, N.R.
HARTY, WILLIAM—Kingston.
HARWOOD, HENRY S.—Vaudreuil.
HENDERSON, DAVID—Halton.
HEYD, CHARLES BERNHARD—Brant, S.R.
HOLMES, ROBERT—Huron, W.R.
HORSEY, EDWARD H.—Grey, N.R.
HUGHES, JAMES J.—King's, P.E.I.
HUGHES, SAMUEL—Victoria, Ont., N.R.
HYMAN, CHARLES S.—London.

INGRAM, ANDREW B.—Elgin, E.R.

JOHNSTON, ALEXANDER—Cape Breton.
JOHNSTON, ROBERT—Cardwell.
JOHNSTON, THOMAS GEORGE—Lambton, W.R.

KAULBACH, CHARLES E.—Lunenburg.
KEMP, ALBERT E.—Toronto, East.
KENDALL, ARTHUR S.—Cape Breton.
KENDREY, JAMES—Peterborough, W.R.
KIDD, EDWARD—Carleton, Ont.

LANCASTER, EDWARD A.—Lincoln and Niagara.
LANG, JOHN—Peterborough, E.R.
LARIVIÈRE, ALPHONSE A. C.—Provencher.
LAURIER, R. CHARLEMAGNE—L'Assomption.
LAURIER, RT. HON. SIR WILFRID, G.C.M.G.—Quebec, East.
LAVELL, JOHN REEVE—Leeds and Grenville.
LAVERGNE, LOUIS—Drummond and Arthabaska.
LEBLANC, OLIVER J.—Kent, N.B.
LEFURGEY, ALFRED A.—Prince East, P.E.I.
LEGRIS, JOSEPH H.—Maskinongé.
LEMIEUX, RODOLPHE—Gaspé.
LENNOX, HAUGHTON—Simcoe, W.R.
LEONARD, J. E. EMILE—Laval.
LEWIS, WILLIAM J.—Albert.
LOGAN, HANCE J.—Cumberland.
LOVELL, HENRY—Stanstead.
LOY, GEORGE M.—Beauharnois.

MACDONALD, PETER—Huron, E.R.
MACKIE, THOMAS—Renfrew, N.R.
MACKINNON, D. A.—Queen's, E.R. (P.E.I.)
MACLAREN, ALEXANDER F.—Perth, N.R.
MACLAREN, WILLIAM SCOTT—Huntingdon.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM F.—York, Ont., E.R.
MCCARTHY, LEIGHTON GOLDIE—Simcoe, N.R.
MCCOLL, JOHN B.—Northumberland, Ont., W.R.
MCCOOL, CHARLES ARTHUR—Nipissing.
MCCORMICK, GEORGE—Muskoka and Parry Sound.
MCCREARY, WILLIAM F.—Selkirk.
MCEWEN, GEORGE—Huron, S.R.
MCGOWAN, JOHN—Wellington, C.R.
MCGUGAN, MALCOLM—Middlesex, S.R.
MCINTOSH, JOHN—Sherbrooke.
MCISAAC, COLIN F.—Antigonish.
MCLENNAN, ANGUS—Inverness.
MCLEOD, ANGUS—Ontario, N.R.
MADORE, JOSEPH ALEXANDRE C.—Hochelaga.
MALOUIN, ALBERT—Quebec Centre.
MARCIL, CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCIL, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARTINEAU, PIERRE R.—Montmagny.
MATHESON, JOSEPH—Richmond, N.S.
MAXWELL, GEORGE RITCHIE—Burrard.
MEIGS, DANIEL B.—Missisquoi.
MIGNAULT, ROCH MOÏSE S.—Yamaska.
MONET, DOMINIQUE—Laprairie and Napierville.
MONK, FREDERICK D.—Jacques Cartier.
MORIN, JEAN BAPTISTE—Dorchester.
MORRISON, AULAY—New Westminster.
MULOCK, HON. WILLIAM—York, Ont., N.R.
MURRAY, THOMAS—Pontiac.

NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E.R.

OLIVER, FRANK—Alberta.
OSLER, EDMOND BOYD—Toronto, West.

PARMELEE, CHARLES H.—Shefford.
PATERSON, HON. WILLIAM—Wentworth and N. Brant.
POPE, RUFUS H.—Compton.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W.R.
POWER, WILLIAM—Quebec, West.
PRÉFONTAINE, RAYMOND—Maissonneuve and Terrebonne.
PRINGLE, ROBERT A.—Cornwall and Stormont.
PROULX, ISIDORE—Prescott.
PUTTEE, ARTHUR W.—Winnipeg.

REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
REID, JOHN D.—Grenville, S.R.
RICHARDSON, MATTHEW KENDALL—Grey, S.R.
RILEY, GEORGE—Victoria, B.C.
ROBINSON, JABEL—Elgin, W.R.
ROBINSON, JAMES—Northumberland, N.B.
ROCHE, WILLIAM—Halifax.
ROCHE, WILLIAM J.—Marquette.
RODDICK, THOMAS G.—Montreal, St. Antoine.
ROSAMOND, BENNETT—Lanark, N.R.
ROSS, JEAN AUGUSTE—Rimouski.
ROSS, HON. WILLIAM—Victoria, N.S.
ROSS, WILLIAM—Ontario, S.R.
ROUSSEAU, JEFFREY ALEXANDRE—Champlain.
RUSSELL, BENJAMIN—Hants.

SCHELL, JACOB T.—Glengarry.
SCOTT, WALTER—Assiniboia, West.
SEAGRAM, JOSEPH E.—Waterloo, N.R.
SHERRITT, JOHN—Middlesex, N.R.
SIFTON, HON. CLIFFORD—Brandon.
SIMMONS, OLIVER—Lambton, E.R.
SMITH, ERNEST D.—Wentworth, S.R.
SMITH, RALPH—Vancouver.
SPROULE, THOMAS S.—Grey, E.R.
STEPHENS, GEORGE—Kent, Ont.
STEWART, D. A.—Lisgar.

SUTHERLAND, HON. JAMES—Oxford, N.R.
SUTHERLAND, ROBERT FRANKLIN—Essex, N.R.

TALBOT, ONÉSIPHORE ERNEST—Bellechasse.
TARTE, HON. JOSEPH ISRAEL—Montreal, St. Mary.
TAYLOR, GEORGE—Leeds, S.R.
THOMPSON, ANDREW THORBURN—Haldimand and Monck.
TISDALE, HON. DAVID—Norfolk, S.R.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TOLMIE, JOHN—Bruce, W.R.
TOLTON, EDWIN—Wellington, N.R.
TUCKER, JOSEPH JOHN—St. John, N.B, City & Co.
TUPPER, HON. SIR CHARLES HIBBERT, K.C.M.G.—Pictou.
TURCOT, GEORGE—Megantic.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.

VROOMAN, ADAM E.—Victoria, Ont., S.R.

WADE, FLETCHER BATH—Annapolis.
WARD, HENRY ALFRED—Durham, E.R.
WILMOT, ROBERT D.—Sunbury and Queen's.
WILSON, URIAH—Lennox.
WRIGHT, AARON ABEL—Renfrew, S.R.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION, NINTH PARLIAMENT

1902

ADDINGTON—Melzar Avery.
ALBERT—William J. Lewis.
ALBERTA—Frank Oliver.
ALGOMA—Albert Edward Dyment.
ANNAPOLIS—Fletcher Bath Wade.
ANTIGONISH—Colin F. McIsaac.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.
ASSINIBOIA, EAST—James M. Douglas.
ASSINIBOIA, WEST—Walter Scott.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcil.
BEAUCE—Henri Sévérin Béland.
BEAUHARNOIS—George M. Loy.
BELLECHASSE—Onésiphore Ernest Talbot.
BERTHIER—Joseph Eloi Archambault.
BONAVENTURE—Charles Marcil.
BOTHWELL—James Clancy.
BRANDON—Hon. Clifford Sifton.
BRANT, S. RIDING—Charles Bernhard Heyd.
BROCKVILLE—John Culbert.
BROME—Hon. Sydney Arthur Fisher.
BRUCE, E. RIDING—Henry Cargill.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—James Halliday.
BRUCE, W. RIDING—John Tolmie.
BURRARD—George Ritchie Maxwell.

CAPE BRETON—Alexander Johnston. Arthur S. Kendall.
CARDWELL—Robert Johnston.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frederick Harding Hale.
CARLETON (O.)—Edward Kidd.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Victor Geoffrion.
CHAMPLAIN—Jeffrey Alexandre Rousseau.
CHARLEVOIX—Charles Angers.
CHARLOTTE—Gilbert W. Ganong.
CHATEAUGUAY—James P. Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Joseph Girard.
COLCHESTER—Seymour E. Gourley.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—Robert A. Pringle.
CUMBERLAND—Hance J. Logan.

DIGBY—Albert J. S. Copp.
DORCHESTER—Jean Baptiste Morin.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Louis Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM, E. RIDING—Henry Alfred Ward.
DURHAM, W. RIDING—Robert Beith.

ELGIN, E. RIDING—Andrew B. Ingram.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Jabel Robinson.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—Robert Franklin Sutherland.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—Mahlon K. Cowan.

FRONTENAC—Hiram A. Calvin.

GASPÉ—Rodolphe Lemieux.
GLENGARRY—Jacob T. Schell.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE, S. RIDING—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. RIDING—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. RIDING—Edward H. Horsey.
GREY, S. RIDING—Matthew Kendall Richardson.
GUYSBOROUGH—Duncan C. Fraser.

HALDIMAND AND MONCK—Andrew Thorburn Thompson.
HALIFAX—Robert L. Borden. William Roche.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON—Samuel Barker. Frank C. Bruce.
HANTS—Benjamin Russell.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, N. RIDING—Alexander W. Carscallen.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—J. Alexandre Camille Madore.
HUNTINGDON—William Scott Maclaren.
HURON, E. RIDING—Peter Macdonald.
HURON, S. RIDING—George McEwen.
HURON, W. RIDING—Robert Holmes.

INVERNESS—Angus McLennan.

JACQUES CARTIER—Frederick D. Monk.
JOLIETTE—Charles Bazinet.

KAMOURASKA—Hon. Henry George Carroll.
KENT (N.B.)—Oliver J. LeBlanc.
KENT (O.)—George Stephens.
KING'S (N.B.)—George W. Fowler.
KING'S (N.S.)—Hon. Frederick W. Borden.

KING'S (P.E.I.)—James J. Hughes.
KINGSTON—William Harty.

LABELLE—Henri Bourassa.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Oliver Simmons.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Thomas George Johnston.
LANARK, N. RIDING—Bennett Rosamond.
LANARK, S. RIDING—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—Dominique Monet.
L'ASSOMPTION—R. Charlemagne Laurier.
LAVAL—J. E. Emile Leonard.
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. RIDING—John Reeve Lavell.
LEEDS, S. RIDING—George Taylor.
LENNOX—Uriah Wilson.
LÉVIS—Louis Julien Demers.
LINCOLN AND NIAGARA—Edward A. Lancaster.
LISGAR—D. A. Stewart.
L'ISLET—Onésiphore Carbonneau.
LONDON—Charles S. Hyman.
LOTBINIÈRE—Edmond Fortier.
LUNENBURG—Charles Edwin Kaulbach.

MACDONALD—Nathaniel Boyd.
MAISONNEUVE—Raymond Préfontaine.
MARQUETTE—William J. Roche.
MASKINONGÉ—Joseph H. Legris.
MEGANTIC—George Turcot.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—James Gilmour.
MIDDLESEX, N. RIDING—John Sherritt.
MIDDLESEX, S. RIDING—Malcolm McGugan.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—William Samuel Calvert.
MISSISQUOI—Daniel B. Meigs.
MONTCALM—François O. Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Pierre R. Martineau.
MONTMORENCY—Thomas Chase Casgrain.
MONTREAL, ST. ANNE—Daniel Gallery.
MONTREAL, ST. ANTOINE—Thomas G. Roddick.
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES—Joseph Brunet.
MONTREAL, ST. LAWRENCE—Robert Bickerdike.
MONTREAL, St. MARY—Hon. Joseph Israel Tarte.
MUSKOKA—George McCormick.

NEW WESTMINSTER—Aulay Morrison.
NICOLET—Georges Ball.
NIPISSING—Charles Arthur McCool.
NORFOLK, N. RIDING—John Charlton.
NORFOLK, S. RIDING—Hon. David Tisdale.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—James Robinson.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E.R.—Edward Cochrane.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W.R.—John B. McColl.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—Angus McLeod.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—William Ross.
ONTARIO, W. RIDING—Isaac J. Gould.
OTTAWA (City)—Napoleon A. Belcourt. Thomas Birkett.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Hon. James Sutherland.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, G.C.M.G.

PEEL—Richard Blain.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Alexander Ferguson MacLaren.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Dilman Kinsey Erb.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John Lang.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—James Kendrey.
PICTOU—Adam Carr Bell. Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, K.C.M.G.
PONTIAC—Thomas Murray.
PORTNEUF—Michel Simeon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Isidore Proulx.
PRINCE, EAST (P.E.I.)—Alfred A. Lefurgey.
PRINCE, WEST (P.E.I.)—Edward Hackett.
PRINCE EDWARD—George Oscar Alcorn.
PROVENCHER—Alphonse A. C. LaRivière.

QUEBEC, CENTRE—Albert Malouin.
QUEBEC, EAST—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.
QUEBEC, WEST—William Power.
QUEBEC (County)—Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.
QUEEN'S, EAST (P.E.I.)—D. A MacKinnon.
QUEEN'S, WEST (P.E.I.)—Donald Farquharson.

RENFREW, N. RIDING—Thomas Mackie.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Aaron Abel Wright.
RESTIGOUCHE—James Reid.
RICHELIEU—Arthur Aimé Bruneau.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—Joseph Matheson.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Edmund William Tobin.
RIMOUSKI—Jean Auguste Ross.
ROUVILLE—Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur.
RUSSELL—William C. Edwards.

ST. HYACINTHE—Hon. Michel E. Bernier.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City—Hon. Andrew George Blair.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City & Co.—Joseph John Tucker.
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE—L. Philippe Demers.
SASKATCHEWAN—Thomas Osborne Davis.
SELKIRK—William F. McCreary.
SHEFFORD—Charles H. Parmelee.
SHELBURNE AND QUEEN'S, N.S.—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
SHERBROOKE—John McIntosh.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—William H. Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—Leighton Goldie McCarthy.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—Haughton Lennox.
SOULANGES—Augustin Bourbonnais.
STANSTEAD—Henry Lovell.
SUNBURY and QUEEN'S (N. B)—Robert D. Wilmot.

TEMISCOUATA—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Raymond Préfontaine.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Jacques Bureau.
TORONTO, CENTRE—William Rees Brock.
TORONTO, EAST—Albert E. Kemp.
TORONTO, WEST—Edward Frederick Clarke. Edmond Boyd Osler.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

VANCOUVER—Ralph Smith.
VAUDREUIL—Henry S. Harwood.
VICTORIA (B.C.)—Thomas Earle. George Riley.

VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
VICTORIA (N.S.)—Hon. William Ross.
VICTORIA (O.), N. RIDING—Samuel Hughes.
VICTORIA (O.), S. RIDING—Adam E. Vrooman.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—Joseph E. Seagram.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—George A. Clare.
WELLAND—William Manly German.
WELLINGTON, C. RIDING—John McGowan.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—Edwin Tolton.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH AND BRANT, N. RIDING—Hon. William Paterson.
WENTWORTH, S. RIDING—Ernest D. Smith.
WESTMORELAND—Henry R. Emmerson.
WINNIPEG—Arthur W. Puttee.
WRIGHT—Louis N. Champagne.

YALE and CARIBOO—William Alfred Galliher.
YAMASKA—Roch Moïse S. Mignault.
YARMOUTH—Thomas Barnard Flint.
YORK (N.B.)—Alexander Gibson, jr.
YORK (O.), E. RIDING—William F. Maclean.
YORK (O.), N. RIDING—Hon. William Mulock.
YORK (O.), W. RIDING—Archibald Campbell.

SELECT Committee Appointed to Supervise the Publication of the Official Reports of the Debates of the House.

BALL, GEORGES—Nicolet.
CHAMPAGNE, L. N.—Wright.
CHARLTON, JOHN—Norfolk, N.
CLARKE, E. F.—Toronto, W.
EARLE, THOS.—Victoria, B.C.
HOLMES, ROBT.—Huron, W.
LARIVIÈRE, A. A. C.—Provencher.
MACDONALD, P.—Huron, E.
MADORE, J. A. C.—Hochelaga.
MONET, D.—Laprairie and Napierville.
ROCHE, WM. J.—Marquette.
RUSSELL, B.—Hants.
SCOTT, WALTER—Assiniboia, W.
SUTHERLAND, R. F.—Essex, N.
TAYLOR, GEO.—Leeds and Grenville.

Chairman:—L. N. CHAMPAGNE—Wright.

ERRATA.

VOL I.

Col. 533, 10th line from bottom, for 'North Grey' read 'East Grey.'

Col. 560, 5th line from top, 'Mr. Kendrey' should read 'Mr. Kendal

Col. 1313, last line,

'Liberal rule . ... $9,841,186'

should read:

'Total increase under Liberal rule $39,841,186

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 13, 1902.

The Parliament, which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 13th day of February, 1902, for the despatch of business.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

A Message was delivered by Molyneux St. John, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod :

Mr. SPEAKER,—I am commanded to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General desires and awaits the attendance of your honourable House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly the House went into the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to 'The Dominion Controverted Elections Act,' certificates and reports relating to the elections :—

For the electoral district of the West Riding of the county of Durham ;

For the electoral district of York, N.B.; and

For the electoral district of Lisgar ;

in all of which electoral districts the elections were declared void.

In conformity with chapter 9, section 46, of the Revised Statutes, I issued my several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts respectively.

I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received from two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the 'Dominion Controverted Elections Act,' a certificate and report relating to the election for the electoral district of Victoria, B.C., by which the election of Hon. Edward Gawler Prior was declared void, and the petition against the election of Thos. Earle, Esq., was dismissed.

In conformity with chapter 9, section 46, of the Revised Statutes, I issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district in the room of Hon. Edward Gawler Prior.

I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received from the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to 'The Dominion Controverted Elections Act,' certificates and reports relating to the election :—

For the electoral district of Ottawa City ;

For the electoral district of Cornwall and Stormont ;

For the electoral district of Charlotte ;

For the electoral district of the South Riding of the county of Ontario ; and

For the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Bruce ;

by which the said election petitions were severally dismissed and the sitting members declared duly elected.

I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, certified copies of the judgments and decisions of the said court in the matter of the appeals from the decisions of the trial judges in the lower courts, relating to the elections :—

For the electoral district of Beauharnois ;

For the electoral district of Burrard ;

For the electoral district of Victoria, B.C. ;

For the electoral district of Two Mountains ; and

For the electoral district of Terrebonne ;

in all of which the said appeals were dismissed.

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also to inform the House that, during the recess, I received communications from several members, notifying me that the following vacancies had occurred in the representation, viz. :—

Of Joseph Godbout, Esq., member for the electoral district of Beauce, by being summoned to the Senate ;

Of Arthur M. Dechene, Esq., member for the electoral district of L'Islet, by being summoned to the Senate ;

Of John W. Bell, Esq., member for the electoral district of Addington, by decease ;

Of Odilon G. Desmarais, Esq., member for the electoral district of Montreal (St. James), by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

Of Thomas Fortin, Esq., member for the electoral district of Laval by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown ;

Of Byron Moffatt Britton, Esq., member for the electoral district of Kingston, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown ;

Of the Hon. Sir Louis Henry Davies, K.C.M.G., member for the electoral district of Queen's West, P.E.I., by the acceptance of the office of Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada ;

Of Nathaniel Clarke Wallace, Esq., member for the electoral district of the West Riding of the county of York, by decease ;

Of the Hon. James Sutherland, member for the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Oxford, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown ;

Of the Hon. R. R. Dobell, member for the electoral district of Quebec West, by decease ; and

Of Henry G. Carroll, Esq., member for the electoral district of Kamouraska by the acceptance of the office of the Solicitor General of Canada.

I accordingly issued my several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts respectively.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that during the recess, the Clerk of the House received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificates of the election and return of the following members, viz .:—

Of Alexander Gibson, junior, Esq., for the electoral district of York, N.B. ;

Of Henri Sévérin Béland, Esq., for the electoral district of Beauce ;

Of Robert Beith, Esq., for the electoral district of the West Riding of the county of Durham ;

Of Onésiphore Carbonneau, Esq., for the electoral district of L'Islet ;

Of Wm. Harty, Esq., for the electoral district of Kingston ;

Of Edward Guss Porter, Esq., for the electoral district of the West Riding of the county of Hastings ;

Of Archibald Campbell, Esq., for the electoral district of the West Riding of the county of York, Ont. ;

Of Melzar Avery, Esq., for the electoral district of Addington ;

Of J. E. Emile Leonard, Esq., for the electoral district of Laval ;

Of Hon. Jas. Sutherland, for the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Oxford ;

Of Jos. Brunet, Esq., for the electoral district of Montreal, (St. James) ;

Of Donald Farquharson, Esq., for the electoral district of Queen's West, P.E.I. ; and

Of William Power, Esq., for the electoral district of Quebec West.

Mr. SPEAKER.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. James Sutherland, member for the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Oxford, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright).

Donald Farquharson, Esq., member for the electoral district of West Queen's, introduced by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and Mr. McKinnon.

Archibald Campbell, Esq., member for the electoral district of the West Riding of the county of York, Ontario, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland.)

Alexander Gibson, jr., Esq., member for the electoral district of York, New Brunswick, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland).

Henri Sévérin Béland, Esq., for the Electoral District of Beauce.

J. E. Emile Leonard, Esq., member for the electoral district of Laval, introduced by Mr. Borden (Halifax) and Mr. Monk.

Onésiphore Carbonneau, Esq., member for the electoral district of L'Islet, by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier).

Edward Guss Porter, Esq., member for the electoral district of West Hastings, by Mr. Borden (Halifax) and Mr. Northrup.

Joseph Brunet, Esq., member for the electoral district of St. James, Montreal, by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) and Mr. Champagne.

Melzar Avery, Esq., member for the electoral district of Addington, introduced by Mr. Borden (Halifax) and Mr. Taylor.

Robert Beith, Esq., member for the electoral district of West Durham, by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—The Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that when the House did attend His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament, a copy of which is as follows :—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In meeting you again at the commencement of another session of Parliament, it is my first duty to express the deep sense of our gratitude to Divine Providence for the many blessings

which Canada has received during the past year, and particularly for the exceptionally bountiful harvest in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

It was very gratifying to note the cordial reception tendered by all classes of the people to the Prince and Princess of Wales, on the occasion of their visit in September and October last, the only regrettable feature being the limited time at their disposal, which prevented their visiting many important centres of population. It is however a great satisfaction to know that their Royal Highnesses enjoyed their tour through Canada and carried away the most pleasant recollections of their visit to this part of the Empire.

The assassination of President McKinley has elicited a universal feeling of sympathy and sorrow throughout the civilized world and, though Canada has happily so far been free from crimes of this character, the close proximity to the United States may make it advisable to join our efforts to the efforts of the United States and other nations and to provide by legislation for the adequate punishment of those who, either by speech or writing, incite fanatics to the perpetration of such horrible crimes.

The returns of the late census will be laid before you and, while the absolute increase in the number of population is not so great as might have been expected, the evidence of growth in wealth and in the general tokens of prosperous development are highly satisfactory. There is good reason also to believe that the increase of population during the latter half of the decade has been very greatly in excess of the average of former years and that in the near future we may look for a much more rapid growth than occurred during the period covered by the last two censuses.

Application having been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for approval of an increase of its capital, to meet the demand for additional rolling stock and other improved facilities, for handling the growing traffic, my Ministers availed themselves of the opportunity to stipulate that the long pending question of the power of the Governor in Council to regulate the tolls of the Company should be submitted to the Courts for a judicial decision. The correspondence and other papers will be laid before you.

The inventor, Mr. Marconi, having met unexpected obstacles to the carrying on of his experiments in wireles ocean telegraphy in a sister colony, my Ministers deemed it expedient to invite him to continue his operations on the coast of Nova Scotia, and they availed themselves of his presence in Canada to enter into negotiations resulting in an arrangement through which, should the project prove as successful as is hoped for, the Government and people of Canada will enjoy the benefits of the invention on very favourable terms, including rates for transatlantic messages very much below those now existing.

I am pleased to inform you that the display made by Canada of her products, at the several expositions at which they have been exhibited during the last year has attracted much attention, and has already resulted in many inquiries and orders for our goods.

I may also congratulate you on the satisfactory condition of the revenue and on the steady and continuous expansion of the general business of the country as evidenced by the increased volume of exports and imports.

With the view of still further facilitating and developing our trade with other countries, it will probably be found expedient to increase the number of our commercial agencies, and Parliament will be asked to consider the desirability of making additional provision for that purpose.

I have also pleasure in informing you that the Governments of Australia and New Zealand have accepted an invitation from my Government to attend a conference in London next June for the consideration of trade, transportation, cable and other matters of inter-colonial concern, and it is hoped that the meeting may lead to an extension of Canadian trade with those important portions of His Majesty's Dominions.

I have further to advise you that my Government, having caused inquiry to be made, has reached the conclusion that the establishment of direct steamship service with South Africa would enable Canada to secure in that country a profitable market for her varied products, and, to that end, will endeavour to arrange for such a service.

His Majesty has been graciously pleased to invite the Premier to be present at the ceremonies attending his Coronation. It is to be hoped that the presence of the leading statesmen of the several colonies upon this occasion will afford an opportunity for the discussion of subjects of mutual interest which may considerably affect the development of our trade and commerce in the near future, with the mother country and with our sister colonies.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The public accounts for the last year and the estimates for the succeeding year will be laid before you without delay.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :
Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I commit the above matters and all others which may be submitted to you, to your earnest consideration, and I rely upon your wisdom and prudence to deal with them in the manner which, under Divine Providence, may prove most conducive to the best interests of Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That Select Standing Committees of this House for the present session be appointed for the following purposes :—1. On Privileges and Elections. 2. On Expiring Laws. 3. On Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. 4. On Miscellaneous Private Bills. 5. On Standing Orders. 6. On Printing. 7. On Public Accounts. 8. On Banking and Commerce. 9. On Agriculture and Colonization—which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may

be referred to them by the House ; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That a special committee of five members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed a list of members to form the select standing committees ordered by this House on Thursday, 13th February, instant, such select committee to be composed of the following members : Laurier, Borden (Halifax), Cartwright, Sutherland (Oxford) and Haggart.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That a select committee be appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of this House during the present session, with power to report from time to time, to be composed of Messrs. Ball, Champagne, Charlton, Clarke, Earle, Madore, Holmes, La Riviere, Macdonald, Monet, Roche (Marquette), Russell, Scott, Sutherland (Essex) and Taylor.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Joint Librarians of Parliament.—(Mr. Speaker.)

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 14, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House proceeded to the consideration of His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL (West York). The very pleasant task Mr. Speaker, has been assigned me to-day of moving a humble address to His Excellency in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and I desire at the outset to express my appreciation of the great honour which has thus been conferred, not so much upon myself as upon the county of West York, for I believe that this is the first time since confederation that to a representative of that county in this House has this honourable duty been intrusted. And while I recognize my inability to perform it as creditably as I would like, or as the occasion demands, I am sure that I will receive from both sides of the House that kind indulgence and consideration which has always been granted to young members.

In the first paragraph of the address I am sure we will all join heartily. I am sure we are all united in expressing our gratitude to Divine Providence for the benefits conferred upon this Dominion during the past year, especially the magnificent harvest which has blessed in particular our great North-west, and diffused gladness and prosperity throughout this Dominion, not only in the North-west but in the other provinces has Divine Providence been kind to us in the past year, and certainly if ever we should express our gratitude to the Giver of all good gifts, we ought to do so on the present occasion.

The address naturally refers to the visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales to this country. We are indeed glad to know that their Royal Highnesses carried away with them most pleasant recollections of their visit. Indeed I think that no event in the history of confederation has so stirred the hearts of our people and evoked such an outburst of loyalty to the person and throne of the representative of the illustrious line of sovereigns who have guided the destinies of the empire, as this visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales. We are glad to know that from the moment they landed upon the historic soil of the old city of Quebec—that soil rendered sacred by the memories of the conflict between the two great races now joined in friendship, that soil in where breathed their last, the one in the hour of victory, the other in the hour of defeat, the two great and noble warriors, personifying the chivalry and valour of the two great nationalities in this country, now living in peace and harmony, and working together shoulder to shoulder for the unification and solidification of this mighty Dominion—we are glad to know that from the moment of landing until departure, the reception which their Royal Highnesses received was one calculated to make them carry away most pleasant recollections. And it is gratifying to our pride as a portion of the empire to reflect that although the Prince and Princess of Wales made the tour of the world, and although they travelled in countries peopled by different nationalities, speaking different languages, yet everywhere they went was British territory and everywhere they were greeted by that grand old flag which for a thousand years has braved the battle and the breeze.

And in all these countries, though the people may speak different languages from that which we speak, and although their religion may be different from ours, yet, from

the bottom of their hearts the prayer went up for the preservation of their royal visitors, and that grand old anthem, so dear to the hearts of Canadians, 'God Save the King,' was sung as fervently as it would be in Great Britain itself. It must have been a revelation to their Royal Highnesses to realize the vastness of this mighty empire, the destinies of which they will, some day, be called upon to guide. Though we all hope that the day is far distant when His Majesty Edward VII., shall pass away, yet we know that the time must come when the sceptre shall pass into other hands; and it is pleasant indeed for the people of this country, having had some opportunity to gain knowledge of the character and disposition of those who, in future years, will rule over this empire, to know that they are of a kingly race and that they are fitted, eminently fitted, to fill the lofty position that some day, they will be called upon to fill.

The Speech from the Throne naturally refers to the assassination of President McKinley. I am sure, sir, that the people of this country, in common with those of all nations, will rejoice to know that this government proposes to join in measures that will prevent such diabolical crimes as that which was lately committed in the United States, and I am sure that this House will learn with pleasure that measures in this direction will soon be submitted to it.

The returns of the census are, naturally, a subject of very great importance to the people. And, while, for myself, I am somewhat disappointed at those returns, having felt that we had reason to believe that the population of Canada had increased at a greater ratio than is shown to have been the case by the official figures presented to us, yet, I believe that the last few years have shown that the population of this Dominion is increasing at a rapid rate. All the evidences known to us, the general prosperity of the country, the stream of immigration that is going into the great North-west, the filling up of our towns and the cities—all these lead us to believe that within the last few years our population has been rapidly increasing and that when the next census is taken it will show a much larger ratio of increase than the census whose figures have just been made known. I am glad that the papers will be laid before us, and that there will be an opportunity of discussing this matter more fully at a later day.

Naturally, the application of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the right to increase their capital by some $20,000,000, is one that could not be passed over without comment in the Speech from the Throne. For my part, I consider it another evidence of the great prosperity of the country that a road penetrating all the parts of the Dominion, with its branch lines completing a great system, should find it necessary to double-track large portions of the line and make other extensive improvements to provide for the enormous amount of traffic that is offering. The necessity of providing for this additional traffic having arisen, it is natural that the company should seek power to add to its capital stock. But I am sure that the House will be glad to know that the government have been guarding the interests of the people and that the addition of $20,000,000 to the company's capital will not affect injuriously the government's right to control the rates. Everybody knows that, under the bargain made with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Governor General in council had no control over the rates of tolls on the traffic of the road until the company had earned a dividend of ten per cent on its capital. The question naturally arose: What is the capital of the Canadian Pacific Railway? We all know that the authorized capital was $65,000,000; and added to that, they had a large bond issue. Questions arose whether the amount of money they raised on these bonds should be considered part of their capital or not, and also whether their authorized capital of $65,000,000 should be considered, for this purpose, at its face value, or at the amount that the company received for it. I am sure that hon. members are all glad to know that these long-pending difficulties and differences of opinion are now to be settled in a practical way by the courts of the land. I believe that, before long, a solution of that difficult question will be arrived at which will be satisfactory to the people of this Dominion. The prospect of such a solution, I am sure, will be gratifying to the House.

The wonderful invention of Marconi, in his wireless telegraphy, is one that is of vast importance to us, and I am glad to know that the government has made arrangements by which Signor Marconi can continue his operations on the coast of Nova Scotia. If he is successful, as I hope and believe he will be—and who can tell in this age of invention, in this age of wonderful development, what the future has in store for us?—his invention will redound to the great credit of this Dominion and will enable us to make arrangements for sending messages across the ocean at very much lower rates than those now in force. I feel sure that the government, in making arrangements with Signor Marconi, has done a thing in the best interests of the people.

The success of Canadian exhibitors at the various industrial exhibitions that have taken place is a matter also of the utmost importance to the people of this country. It is gratifying indeed to know that our success in these great exhibitions, notably at Paris, at the Pan-American at Buffalo, and at Glasgow, has been so great as to assure us of practical results of vast interest to the people. At the Paris Exposition, Canadian exhibitors won 45 grand prizes, 87 gold medals, 105 silver medals, 85 bronze medals, and 48 honourable mention diplomas, a total of 370. And, at the Pan-American at Buf-

falo, the results have been almost as good. At that Exposition, Canadian exhibitors won 21 gold medals, 33 silver medals, 38 bronze medals, and 88 honourable mention diplomas—a total of 180 prizes and diplomas for Canada. The live stock entered by United States exhibitors at Buffalo comprised 546 animals, and the exhibitors were awarded prizes to the amount of $4,368.40. From the Dominion of Canada we sent 344 animals, yet our exhibitors carried off prizes to the amount of $3,141.60, a very much larger proportion than that of the United States exhibitors. I need not take the time to give the details in other cases. The exhibitors at the fair in Glasgow were able to carry off a great many prizes, and got high awards for the excellence of their exhibits. And what is better, they were able to make sales of their furniture, of their carriages, of their agricultural implements, and especially of bacon. The House is no doubt aware that we have sold very little bacon in Scotland, but after the exhibition took place, and after the quality and excellence of Canadian bacon became known there, enormous orders were given to the Wm. Davies Co., of Toronto, and to other companies, and they have been enabled to make large sales, and have placed upon the markets in Scotland a large quantity of the excellent bacon which they are producing from our Canadian pork. But in other lines also Canadian manufacturers have been enabled to sell a large quantity of their goods in consequence of the exhibition that was held in Glasgow. So I think that the three exhibitions we have held in the places I have mentioned, have proved of enormous advantage to the people of this country. They have advertised Canada as it was never advertised before, and have brought our goods into competition with those of the rest of the world ; they have shown that the people of this young Dominion are able to carry off a great number of prizes in competition with the wide world ; they have shown that our people are energetic, are perfecting their machinery and their plant, and are able to produce articles that will compete successfully with the wide world.

The condition of the revenue, and especially the enormous exports and imports of this Dominion, naturally called for some comment from His Excellency. It must be exceedingly gratifying to the people of this vast Dominion, no matter to what political party they may belong, to know that their country is marching forward by leaps and bounds. One can scarcely realize the enormous advance that has taken place during the last few years. Take, for instance, the trade of Canada, which is a very fair index of the prosperity of the country. In 1891, we find the foreign trade of Canada amounted to $218,284,934. In five years, from 1891 to 1896, that trade made but slow progress. In 1896 our foreign trade amounted to $239,025,360, or an increase at the rate of about 9 per cent in those five years. But in 1896 a change came over the affairs of this country ; the shackles were taken off trade ; the wheels of commerce were set in motion ; and immediately Canada went forward by leaps and bounds. In 1891, 5 years afterwards, what do we find? The foreign trade of Canada rose from $239,000,000 to $386,900,000. Our foreign trade in those five years increased at the rate of 61 per cent, instead of 9 per cent as in the previous period of five years. But, Sir, notwithstanding that our foreign trade increased with this rapidity in the past five years, the end is not yet ; and year by year, and month by month, we are able to report a steady increase ; and it must be gratifying to all true Canadians to know that this great Dominion, of which we are all so proud, is marching forward steadily and rapidly. Why, Sir, during the last seven months the foreign trade of this country has kept going forward. During the seven months ending with January last the foreign trade of this country has increased much more rapidly than it did during the corresponding months of the previous year, showing a gain of something like $18,555,000. This must be exceedingly gratifying to those who follow the course of public events in Canada.

Now, let us notice the character of this increase as regards the export of the products of Canada, as that is the feature with which we are more directly interested. In 1891 the exports of the products of Canada were only $88,000,000 in round numbers. In 1896 they had increased to $109,000,000, or at the rate of 24 per cent. In 1901 the exports of the products of Canada rose to $177,000,000, or an increase at the rate of 61 per cent. That increase has still been going on during the last seven months ; and I am satisfied that when we close the books on the 30th of June next, the foreign trade of Canada will show a great increase over that of last year, and that, in round numbers, it will amount to probably $425,000,000.

But our progress is not only shown by the increase in our exports and imports. Take, for instance, the amount of money deposited in our banks as the savings of the people. In 1891 the deposits in our savings banks amounted to $39,400,000. In 1896 they amounted to $46,799,000. In 1901, five years afterwards, they rose by $10,000,000, and amounted to $56,048,000. Then if we take the deposits of the people in the chartered banks, both those with notice and those without notice, you will find that the same gratifying increase has been going on. In 1891 the combined deposits in the chartered banks, with notice on demand and without notice, amounted to $142,631,000. In 1896 they rose to $183,769,000 ; and in 1901 they rose to $315,775,000.

I am sure, Sir, that it must be exceedingly gratifying to the people of this coun-

try to know that this young Dominion is making such marked progress. They rejoice to see the evidences that this progress is likely to continue, and that we are likely to go forward in our career of prosperity until ultimately we reach that high degree to which we believe this young Dominion is destined.

His Excellency also refers to the necessity of increasing the number of our commercial agencies in the different countries for the purpose of facilitating and developing our trade. I look upon that proposal with a great deal of satisfaction. I think the people of this country will hail with delight this move of the government and the reference of His Excellency to the necessity of increasing our commercial agencies throughout the world. We know that other countries, notably the American Republic to the south of us, have commercial agencies located in every principal town and city of this Dominion, and in other countries as well, while Canada has been depending upon the agents appointed by Great Britain who are not able to afford our manufacturers the advantages which the American government furnish to their manufacturers. I am sure that there is nothing the people of Canada will hail with greater delight than this reference of His Excellency to the necessity of increasing the number of commercial agencies and of making additional provision for these agencies.

Then, reference is also made to the fact of the Australian and New Zealand governments having accepted an invitation from this government to attend a conference in London next June, for the consideration of trade, transportation, cable and other matters of intercolonial concern. I think that this conference will be of enormous advantage to this Dominion. I hope the results that will flow from it will bind still closer and closer the bonds between Great Britain and her various colonies, and I am sure that those whom we send to represent us there will look well after our interests and will, I hope, be able to effect such arrangements with our sister colonies of Australia and New Zealand as will tend to the development of our trade and to the increase of the prosperity in this Dominion in accordance with the wishes expressed by His Excellency the Governor General.

I am also pleased to note that this government has reached the conclusion that a direct steamship service with South Africa would enable Canada to secure a profitable market for her various products, and that to that end will endeavour to arrange for such a service. I think that when the war, which is now going on in South Africa, is happily brought to a close—and we all hope that the end is not far distant —that, when the country is in a settled state again, when the war is over, and when a grand South African confederation is established on the lines of this Dominion, there will be an enormous development of trade throughout that country and it is our bounden duty as a wise and careful people to see that we obtain our share of that trade; but, it is quite impossible to establish a trade with these far distant countries unless we have a direct line of steamships running regularly so that shippers may know just when their products can be forwarded to those markets. Given this line of steamship accommodation, I believe the result will be that we will be able to establish in the South African confederacy an enormous trade. I consider the time exceedingly opportune to establish such steamship communication, because we all know that when trade gets into certain channels it is exceedingly difficult to turn it in other directions, and so it is proper and wise for us to take time by the forelock and establish this line of steamships which will sail from Eastern Canada to South Africa, and perhaps continue on further to Australia, thus establishing a regular steamship communication which will redound to the advantage of Canada, and build up this great Dominion, as I believe, nothing else can build it up.

Another matter to which His Excellency refers is the coronation of His Most Gracious Majesty, King Edward VII. in June next. There is no doubt, Sir, that this will be an event such as has never occurred before, and will seldom occur in a life time again. We are pleased to know that the premiers of all the different provinces will be invited to attend the coronation, and, that among the great galaxy of men from every country in this wide world, not only from all the British colonies, but men speaking different languages, perhaps, and of different nationalities, coming from foreign countries, the brightest, smartest, and ablest that the world can produce, the man above all men, the man whom everybody will delight to honour, the man who will tower away above all others and the man who on a former occasion when the world's great men met to celebrate the jubilee of the King's mother, who stood on a pedestal of glory and honour was the premier of this vast Dominion. I think we may all be proud that we have a statesman of such ability, a man of such magnetic influence, a man who is recognized not only in the British colonies, but all over the world as one of the grandest and noblest and brightest statesmen that this world has ever produced.

I beg to move :

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, to thank His Excellency for his gracious speech at the opening of the present session ; and, further, to assure His Excellency that—

1. We unite with His Excellency, at the commencement of another session of parliament, in

expressing the deep sense of our gratitude to Divine Providence for the many blessings which Canada has received during the past year, and particularly for the exceptionally bountiful harvest in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

2. We receive with much pleasure His Excellency's expression of gratification at the cordial reception tendered by all classes of the people, to the Prince and Princess of Wales, on the occasion of their visit in September and October last, the only regrettable feature being the limited time at their disposal, which prevented their visiting many important centres of population; and we are happy to know that their Royal Highnesses enjoyed their tour through Canada and carried away the most pleasant recollections of their visit to this part of the Empire.

3. We have shared the feeling of sympathy and sorrow which the assassination of President McKinley has elicited throughout the civilized world, and we are glad to be informed that, though Canada has happily so far been free from crimes of this character, the close proximity to the United States may make it advisable to join our efforts to the efforts of the United States and other nations and to provide by legislation for the adequate punishment of those who, either by speech or writing, incite fanatics to the perpetration of such horrible crimes.

4. We are pleased to learn that the returns of the late census will be laid before us and that, while the absolute increase in the number of population is not so great as might have been expected, the evidence of growth in wealth and in the general tokens of prosperous development are highly satisfactory; and also that there is good reason to believe that the increase of population during the latter half of the decade has been very greatly in excess of the average of former years and that in the near future we may look for a much more rapid growth than occurred during the period covered by the last two censuses.

5. We learn with great satisfaction that, application having been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for approval of an increase of its capital, to meet the demand for additional rolling stock and other improved facilities, for handling the growing traffic, His Excellency's Ministers availed themselves of the opportunity to stipulate that the long pending question of the power of the Governor in Council to regulate the tolls of the company should be submitted to the courts for a judicial decision, and we thank His Excellency for informing us that the correspondence and other papers will be laid before us.

6. We are pleased to be informed by His Excellency that the inventor, Mr. Marconi, having met unexpected obstacles to the carrying on of his experiments in wireless ocean telegraphy in a sister colony, His Excellency's Ministers deemed it expedient to invite him to continue his operations on the coast of Nova Scotia, and availed themselves of his presence in Canada to enter into negotiations resulting in an arrangement through which, should the project prove as successful as is hoped for, the government and people of Canada will enjoy the benefits of the invention on very favourable terms, including rates for transatlantic messages very much below those now existing.

7. We are gratified to know that the display made by Canada of her products, at the several expositions at which they have been exhibited during the last year, has attracted much attention, and has already resulted in many inquiries and orders for our goods.

8. We receive with much pleasure His Excellency's congratulations on the satisfactory condition of the revenue and on the steady and continuous expansion of the general business of the country as evidenced by the increased volume of exports and imports.

9. We learn with much interest that, with the view of still further facilitating and developing our trade with other countries, it will probably be found expedient to increase the number of our commercial agencies, and we assure His Excellency that we will willingly consider the desirability of making additional provision for that purpose.

10. We thank His Excellency for informing us that the governments of Australia and New Zealand have accepted an invitation from His Excellency's government to attend a conference in London next June for the consideration of trade, transportation, cable and other matters of intercolonial concern, and we unite with His Excellency in the hope that the meeting may lead to an extension of Canadian trade with those important portions of His Majesty's Dominions.

11. Our thanks are due to His Excellency for the information that his government, having caused inquiry to be made, has reached the conclusion that the establishment of direct steamship service with South Africa would enable Canada to secure in that country a profitable market for her varied products, and that, to that end, His Excellency's government will endeavour to arrange for such a service.

12. We are gratified to learn that His Majesty has been graciously pleased to invite the Premier to be present at the ceremonies attending his Coronation, and we share the hope that the presence of the leading statesmen of the several colonies upon this occasion will afford an opportunity for the discussion of subjects of mutual interest which may considerably affect the development of our trade and commerce in the near future, with the mother country and with our sister colonies.

13. We thank His Excellency for informing us that the public accounts for the last year and the estimates for the succeeding year will be laid before us without delay.

14. His Excellency may rest assured that the above matters and all others which may be submitted to us will receive our earnest consideration, and we thank His Excellency for the expression of his reliance upon our wisdom and prudence to deal with them in the manner which, under Divine Providence, may prove most conducive to the best interests of Canada.

Mr. HENRI BELAND (Beauce). (Translation.) I am sensible of the great honour that has been conferred upon me, in that I have been chosen to second the motion moved in such happy terms by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Arch. Campbell). But at the same time I cannot help the thought that if it was my good fortune to have been selected to address this House under such circumstances, and to discharge so honourable a task, it was perhaps also my bad luck to be called upon to do so after one of the most eloquent members

from the province of Ontario. or it is still within the vivid recollection of this House, what a remarkable feat the hon. gentleman did achieve, who has just taken his seat. At all events, Mr. Speaker, apart from the question whether it was to good or bad luck that I am indebted for the honour of seconding this motion, I have a very pleasant duty to discharge from the very outset, and it is to offer my best thanks to the right hon. the prime minister for the great honour he has conferred upon me in inviting me to perform this task. That honour, I am well aware, is not only a compliment paid to my humble self but a compliment paid to the electors of the county of Beauce, who have just returned me by acclamation. To the right hon. prime minister, then, my most heartfelt thanks are due, the more so, as under these particular circumstances, he has given a fresh proof of his devotion, which was already so marked, to the interests of his old agricultural county.

Mr. Speaker, in reading over the different paragraphs of the Speech from the Throne, the feeling which is uppermost in our minds, the feeling which is most vividly brought home to us is one of gratitude to Divine Providence for the blessings conferred, during the last twelve months, upon this vast Dominion.

I think I am voicing the feelings of this side of the House at any rate in saying that to Divine Providence we indeed owe a debt of gratitude for the happy inspiration imparted to the gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches and who have the control of public affairs.

A simple glance thrown at the Speech from the Throne will show that the government do not mean to rest upon their oars but that they are up and doing.

No doubt, they have not forgotten the fact of that great general who saw the fruit of his dearly bought victories snatched from his hands, for having one single day rested upon his laurels. No, the government cannot remain idle and with their arms folded, and that is the reason why fresh legislation is going to be brought forward and new amendments added to the existing laws. It is characteristic of human affairs that they always admit of improvement and perfecting. Go through the different provinces of the Dominion, and everywhere among the various classes of the community, you will find the country is blessed with universal prosperity ; go among the farming community, the mechanics, the manufacturing classes, and everywhere you will find that the fires of content blaze upon the hearthstones and the lights of hope illumine every household.

I need not dwell at any length here on the facts which show that an unprecedented prosperity smiles on us. But I may anticipate the comment often heard from certain quarters, and mainly from the hon. gentlemen opposite, that the prosperity we are now enjoying is neither the result of legislation nor to be attributed to any action of the government, but is the gift of a bountiful Providence. On the other hand, I am also aware that credit is claimed for the Liberal party for the prosperity with which the country is blessed. That public men are often unduly criticised or lauded and praised beyond their deserts I know very well. I for one am inclined to believe with some—and that opinion rests on a well known principle in poltical economy—that the criterion of prosperity of a country is to be found in the balance of trade, according as that balance turns in favour of or against such country. Although, under the circumstances, to encroach upon the domain of statistics may seem out of place, still I crave leave to say that, during the last five years of the Conservative administration, from 1891 to 1896, the balance of trade was in our favour but for one year ; whereas, in four out of five years under Liberal rule, the balance of trade was in our favour. During the last five years under the Conservative regime, only in one year was there an excess of imports over exports ; whereas, under Liberal rule, there was an excess of exports over imports in four years out of five.

As I have the honour of representing here a rural constituency, the population of which is one as thoroughly agricultural as is to be found anywhere in the province of Quebec, I may perhaps take the liberty of dwelling at greater length on the prosperity of our farming community, and mainly upon the remarkable growth and steady development of dairying, but at the very outset, I am met with this question : what is the part to be played by the government, in order to promote, encourage and secure the proper development of our agricultural industry ?

To build up and secure the prosperity of that industry, there are requisite conditions : first, a market must be provided ; in the second place, proper and ample facilities of transportation at a low temperature have to be arranged ; and thirdly, improving our processes of manufacture and bringing them up to date.

Now, the government have secured the proper manufacture of cheese and butter, by educating the farming population as to the best methods of manufacture, and this by means of lectures given by competent men ; further, by bonusing the industry and trade, and by enacting proper legislation. To the prosperity of that industry the government have also contributed by providing greater facilities for carrying our perishable agricultural products, and mainly by means of a chain system of cold storage on board trains and by the mechanical refrigerator plan on board steamers, so that our farm products may be placed upon the British markets in as good a condition as when leaving points of shipment.

In connection with the British market, we are sometimes told that in business matters, sentiment is of no account, and that is to say that the government have succeeded in securing the British market for our agricultural products—is altogether preposterous. To such a statement I, for one, take exception. On the contrary, I do believe in sentiment as a most potent factor in trade matters and I further say this : that to the preferential treatment of 35 per cent given by the government to the trade of England, coupled with the eloquent speeches delivered in Great Britain by the leader of the Liberal party, is due the better position we are enjoying on the markets of the mother country. To the influence exerted by the right hon. prime minister, as also to the various other measures adopted by the government, as for instance, when they so nobly responded to the appeal of the mother country in her hour of stress and difficulty, we owe the boon of having secured a market with such boundless capacity and possibilities for our agricultural products. All these circumstances, I say, have conspired in creating a favourable sentiment to Canada on the world market of Great Britain.

But, Sir, what I have just said as to what has been achieved by the government in favour of the butter and cheese industry applies with equal force to all other farm products. With a government at the head of affairs which is anxious to promote the prosperity of the farming community, small wonder indeed, that our Canadian farmers should now find plenty and comfort where formerly there was nothing but distress and suffering for them. To our manufacturing industries, to trade in general and to our artisans and labourers these remarks equally apply.

I hope the House will bear with me, if I briefly touch upon the great national work which is being carried out by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), in improving the St. Lawrence route. No doubt, the old administration had, in some measure, grappled with that problem, but I think I am within the truth when I say that since the hon. minister has assumed control of his department, this question has reached a new stage. He it was who brought to bear upon the solution of that great problem all the resources of civil engineering ; he it was who availed himself of all the information and data bearing on the St. Lawrence route—a national highway which is the national outlet for Canadian products exported to Europe, as also for foreign traffic with the commercial metropolis of Canada. Surely, Providence, which has given us such a magnificent river, cannot be taxed with niggardliness.

What with its powerful volumes of waters, its magnificent banks, its fertile valleys, the St. Lawrence, in the views of Providence, is also the great thoroughfare for the carriage of the products of the vast granaries of our great North-west, a country which is destined in the near future to supply food to a portion of old Europe.

In a speech which I happened to read a few years ago, of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the hon. gentleman, in a masterly peroration, expressed the view that Canada had perhaps reached the zenith of her prosperity, but still he was confident that better times were possibly in store for her.

Well, Sir, I may say that the most sanguine expectations of the hon. minister have been realized beyond his dreams. Now, we are not satisfied with surpluses of from two, three to four million dollars ; but, for the seven months of this exercise, the surplus or the excess of ordinary revenue over our expenditure has reached the high water mark of seven million dollars, and this under a tariff that has been re-adjusted and reformed.

" Hands off the tariff " was what our friends on the other side of the House were heard to say in 1896 ; the tariff was then held up as something sacred, something that profane hands should not touch, and it was sacrilege to look upon it. But what they looked upon as a sort of national inheritance, was at the best but a party glory. No sacrilegious hand has touched it ; but the hand that did remodel the tariff and lop off the mouldering branches was the very hand of the great financier who during so many years has wielded such a prepondering influence in the councils of his province of Nova Scotia.

Reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to the fact that His Majesty has been graciously pleased to invite the premier to be present at the ceremonies attending his coronation. What a glorious part the premier has played in London upon the occasion of the jubilee of the late regretted Queen, we all know, and we also know what a lustre his presence in the metropolis has shed on Canada. That upon the occasion of the King's coronation, he will discharge his duties as our representative with as much éclat as he did in 1897, goes without saying. Of all the men of eminence in this House or out of it, none are to be found who could speak with a more authorized voice than the premier will be able to do at the conference to be held between the leading statesmen of the several colonies. From his lofty patriotism, and his broad spirit of statesmanship, we know that he adequately represents the aspirations of our young nation.

I do not intend to occupy the time of the House at greater length, but before bringing these remarks to a close, I wish briefly to refer to the visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales, and to bear witness here to the hearty and enthusiastic reception extended to our royal visitors by the people of the province of Quebec. As we crowded together where the old ramparts of the

city of Quebec rise, the royal yacht was sighted over the point of the Island of Orleans. Expectant Quebec in thousands thronged the heights. The whole population of St. Roch had turned out *en masse* to greet our royal guests. No longer, as in the days of Wolfe, was it a question of taking Quebec by storm; no longer the thunders that broke forth from the forts belched forth death and destruction, but from the mouths of her cannon the old city roared out a loyal welcome from a whole people to the heir to the throne of England.

That the visit of the Prince of Wales was but a triumphal march throughout the length and breadth of the land we all know from press reports. And when, on board the yacht which was taking him back to England, the Prince reviewed in his mind the rich domains he had travelled over, as also the cordial and enthusiastic welcome extended to him by the people of this mighty Dominion; when he looked back at the great manufacturing centres he had visited, where industrial life and activity are in full growth and development; all this no doubt vividly brought home to him the reality of the strange phenomenon which is being enacted on this continent, of Anglo Saxons, Normans, Scotchmen and Irishmen working shoulder to shoulder to the upbuilding of a prosperous and happy nation.

Mr. Speaker, as there are amongst my constituents a number of my electors who are of English origin (though I may say they are not very numerous), I deem it my duty on this occasion to address a few words to the House in the English language. It is, I know, scarcely necessary for me to ask from the members of this hon. body that indulgence which is usually extended to every new member. Hon. gentlemen who listen to these few remarks will easily see that this language is not familiar to me; not nearly as familiar as the tongue which I was taught to speak in the days of my youth. In reading the speech which His Excellency addressed to us yesterday, one at once reaches the idea that this government, although anxious to aim at still better results in the future, if that be possible, are perfectly satisfied with the existing state of affairs.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELAND. Yes, the existing government is perfectly satisfied because the people of the country at large are satisfied. Whether you stand at the door of the farmer, or at the door of the workingman; whether you stand at the door of the artisan, or at the door of the manufacturer; wherever you go, whether it be in the streets of the city or into the remotest lumbering regions, whether on the coast of the Atlantic, or whether in the mining districts of the Yukon or of British Columbia; wherever you go your eye and your ear will be delighted with the sound and the sight of prosperity throughout this broad land. I am here, Sir, as the representative of perhaps the largest rural district in Eastern Canada, and it becomes my duty to express my gratitude to this government, which has conferred such benefits upon the farming community of this country. By the aid and solicitude of the present government new and profitable markets have been secured for our products. The preferential tariff, the eloquent speeches that have been delivered in England by the prime minister; the readiness with which the appeal of the motherland was answered by Canada when she was in want of moral and even substantial support during the struggle in South Africa; all of these circumstances have tended to create a favourable sentiment for Canadian products in the British market. Then again, the transportation facilities which have been provided by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) have not been the least amongst the processes by which this country has reached its present prosperity. As my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell) has covered the most important parts referred to in the Speech from the Throne, it is unnecessary for me to dwell upon them at length. Let me say that all of us in this great country should entertain enthusiastic hopes for the future. There are in Canada citizens of different creeds and different races. Along side of the Irish we have the English, alongside of the French we have the Scotch, alongside of the Protestant we have the Catholic, and though we may differ in nationality and in religion, though one may speak the tongue of Louis XIV. and another the tongue of Shakspere, let us all remember that our duty is to build up a prosperous and happy country founded on principles of tolerance and equal rights to all. I see in this House members on both sides whose hair has faded from its original colour in the work of securing peace and harmony between the heterogeneous elements of our population. Let me express the hope that before these gentlemen pass from the troubles of this earth they will gather the fruit of their patriotic efforts.

It is scarcely necessary for me to refer to the visit paid to this country by the Prince and Princess of Wales. If those who are not acquainted with our population in the province of Quebec and who do not know the sentiment of that province, if they had had the privilege of witnessing the grand scene presented when our people in the old city of Quebec greeted the landing of the illustrious visitors; if it had been their privilege to hear the deafening cheers of the people of East Quebec so eminently represented by the prime minister; if it had been their privilege to glance at the beautiful women of that old city waving flags and handkerchiefs and throwing flowers at the feet of the royal visitors, I am sure they would have said from the bottom of their hearts that a people so enthusiastic on that occasion, could never be disloyal. Not only have

the men of my race proven their devotion to the British Crown in the days of rejoicing, but also in the days of sorrow. Not so long since, in lands far away, they sacrificed their lives to protect the flag which waves over them. And, Sir, that province from which I come will enshrine with fadeless flowers, the memory of those volunteers who have fallen, and the incense of their gratitude will continue to ascend until the last drop of the St. Lawrence has rolled by their homes on its way to the sea.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, it is with very great pleasure that I rise, in the first place to congratulate the two hon. gentlemen who have so well discharged the duty of moving and seconding the motion which has been presented to the House. For a young member of this House, my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell) has certainly borne himself in a very self-possessed manner, and I am quite sure that after a little more acquaintance with the interior of this chamber, he will be able to get up and address the House without any of the nervousness which he exhibited this afternoon. The hon. gentleman tells us that he is proud of representing the constituency of West York, and he may well be. I had in mind, as he spoke, an expression which a friend of mine in Halifax sometimes uses when he is reproached with having done anything that is not exactly right—he always gravely shakes his head and remarks : It will never occur again.

With regard to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Beland) who seconded the motion, I must say that he possesses that splendid gift of facile expression which so many gentlemen from the province of Quebec have shown in this House ; and while I was not able to follow him as closely as I should desire while he was speaking in his own beautiful language, I could not help, while he was addressing us in English, deeming it my misfortune, indeed, my fault, that I did not possess the same acquaintance with his native tongue that he exhibited to us this afternoon with regard to the English language.

Now, Mr. Speaker, dealing for a moment with one or two of the matters mentioned in the speech, I desire to say, in the first place, that I most heartily concur in what is said in the speech, and also in the very appropriate words of the mover and the seconder, respecting the visit of their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales to this country. Their visit to Canada was not only of advantage to Canada herself, but was of advantage to them, the future King and Queen of this great empire. While we in this country have not attained the development which we hope for in the future, still I think we may be proud of the fact that we were able to transport them from ocean to ocean in the manner in which we did, upon a railway which links two continents, and through a country which possesses such tremendous possibilities for the future as the great North-west of Canada. Without saying a word in depreciation of the other great dependencies of the empire which they visited, I venture to think that they saw in Canada as great a country in process of development as it was their privilege to visit on their journey throughout the confines of the empire.

I also desire most heartily to concur in what has been said in the speech and by the hon. mover and seconder, with respect to the sympathy which this country felt towards the great republic to the south of us on the occasion of the loss which that people sustained by the death of the great man who lately was their president. On occasions of that kind, as was shown by the sympathy of the great republic to us in our hour of sorrow, the two great English-speaking countries of the world are one, if not otherwise, and I trust and believe that it will always be so. I do not know what measures the government propose to bring forward with respect to the subject which has been mentioned in this connection, but any legislation of that kind within reasonable limits would, I think, commend itself to the judgment of this House, and would receive a reasonable support from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before referring to certain matters that have not been dealt with in the speech, I would like to say a few words with regard to the long roll of gentlemen who have left the ranks of this House for the purpose of strengthening the judiciary and the peerage of Canada. I have always felt very much for my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) when any references have been made to matters of this kind. I know that his own natural modesty has prevented him from making any explanation of his position with regard to them; I have also noticed that no other hon. gentleman on the other side of the House has ever come to the rescue of the hon. the Postmaster General; and, indeed, the position of that hon. gentleman is not an easy one. He cannot very well, so long as he is a member of this government, lay down a policy so directly in conflict with the practice of this government as that which he advocated not so many years ago. The rule which requires absolute unanimity in a cabinet would preclude his doing that. Then, you see, the hon. gentleman has another difficulty; he could give to the House no good reason, I suppose, for changing his opinion, which is, I have no doubt, as a matter of fact, the opinion he has always held on that particular subject. Now, I propose to offer a theory, a policy, for the hon. gentleman. I do not say that it is an absolutely perfect theory, but I offer it as a fair working theory, and the hon. gentleman can expand it or modify it as may be necessary or suitable for the public platforms of this country. It has been laid down by gentlemen on the other side of the House that the prosperity which came to Canada and inci-

dentally to the world in 1896 was due entirely to the advent of this government. My hon. friend the member for West York (Mr. Campbell) has indeed persuaded himself of that, just as George IV. persuaded himself that he commanded at the battle of Waterloo, and my hon. friend the Postmaster General cheered the hon. member for West York when he put forward that idea very forcibly this afternoon. Now, what I suggest to my hon. friend the Postmaster General is that he should carry out the logical converse of that. We know that the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has told us—he certainly stated in his address to the electors in 1900—that this prosperity is not due altogether to the advent of this government, but is mainly due to matters beyond the control of this government, and indeed is one of the blessings of Providence. Now, if we attribute the prosperity of the country to the advent of this government to power, why would it not do for my hon. friend the Postmaster General, while claiming credit to the government for all the prosperity of the country, to attribute these appointments solely to Providence and in that way, as it were, to balance matters. It seems to me that affords a fair working theory for my hon. friend, and, with a little modification and elaboration, it might be found very useful. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are supposed to be aspirants for positions in the Senate or on the bench, are sometimes a little restive when reference is made to such matters in the House; but certainly no hon. gentleman on the other side could object to the remark that the eye of Providence was upon him.

I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that there is no reference in the Speech from the Throne to the fast Atlantic steamship service which was announced as an accomplished fact by the government of this country, some four years ago. I regret that very much, because the importance of that service is universally conceded. Englishmen visiting this country who see enormous amounts of American capital being expended in the country, and who are asked why English capital is not flowing into this country to assist in its development to the same extent, tell us that one of the first things required for closer connection in that way between this country and the mother country is the establishment of better steam communication between the two countries. We know the record of the present government with regard to that subject. Although they told us that they had a certain contract, a sure contract, in 1898, we know that nothing has been accomplished from that time to this—that we have heard nothing but excuses; and when they tell us that they propose to establish a steamship line between Canada and South Africa, I am tempted to inquire whether they expect to make the same degree of progress with regard to that project as they have with regard to the fast Atlantic service. I am convinced that if they do not establish a very much better record with regard to that than they have with regard to the fast Atlantic service, the markets of South Africa will be in the position described by my hon. friend from West York this afternoon, and the trade of that country will be so diverted into other channels that by the time the proposed service will be established it will be almost impossible to secure it.

There is another subject upon which we have no information whatever in the Speech from the Throne, and that is the position in which this country stands at present with regard to its trade wth Germany—I mean with regard to the German tariff as applied to Canada and as applied to Great Britain and the United States. Last year, when this matter was brought to the attention of the House, I was sorry to observe that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) seemed almost inclined to justify the action of Germany in excluding Canada from privileges she was granting to the mother country and to the United States. I was sorry to see him take this position because the preference which we gave the mother country some years ago should not have resulted in an agreement by the mother country with Germany to establish a temporary treaty, from the benefits of which Canada was to be excluded. That should not be the result for another reason also, namely, because that very preference granted to Great Britain has practically resulted in a preference to Germany. We know that German goods, goods on which a considerable amount of German work and money has been expended, are sent to England in order to have certain work there done on them and are then shipped to Canada to be admitted as British goods under the preferential tariff. Germany is therefore—so I am informed by men more conversant in these matters than I—receiving no small benefit in that way from the preference we have given to British goods, while on the other hand we are subjected to the imposition of a higher German tariff than Great Britain herself has to face. That this should operate disastrously on the trade of Canada no one can doubt. I have had occasion to look into the figures, and I find that the exports of Canada to Germany are some $600,000 less than they were in 1899, while the exports of the United States and Great Britain—particularly the United States—have very largely increased. And mark you, Mr. Speaker, our exports to Germany have decreased in a period during which our exports to all other foreign countries have very largely increased. This discrimination is felt by all exporters throughout Canada, and I regret that the government has not seen fit to give the slightest information in the Speech from the Throne

as to what efforts it has made or proposes to make to remove this very grave injustice.

Another subject on which we have no information is the Alaskan boundary question. We were told last year by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that a provisional boundary line, in the nature of a compromise, had been arranged between the two countries, and that the report of the commission appointed to establish that boundary line was to be very shortly brought down. I inquired whether or not this line was in the nature of a compromise, and I rather gathered from the reply of my right hon. friend that I would obtain all the necessary information from the report of the commission. Well, I have examined that report with some care, and I do not understand whether the compromise which has been made, is entirely at the expense of Canada, or whether we have on the Canadian side of the so-called provisional line any portion of territory which the United States are claiming. I do not conceal from myself the fact that there may be grave difficulties in dealing with this question, and I do not want to say anything that might embarrass the government in its dealings with the Imperial government, but I would like to point this out to my right hon. friend, that the longer the United States remains in possession of any portion of Canadian territory, which we think we can rightfully claim, the greater will be our difficulty in the future in asserting our rights. Therefore I think it is only my duty, occupying the position I do, to urge this matter on the attention of the right hon. gentleman and ask him to confide to the House whatever information he may properly divulge as to the present condition of the negotiations between the Imperial government and the United States with regard to that particular point.

There is another matter which has not been referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and you, Sir, will perhaps have noticed that there are almost as many matters not referred to, and to which reference properly should have been made, as those which are particularly mentioned. We understand from the newspapers that a contingent was sent from Canada during the past few months to South Africa for the purpose of assisting the troops of the empire. We have heard through the same source of the terms on which that contingent was sent and certain negotiations in connection therewith; but up to the present parliament is absolutely ignorant, so far as official communication is concerned, as to what contingent has been sent, as to the terms upon which it has been sent, and as to any negotiations between this country and the Imperial government with regard to that contingent. I certainly would have thought that the sending of a contingent of brave Canadian soldiers to South Africa was a circumstance deserving of some reference in the Speech from the Throne, and that the government would have taken parliament into its confidence at once and given us the fullest details on so important a subject.

The country is congratulated upon the very satisfactory condition of its revenue and the expansion of general business, as evidenced by the increased value of exports and imports. I do not regard a great increase in the imports as absolute evidence of prosperity. It might well be that while great manufacturing industries in Canada were being crowded out of existence by competition from abroad, the volume of our imports would increase; and I think that some closer reasoning and more conclusive evidence with regard to the conditions of prosperity might have been furnished us. I, for one, do not believe in the doctrine of buying in the cheapest market, if it is to be done at the expense of our manufacturing industries. We have had conflicting views expressed by members of the government on this point within the past few months.

The hon. the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), who, I regret, is not in his place, is reported in the public press as having said not long ago at a convention of the Liberal party in Manitoba:

> Some woollen factories are closing up. They say the reason is that they have not sufficient protection. I say it is not. If they cannot live on a 23 per cent tariff, the sooner they shut up the better.

That apparently is the policy of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), and I notice that my hon. friend the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), appears to be in entire accord with the policy so laid down.

Mr. FRASER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That policy either is or is not the policy of the cabinet. If it is the policy of the cabinet the sooner we know it the better. If it is not the policy of the cabinet, then the Minister of the Interior ought to resign his position.

Now, let us hear what the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has to say on this subject. He told us, I think, no later than the month of November last, at a certain gathering at Montreal, that he thought Canadians should stand by Canadian manufacturers:

> Why should not our Canadian Customs laws be just as self-protecting as those of the United States, exclaimed Mr. Tarte. I cannot see for the life of me, he added, and there was more applause. A man's first duty is to defend himself. He was brought up in a protectionists school and had not renounced his faith.

The Minister of Public Works, notwithstanding the optimistic view of the condition of the country that is disclosed in the Speech from the Throne, and that has

been dilated upon by my hon. friend from West York, and the seconder of the address, has told us in a more recent utterance in the city of Montreal, that there is a great crisis in this country. And he has not only told us that, but he has told us that the members of the government know all about it. This is what he said :

> Our American friends, declared the minister, are making tremendous efforts to crush this country. We, who are in office, know that they are leaving no stone unturned to crush this Dominion to both industrially and commercially. * * * There is a crisis at hand. Our American friends are endeavouring to make a slaughter market of this country. In consequence of this attempt, let us have a tariff that will protect our national industries and waterways, that will protect our national trade.

I do not know how this language of the Minister of Public Works commends itself to my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser).

Mr. FRASER. We have it now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) does not agree with his leader that there is a crisis.

Mr. FRASER. That is not what I said. I said that I agree with the Minister of Public Works that we have it now—that is all he said.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works said, let us have such a tariff as will protect. Well, if there is a crisis in this country and if the members of the government are so familiar with it as the hon. Minister of Public Works tells us, it is a singular thing that there is no reference in the Speech from the Throne, to so important a matter. Possibly, the member of the cabinet who is charged with looking after this crisis was not able to contribute his quota to the King's Speech, and no reference to it has been omitted. But, speaking seriously, I venture to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no doctrine of parliamentary government more thoroughly settled than this—that there must be political unanimity in the cabinet. Parliamentary government is degenerating into a farce if the Minister of the Interior can proclaim one doctrine in the west, and the Minister of Public Works can proclaim the very opposite in the east with regard to an important matter. And I will call the attention of my hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to an authority on this subject which he will not question. This authority is Mr. Gladstone, who said :

> It is one of our first duties to decline to acquit any member of the cabinet of responsibility for the announced and declared policy of another.

Now, Sir, we have the Minister of the Interior, in language as distinct as possible, telling the people of this country that, if 23 per cent is not enough to keep the great industries of this country on a proper footing, then it is better for this country that those industries shall be closed, that our factories shall be shut up and that the operatives who are working in those factories shall go to the United States, while we spend hundreds of thousands of dollars every year in bringing people of a foreign race and different language into our North-west. But the Minister of Public Works, on the other hand, has taken the stand—practically the position which he took by a resolution which I moved during the last session—that this country should stand by its great manufacturing industries, the position that this country cannot afford to have its factories closed and to have our people going to the United States. We know well enough, from the census returns, the effect that the great industrial centres of the United States produce upon the population of our eastern provinces. We know that, so long as our own industries remain in their present condition, so long as they do not develop, they are not sufficient to keep the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, or even the people of Ontario and Quebec, from emigrating to the United States. I say it would be folly—and I agree with the Minister of Public Works on that point—to think of adopting a policy that would close these manufacturing industries and send our people across the line in still greater numbers, while we continue to spend annually an enormous amount of money in bringing men of different nationality and language from the two great races of Canada to fill up our North-west. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not presume to tell the government which of these two hon. gentlemen should resign—the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Public Works. That is a point on which I would hardly venture to offer advice to my right hon. friend. I suppose it is a problem which is engaging his attention at the present time. But, if I might be permitted to make a suggestion on the subject, it would be rather on this line—that all the other members of the cabinet should resign and that my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, should remain in office and carry out the policy he has announced. But, perhaps I am going too far in making that suggestion. And if my right hon. friend thinks it is a suggestion that should not come from me, I beg that he will accept my most humble apologies for making it.

Now, Sir, I do not intend to say very much with regard to the census or to that most extraordinary paragraph in the speech which purports to deal with the census. I almost wish that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) could get leave of absence from the government for about two hours to do justice to that subject this afternoon. I know that my hon. friend appreciates that suggestion by the smile I see illuminating his countenance. I do not

wish to take up the time of the House in regard to this matter, because I know there will be an opportunity later on—I hope, during this session—of discussing this subject more fully. But, unless my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) exhibits more energy during this session than he has exhibited since we last met we shall not have the census returns in time to discuss them even during this session. I endeavoured to procure bulletins giving me some information with regard to the matter. Coming here I found bulletins in the library which are apparently not quite up to date. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will be able to give us some assurance within the next day or two, as to the date when the census returns will be brought before the House, for I think the time of the House should be occupied with some discussion with regard to them. But I have this to say—if we apply the argument which the Minister of Trade and Commerce so ably applied to the census figures some ten years ago, we shall find that all the efforts of this government, all the enormous sums of money they have expended during these four or five years in promoting immigration to this country, have been absolutely wasted. The Minister of Trade and Commerce on that occasion proved, very much to his own satisfaction, —and, indeed, set out in the terms of his resolution—that there was a natural increase in this country of at least 2¼ per cent annually. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has any information in his possession which enables him to say that that rate would not be a fair one during the past five years. If it is a fair rate for the past five years, then even though you asume that not a single soul was added to the population of Canada from the time of the last census until this government came into power, you will have the result before you that not one soul has been added to the population since that time beyond the natural increase.

Now, I feel I am really not able to do justice to a subject of that kind as the hon. gentleman could. Perhaps if he were moving a resolution at this stage, and were on this side of the House, he would be very likely to conclude it in the language in which he concluded a resolution he moved ten years ago. It was as follows :

> That the deplorable state of things disclosed by the above mentioned returns imperatively demands a radical change in the policy and methods of government followed by the administration.

I do not think that the hon. gentleman, even with all the experience of the last ten years, added to the abundant experience which he previously possessed, would be able to improve upon that.

Now, we have been told by the Minister of Agriculture on several occasions, both in this country and in the mother country—because I was glad to note that the Minister of Agriculture was a member of that somewhat numerous band of ministers of this country who lately journeyed across the Atlantic, no doubt entirely in the interests of this country, and a grateful country appreciates the efforts which they made to enjoy themselves on the other side—the Minister of Agriculture tells us that the emigration to the United States from Canada has absolutely ceased, and that, of course, is entirely due to the advent of the present government to power. It is due, he thinks, to the same cause as that which created the prosperity.

Now, there is another case of resignation, I think, or perhaps it would not amount to a case of resignation; but the hon. the Minister of Agriculture is absolutely in conflict on this point with the hon. the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General is not only Postmaster General, but he is also a journalist, or rather he has a journal in his department which is known as the 'Labour Gazette.' In an issue during the past year the 'Labour Gazette' pointed out that in the provinces of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Quebec and New Brunswick, a very marked emigration of persons to the United States had to be noted. Now, who are we to believe ? Which of these gentlemen is telling us what is correct ? Has emigration from these provinces entirely ceased ? Is the Postmaster General right when he tells us in this 'Labour Gazette' of his that the emigration from these provinces to the United States still continues? The Postmaster General seems to have the weight of authority on his side, because I notice that an independent authority, the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia, in a speech recently made in that province, is reported to have said :

> He mentioned the great enterprises which they had at Sydney, and trusted that these and similar undertakings would tend to stop the exodus of our young men to the United States.

And his remarks were received with applause. Any one who lives in the province of Nova Scotia, or the province of New Brunswick, or the province of Prince Edward Island, will realize the fact that emigration to the United States has not ceased. It is very difficult to bring about a condition of affairs which will cause it to cease entirely, because migration naturally tends towards great cities and great industrial centres. In saying this I do not mean that we are entirely to rely upon the figures of the census which, for example, indicate, in the province of Nova Scotia, that the urban population has enormously increased at the expense of the rural population. The true explanation of that fact is, that during the past ten years a great many towns in Nova Scotia have been incorporated, and people who ten years ago were classed among the rural population are now classed among the urban population.

Now, sir, I think this particular circumstance, this fact that the people are migrating to the great industrial centres of the

United States, is another strong argument in support of the policy which has been laid down by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, speaking, I suppose, as a private member of parliament and not as a minister, when he told us that our industries must be maintained at all hazards. In the province of Nova Scotia the total increase of population was about 9,000. Now, Sir, in the county of Cape Breton alone, where great industrial establishments have been formed within the past five or six years, there has been an increase of population from 34,000 to 48,000, or 5,000 more than the entire actual increase of the whole province. This fact points to the conclusion, it seems to me, that whatever may be our policy with regard to the North-west, so far as the eastern provinces of Canada are concerned, you cannot look for a great expansion of the population in the future unless you have a policy which will maintain and develop our great industries, which will keep those factories going which are now at work, which will establish other factories, which will give ample room for the people of this country to get work at home, and which will tend to diminish, if not absolutely to obliterate, the emigration which has taken place in the past from these provinces to the United States. In saying this I do not wish to minimize the great value and importance of the agricultural, fishing, mining and other industries of this country; but I do say that the great manufacturing industries of this country seem to be a most important factor in keeping our surplus population at home, and in preventing them from crossing the line for the purpose of finding employment on the other side which they cannot find in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken more time in dealing with the motion than I intended to do. I may perhaps be permitted, in closing, to mention the names of three gentlemen who were members of this House when we last met, and who have since passed over to the great majority. One of these gentlemen, Mr. Dobell, a member of the government, without portfolio, was a gentleman whom I had not had the pleasure of knowing for a long time, but during the few years in which I did know him somewhat intimately, I learned to respect and esteem him very much; and, I believe, I can truthfully say that if there was one man who had not a single enemy in this House of Commons of Canada, it was Mr. Dobell. We all remember his kindly and cordial manner towards every member, not only on the other side, but on this side of the House. I wish also to mention my late friend, Mr. Clarke Wallace, who sat beside me during the past session, when I had entrusted to me the very arduous duty of attempting, as a new and untried man, to lead the Liberal-Conservative party in the House of Commons, and to act in that capacity beside men who possessed much greater experience than I did myself. I always received a hearty and generous support from Mr. Wallace. He was a man of great ability, an authority on many public questions, a man of strong convictions, a man of strong character, a man who always had the courage of his convictions. He gave the best possible proof of his sincerity that any man could give in this country or in any other country. I did not always see eye to eye with him although I belonged to the same political party, but I was always ready to recognize and did recognize the absolute sincerity of the opinions upon which he acted in this House and as a public man in this country.

I also desire to mention another friend of mine, a gentleman beside whom I sat for three sessions when first I had the honour of a seat in this parliament. I refer to Mr. John W. Bell, the late member for Addington, a shrewd, kind-hearted, observant man, whose voice was not often heard in this House, but who was thoroughly respected and esteemed by all those who knew him, and whose place in the public life in this country cannot easily be filled, a man who did not take a large part in the debates of this House, but a man who had a thorough and complete acquaintance with public life, and with the necessities and interests of the country.

Might I be permitted in closing, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the loss, which, not only the empire as a whole, but which Canada, herself, has sustained in the death of Lord Dufferin who gave five or six years of his life to Canada as her Governor General. He performed his duty as Governor General during a time when party passions and party strife were very greatly aroused, but whatever criticism may have been made upon his conduct at the time when that party strife and passion prevailed, I venture to think, when the strife had passed away, when the passion had become less, it was recognized that he had acted in every way according to what was right and proper and according to his just and honest convictions. A many-sided man, as statesman, diplomat, pro-consul, man of letters, he filled a great place in the empire and did for Canada much in this that from the first he was inspired with a supreme confidence in the future of this country, and what is more than that, he was possessed with the same supreme confidence that the absolute legislative independence of this country would tend to bring about closer ties between this country and the empire as a whole. Twenty-five years have passed since he made that great speech at Winnipeg, in which he pictured Canada as nestling at the feet of her majestic mother, dreaming her dream and foreboding her destiny. Some of that dream has been realized and some of that destiny has since been unfolded and we are all glad that he lived to see it. When the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) goes across the water to attend the Coronation ceremonies, in which we all wish him

God speed, he will be able to say of Canada then what Lord Dufferin said so many years ago that there is still found in Canada:

> The reverence of a free people for constitutional liberty as secured by monarchical government, the recognition by the owners of half a continent of their right to share a still mightier imperium, the unswerving confidence of a modest God fearing community in their ability to vindicate their independence, to elaborate their own destiny and to guard and embellish to the utmost the glorious inheritance with which they have been endowed by Providence.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the House, I am sure, has listened to the observations of my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), with a great deal of interest varied in some respects, with some surprise. My hon. friend has proceeded from sentence to sentence. In the earlier stages of his speech, I could not but think, and I believe my impression was right, that my hon. friend had not had a good night's rest, that he had awakened this morning under tne impression of some painful dream which had disturbed his equanimity and that he had not recovered. I willingly bear this testimony that it is due to my hon. friend to say that he is, generally speaking, fair and candid in his manner of treating subjects which come before the House, but on this occasion I cannot help but believe that my hon. friend, of set purpose, struggled, and I do him the justice to say with only partial success, to get away as far as he could from those attributes of his better nature. My hon. friend, perhaps remembering that he has behind him and beside him some followers who are of a fiery disposition, thought that if it were possible he would get them under his control by launching forth some of their bellicose invectives. My hon. friend proceeded to make good what I am now saying by the reference he made to the changes that have taken place in the cabinet since last session. Two gentlemen who were members of the cabinet last session have been promoted to the bench of the Supreme Court. My hon. friend did not challenge the fitness of these gentlemen to occupy the high position to which they have been elevated. He could find nothing more to say than to characterize these appointments by the statement that they were due probably in some way to the action of Providence. Amongst the blessings with which Providence can favour a nation is a good government. As we all must acknowledge a good government is a greater blessing than probably even a good harvest and we know by reference to the pages of history that sometimes Providence will make use of most unworthy instruments to confer upon a people the very greatest blessings; and even under these circumstances, if Providence has made use of ourselves, unworthy as we are, to confer a great blessing upon the people of Canada, I am sure that upon this side of the House at any rate we can stand the criticism. My hon. friend objects to the action of the government in not mentioning the fact that our commercial relations with Germany are not as good as they should be or as good as we could have hoped them. If our relations with Germany are not as good today as they were five or six years ago, if we have not now the advantage of as low a tariff in Germany as then existed, it is because the Canadian parliament, on both sides of politics, Conservatives as well as Liberals, nay, the whole Canadian nation, wanted to put an end to the very treaty which then existed and which gave us the benefit of the minimum German tariff. We were shackled by that treaty, and we rightly thought that that treaty, as long as it existed, prevented us from taking the action which we wanted to take in order to bring Canada and the motherland more closely together. Again and again the party of my hon. friend, when they were sitting on this side of the House, applied to Great Britain to have that treaty denounced and again and again their efforts failed. We were more lucky, or more successful than they were and upon our representations the British government put an end to the treaty. Now, Sir, the consequence is that the maximum tariff is imposed upon Canada. We have been making efforts by negotiations to have this removed. These negotiations have not yet matured, but I must say to my hon. friend that the commercial relations between Canada and Germany are not as he has represented them. I understand from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and from the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who is looking at the figures, that instead of having a decrease we have an actual increase even under these unfavourable circumstances in our trade with Germany. Now, Sir, I may say, and I may perhaps later on during the session have something further to say upon this subject, that we have endeavoured to better and improve our trade relations with Germany and that although these efforts have not yet been crowned with success it would be premature to say that they have been abortive.

Neither have we mentioned in the speech of His Excellency, the Alaskan boundary matter, and the reason why we have omitted a reference to it is simply because it is today in the very same position it was in last year. It has made no progress since then. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has called attention to the fact that the correspondence which we have placed on the Table does not disclose in what respect the provisional line which we have established with the United States in Alaska, is

or is not a compromise. It is a compromise. If the hon. gentleman had looked at the newspapers—whether the correspondence discloses it or not—he would have seen that under the provisional line which we have established in the Porcupine district we have mining camps which were claimed by the American miners before that provisional line was established. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the longer this matter is deferred the greater will become the difficulty of settling it. I agree with him that the longer the settlement is deferred the more difficult it will be to recover possession of whatever Canadian territory may be occupied by American settlers. I have to say to my hon. friend that we have pressed as much as we could; nay more I may say that we have pressed in season and out of season, on the Imperial authorities to bring that matter to a close. Nothing could be more unsatisfactory than the condition in which this question is to-day, and nothing could be more dangerous even, than to leave it in this unsatisfactory condition. We hope to bring the question to a close at a convenient season, and I am sorry that I am not in a position now to give to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) as positive an assurance in this respect as I would like to give him.

My hon. friend spoke of the Fast Atlantic service, and he said that five years has elapsed since we have taken office, and yet the Fast Atlantic service has not been established. He complained a little of the delay and he indulged in perhaps, well deserved banter. This is my answer to him. If three years more elapse and we have not then brought this matter to a satisfactory conclusion, then we will stand in exactly the same position as the Conservative party, who brought the matter forward in 1887, and had not concluded it when they went out of office in 1896.

My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) also said that there was no mention in the Speech from the Throne of the volunteers who have lately gone to South Africa to serve their Sovereign. It ought not to be any surprise to my hon. friend that a reference to this matter was omitted from the speech. He should know the reason very well. I am afraid from some things which I have observed, this amongst others, that the very arduous duties which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) undertook last year are telling upon him, and that he has not as good a memory now as he had at one time. I have not had a very long acquaintance with the hon. gentleman, but I had always understood that he was blessed with a good memory, which, however, now appears to have become treacherous and defective. He has only to remember what took place last session to understand why there was no mention of this matter in the Speech from the Throne. There really was nothing to mention about it. Last session there was a motion brought forward by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) which concluded in this way :

> This House further declares that there is no necessity for sending any more Canadian troops to South Africa, and that the enlistment of recruits for the South Africa constabulary should not be allowed to take place in Canada.

It was my duty as leader of the House to answer that motion, and in the course of my remarks I then said :

> As to the first conclusion of this proposition, that there is no necessity of sending Canadian troops to South Africa, I must say I altogether agree with my hon. friend—not for the same reasons that have prompted him, but for the reason that the war is at an end. There may be still some guerilla warfare, there may still be some brigandage under the name of war, but the war is no longer at issue. Though my hon. friend pretends to be very much in doubt as to the issue of the war, for my part I am ready to leave the issue in the hands of the men who have it in hand now, and to say, with my hon. friend, that there is no necessity for sending Canadian troops to South Africa. As to the other portion of the conclusion that enlistment of recruits for the South Africa constabulary should not be allowed to take place in Canada, I ask my hon. friend what reason can there be why the enlistment of men for this force should be put to an end in Canada ? If there are men in Canada who—I care not for what motive, whether high or low, whether dignified or undignified, whether because they desire to get a living, or from a spirit of adventure, or from the nobler impulse of fighting for their sovereign—wish to take service in the South Africa constabulary, on what principle should a Canadian government interfere to prevent their liberty being so exercised ? My hon. friend has spoken well and eloquently upon the cause of liberty on which he has constituted himself the champion in this House, and almost alone ; but I must ask him, what kind of liberty is it which will not permit a British subject, if he so chooses, to offer his King to serve him, no matter in what capacity.

My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has now the explanation of this matter. Later on in the same debate the hon. gentleman himself spoke and he took no issue on anything I had said. On the contrary, he rather approved the course I had taken. Under such circumstances my hon. friend is aware that we could not send a contingent to South Africa, for the reason that we had no appropriation for it. In 1896, under the circumstances which then existed, we could send a contingent without any parliament appropriation, because the war was sudden, because it took us by surprise, because there was an outburst of popular feeling in favour of the course which we took, and our action was afterwards approved by parliament without any dissent. However, in this instance when the war had been lasting for two years, the government of Canada had no excuse whatever for taking any money from the Treasury to send a contingent to South Africa. But, Sir, if there were, as it turned out to be ;

if there were young men who wanted to go to South Africa, as was the case when the constabulary were recruited here, there was no reason why they should not be allowed to do so. Last year the Canadian people allowed the young men who wanted to go and serve in South Africa to be recruited under the machinery of our Militia Department, and this year there were some young Canadians who were anxious to go and do a last service, not only for the cause of their Sovereign, but in my estimation for the cause of justice and liberty. We simply put at the disposal of the Imperial authorities the machinery of the department to carry out what we thought was a laudable object. There was nothing to announce to parliament in that. It was not parliamentary action. It was not even the government action. It was simply the same thing which took place last year in the case of the South African Constabulary, and which was not mentioned in parliament though parliament was sitting at the time. The hon. gentleman has now the whole explanation with regard to that. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was more himself when he came to another part of his speech—a part of his speech, upon which, if he will permit me, I offer him my most sincere compliments—where he spoke in feeling terms of some of our departed colleagues, and above all, when he spoke of a man who has left in this House and in this country a record which shall not be forgotten for many and many a day. My hon. friend was truly eloquent in his references and he gave expression to sentiments which will be re-echoed by the whole Canadian people. Lord Dufferin was a statesman of Imperial mind. There was nothing shackled about it. He moved on broad lines. Whatever the subject he had to deal with he could rise above all boundaries and divisions of creed and race, or any of the other considerations which divide men. On every question he soared to the highest possible level. The Marquis of Dufferin was one of the few men who during the last twenty-five years or so has done for the empire the highest possible service, and he did it in a way which will redound to his credit and which nowadays must be appreciated more and more, because wherever he went he had the knack and facility of conciliating men, and causing them to move always in the direction of Imperial interests and the broadest kind of liberty.

I thank my hon. friend for the very noble word which he spoke in favour of my lamented colleague, Mr. Dobell. Mr. Dobell unfortunately was not sufficiently known in this House; but we who were his colleagues had on many an occasion an evidence of his great ability as a business man, and many times profited by his experience.

With regard to our colleague, Mr. Clarke Wallace, as the House knows, he and I were upon many questions at the very antipodes. But there is one thing which must be said for Mr. Clarke Wallace : every one, whether his friend or his foe, had to recognize his masterly intellect, his rugged force, his strong common sense, and the ability which, whether he was to stand or fall, he brought to bear more and more on every question which came before this House. He never spoke without being listened to; he never spoke without having something to say; he never sat down without having made an impression upon the House.

Mr. Bell of Addington was a man of very different character—a genial, unobtrusive, useful member of the House. Not only is his death a loss to his own political friends, but we on this side of the House will miss almost as much as they his very genial face.

My hon. friend was at his very best when he gave a good measure of praise to the mover and the seconder of the address. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell) —the young member for West York—will not make us forget the old member for Kent. He comes back with the same fire we knew in him before, and we shall have from him the same useful service which we had before.

As to my hon. and young friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland), his reputation preceded him to this House. There were great expectations of what he would do when he came here, and our expectations have been more than realized to-day.

My hon. friend was also himself when he spoke of the visit of the Prince and the Princess of Wales to this country. We in Canada live under monarchical institutions and we are satisfied with our lot. I remember a time, when I was much younger than I am to-day, when it was a subject of discussion, rather more academical than practical, whether monarchical government or republican government was the preferable. All such discussions have become obsolete; in fact, they have disappeared; and the reason is that we have learned in the last century that there may be as much liberty under a monarchy as under a republic, that there can sometimes be as much tyranny under a pure democracy as under despotism. We in Canada have the blessing of living under British monarchical institutions, and we appreciate them to the full; and that was the sentiment which prevailed in every place which was visited by their Royal Highnesses. Everywhere our people received them and cheered them with a conscious pride in the privileges which they enjoyed and in the duties and the responsibilities which were consequent upon Canadian British citizenship.

When my hon. friend had delivered himself of these two topics, he had exhausted the whole of the good nature that was in him. Then he became morose and sad, and the rest of his speech, was redolent with the sad and lachrymose reflections of a dissatisfied soul. Nothing could cheer him, nothing could appeal to him, nothing could gladden

him—not even the prosperity which he sees about him, prosperity never before equalled in this country, prosperity unsurpassed in any other country; not even the almost miraculous crop we have had in the North-west; not even the everbuoyant revenue, not even the ever-increasing trade and commerce. Now, I firmly believe that if, instead of the prosperity which my hon. friend sees everywhere, he had seen returning that grim visitant, the companion of the Conservative administrations, the hard times, and if he had had to tell a tale of woe, he would have had a congenial subject to speak about. Nay more, if there had been destitution and famine in the country, I believe my hon. friend's happiness would have been complete.

In fact—I appeal to those who had the pleasure of listening to my hon. friend—the only ray of something like joy which was apparent in his speech was when he came to speak of the census. We are all disappointed in the census, and the very disappointment of the country was my hon. friend's comfort. If, instead of the beggarly increase of 10 per cent in the population there had been a good increase, such as we had reason to expect, my hon. friend would have been extremely doleful. If he had had a doleful speech to make, he would have been happy and cheerful; but as he had the material for a cheerful speech, he was doleful and unhappy. So far as the census is concerned, I am grievously disappointed at the result; but the figures only show the extreme gravity of the exodus in former decades. There is a reason for this perhaps not peculiar to Canada alone. Looking back at the history of the past one hundred years, we see that the young American republic in a halo of glory sprang into existence in a way which fairly took all the civilized nations by storm. A new star had arisen in the western sky, and attracted like a magnet the young of all nations of the world to its doors. From every country those who were dissatisfied with their lot—the young, the ardent, the enthusiastic, the enterprising—flocked to the new country in a copious and never-ending stream. The new nation displayed more unbounded energy and activity during a hundred years than perhaps any other nation in the world's history. As Canada was the nearest country to the United States, she was perhaps the most attracted by it, and it is unfortunately too true that generation after generation almost the whole of our natural increase had crossed the border. It was the boast of the Conservative party, when they adopted the National Policy, that it would put an end to the exodus, and turn a new page in the history of this country. What a delusion that hope was we now know, because the records are there to show that the period of the National Policy was perhaps the worst, so far as the migration from Canada was concerned. But there is no doubt whatever that at the present time Canada is entering upon a new era; we have turned a new page in the history of the country. My hon. friend a moment ago disputed the fact that the exodus was a thing of the past. I do not say that at the present time the exodus has absolutely ceased; but it is within every man's knowledge that it is not what it was ten years ago, nor five years ago.

And, sir, there is something more. It may be possible that there is a continued migration from north to south; but it is a fact within the knowledge of everybody that there is now a new current of migration from south to north, from American to Canadian territory. There is, if I may so speak, a migration of American capital in the east and a migration of American settlers in the west. I know there are some in this country—I see one, at all events, in my eye at the very moment—who pretends to be rather disturbed by this condition of things. What will become of the country, it is said, if it is invaded—that is the word used—by American capital and American citizens ? So far as American citizens are concerned, our experience has shown that those who come to settle in the Canadian North-west—and they are coming in thousands—come with the notion which has been implanted from youth in the bosom of every American, that the American constitution is the cream of perfection—the most perfect institution devised by man. But after being some time in Canada, they realize that the British constitution as applied in Canada is more elastic, more democratic, more amenable to the people, than the much-vaunted American constitution. They realize that in Canada the laws are better administered, and that there is better protection for property and life than in the United States; and they have no hesitation in becoming Canadian citizens and taking the oath of allegiance to the King. In the Yukon territory thousands of Americans have taken the oath of allegiance and assumed the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship.

There is another kind of colonization in the eastern part of Canada, and for my part I see no danger in it. On the contrary, I welcome the influx of capital into Canada. Whether it comes from Great Britain or from the United States, it is the very thing we want. If Americans come here and put their capital into our industries, what is it for ? It is to develop those industries and make them fruitful. My hon. friend referred a moment ago to the fact that the population of the county of Cape Breton had increased some fifteen thousand during the last decade; and if he had told the whole story, he would have stated that this increase was largely due to an American citizen who had come to Canada to better his fortune and to develop our industries. If some American capitalists invest their capital in our railways, what is it for ? To so develop those railways as to enable them to carry the trade not only of Canada but of

the United States to the seaboard. What seaboard, may I ask ? The nearest and the cheapest, that is, the St. Lawrence river. Whoever has the control of any railroad will administer it for the benefit of his company, in order to make it yield the best returns possible. In my opinion, in the matter of transportation, geography is altogether in favour of Canada; and far from frowning upon the investment of American capital seeking investment in these industries, I altogether welcome it.

I have only one more thing to say. My hon. friend anticipated a discussion on the tariff. My hon. friend knows that it is not the rule, nor is it good parliamentary tactics, to call for a discussion of the tariff on the address. We shall await that in the budget speech, and there is no occasion for anticipating it. When we bring down the tariff, my hon. friend will find a united party against him. Until that time, therefore, I think it well to reserve any comments on this subject.

I will only say, in conclusion, that the government have no great measures to introduce to the House. It is our intention, if possible, to have a short session; and in that I believe we shall serve the wishes of hon. members not only on this side of the House, but even of my hon. friend himself and his friends behind him.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I really believe that it is as much in the interest of gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches as of ourselves that some slight effort should be made on this side of the House to dispel the strange illusions of which my right hon. friend has just given evidence, and the cause of which, I regret to say, is to be sought for largely in the enormous and fulsome measure of praise given to this Speech from the Throne by my good friend the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell). But a moment ago my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) claimed that he and his colleagues were the special instruments of Divine Providence in this country, and that any one who had any fault to find with the Speech from the Throne must necessarily be suffering from nervous prostration or a bad digestion. At the risk of dispelling this happy illusion on the part of my hon. friend, I can not refrain from pointing out the ghastly weariness of the ministerial programme. Even my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), the champion census taker of the world, who, like George IV., appears confirmed in the belief that he has been the leader in every important event since the dawn of history, would hardly care to assume the paternity of so insignificant a production as this Speech from the Throne. On each and every one of the important questions which this country is called on to solve, this speech is remarkable for its silence.

One of the most important questions is that of transportation. Why have we not some statement from the government as to what definite policy it has formed upon this subject. Allow me to refer to a document from my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who, though he is not my enemy, has written a book, or rather an article, signed with his own name. In this article he points out clearly the duty of the present hour; and at the risk of taking up a little time, but in order to justify the reproach which I make the government, let me quote a few words from that article published by the hon. Minister in his organ at Montreal, over his own signature. It is entitled: "What I would do if I were a member of Parliament." And in thus quoting the Minister of Public Works,—who evidently looks upon himself as a sort of Jekyll-Hyde in politics, to be dreaded as a minister and relied upon as an ordinary member—I am doing a service to the man by pointing out the laches of the minister.

'What I would do if I were a member of parliament. I would buy to-day the very best geographical map of Canada.' Have these gentlemen done so ? Is it not possible for them to procure a map of this country ? From a mere inspection of that map it will become evident to them that they have grossly neglected their duty by not announcing this session, at the very commencement, that they are determined to take some steps for the practical solution of this question and to save us from the destruction of our own trade which, indirectly, our neighbours to the south of us with energy, with strength, with pluck, which are deserving of all admiration, are gradually taking away from us. Well, after having, very properly, I think, suggested pointedly the purchase of a map as necessary for a beginning for these gentlemen, he continues : 'I would in the second place study fully, study maturely, the question of the means of transportation.' Have they done so ? Not at all. There is not one of these gentlemen able to rise in the House to-day and tell us that he has studied this question, or to tell us what is the policy of the government which they will attempt to carry out courageously. 'I would,' says the article, 'make of this question my question, the important question.' That is right. It is for each and every one of us, from one end of Canada to the other, the important question of them all. 'The session,' continues the article, 'is approaching,' but what is the use of the session, if these hon. gentlemen have no scheme to lay before us; if they are afraid to tell us what is the policy of the government in regard to the question of transportation and help each of us, on whatever side of the House he may sit, to apply himself to the carrying out of some practical solution of this question. But, let my hon. friends listen to

this further statement: 'I would not leave to parliament or the Cabinet either rest or intermission until I had forced both parliament and the government to adopt a policy, energetic, definite and well defined.' Have these gentlemen done so? 'We are,' continues the article, 'proceeding in the proper direction, but we are not proceeding fast enough?' What guarantee have we that we shall proceed with any more speed? The question is retarded for another session; and, though we are given information about the crops concerning which we long ago knew as much as do these hon. gentlemen; though we are informed that Marconi has been here and other commonplaces of this description, yet, on this important question we are left utterly in the dark. And my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), who dares to suggest that there is something missing in the Speech from the Throne, is told that he must have slept badly, that he must have poor digestion or must be suffering from loss of memory. 'The St. Lawrence is the shortest route between the west and the great lakes and the markets of Europe, but, as we know, until now, we have had a commerce in our own country which, compared with the commerce of the United States, may well be called insignificant.' That is true. And that is why it is so urgent that, since we have the shortest route and every natural facility, the government should take steps to secure the welfare of this country by increasing this trade. That is why it is so important why the government should give us their views upon this subject and make this the paramount question of the day. 'We transport to Europe but a very small portion of our own produce, New York, Boston, Portland, Buffalo, do a considerable part of our exporting. This autumn, Buffalo has received nearly 5,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat, of 12,000,000 bushels which have been carried to Fort William by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It would be interesting to know what proportion of the balance of 7,000,000 has passed through the St. Lawrence route, because these 7,000,000 have been distributed between the different ports of Canada, the ports of Georgian Bay particularly. And most of these ports are used by the Grand Trunk, which has made its principal terminus at the port of Portland.'—thanks to the neglect and carelessness of these gentlemen, who, whilst they were treating with the Grand Trunk for the Intercolonial Railway and bonusing the Grand Trunk Railway for the construction of the Victoria Bridge, never for a moment thought that it was necessary to secure the terminus of that national highway—for so we may well call it—within the limits of our own territory. I am quoting the principal parts of this article in support of my claim, that, in neglecting to give us their policy on this question, in failing to make this the paramount question during the present session, the government has failed to perform its duty. 'We had,' the minister says in that article, 'no proper arrangement of our own ports. We had no terminal facilities. New York has magnificent terminal facilities. What had we at Montreal? What have we at the present hour? And, I refer to Montreal not because I happen to live in that city, but because it is such an important point on our national highway to the sea. I refer to it because of its importance to us all as Canadians and not alone to those who live there. What have we at the present hour in Montreal, what have we at Quebec and at Three Rivers along the St. Lawrence route? Numerous accidents have caused us great damage in rendering the insurance rates almost prohibitive during the most valuable time for transporting freight, the autumn.' And the hon. gentleman continues by stating that, within a couple of years, we shall be in an irreproachable position in so far as the navigation of the gulf of St. Lawrence is concerned. 'Quebec and Three Rivers,' says the hon. gentleman, 'are being studied.'

> The necessary work will be executed there.

But we have no statement whatever from the government in regard to its policy in respect of those works, and in fact nothing whatever in regard to that important question of transportation. After having given in this same article figures, which I will not quote to the House, to prove the absolute superiority of our own route over any other on this continent, the hon. minister goes on to say:

> The very day after French River will have been improved in such a way as to give a 20-foot channel upon the whole course of that river, 25 to 30 million bushels of wheat will be accumulated along the shores of Lake Nipissing in the two months of autumn during which the transportation of this important cereal can be done most effectively and most usefully. Let us not forget that Lake Nipissing, that the French River, are bound to Ontario by a branch of the Grand Trunk Railway from Callendar to the capital of the sister province. The improvement of the French River is therefore, in my opinion, a matter which is most urgent and of immediate importance. It is an affair of $4,000,000 at most, a bagatelle of $125,000 in interest per annum.

Then, after continuing to point out the absolute necessity for immediate action upon the part of the government, the hon. gentleman concludes as follows:

> I am not a member of parliament, I am nothing but a Minister, which makes all the difference in the world.

And, indeed it does, Mr. Speaker, because in spite of the assistance which the hon. gentleman might have expected from those around him in carrying out all, or part at any rate, of those improvements which are absolutely necessary, which we require, which are essential to this country, he received no more assistance than he has from the gentlemen who surround him in the de-

liberations of the cabinet. But this question is not one which, according to the opinion of the Minister of Public Works alone is important. You can find evidence of that in the daily papers of the city of Montreal and elsewhere. You will find scarcely a newspaper in which that question is not adverted to in some way. For example, I find in the issue of 'La Presse' of the day before yesterday allusions to this important question. Upon the first page it treats the question of finding out the cause of delay in the city of Montreal. We have suffered now over one year's delay from the absence of an elevator in the city of Montreal, which we should have had a year ago. This paper asks :

> Who is to blame ? Is it the Minister of Public Works ? Is it the Montreal Board of Harbour Commissioners ? A solution is desired upon that point.

A reference is made to the reiterated complaints of the Montreal Chambre de Commerce, through its president, Mr. Geoffrion, a friend of the present government, concerning the repeated delays that we have suffered in respect to the construction of an elevator. We have no information in the Speech from the Throne in regard to that or any other question that affects the port of Montreal. And yet, the Minister of Public Works knows it, during the last election in St. James Division, Montreal, and during the election that took place in Laval when the Minister of Public Works and the right hon. the Prime Minister both came down to take part in the fray, these questions were spoken of, they were discussed, and we were assured that the government were anxious to adopt a settled policy in regard to the port of Montreal and to carry out that policy—not in a niggardly manner, not slowly, but promptly, and without regard to expense, as we were advised to do by Mr. Reeve, the late general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, when he attended an inspection of the port of Montreal some months ago, at which, I think, my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was present. So much with regard to the question of transportation.

Then, sir, we have not a single word in the Speech from the Throne in regard to the fast Atlantic service. My right hon. friend seems to forget that. It is he who is losing his memory, and not my hon. friend to my right. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that when the Conservative party went out of power in 1896 there was at that moment a contract signed for a fast Atlantic service. Why did not these gentlemen carry it out ? They would have had that fast Atlantic service to-day if they had carried it out. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, as we think, and the public generally think, that these gentlemen are fighting a little too much 'like blazes,' as the Minister of Public Works said at the banquet in the city of Montreal. They are fighting so much that they cannot agree upon any policy, upon any question. The only thing they can agree to speak about in the speech is of Mr. Marconi's coming here. But is it a fact that at this banquet in the city of Montreal, where there was a great divergence of views between the Minister of Public Works and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), is it a fact—since you require only facts—that the Minister of Finance went away so tearing mad, so much 'in blazes,' that he said he never would sit again at a banquet with my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works ? If you require history, if you require facts that have actually taken place, let us know the true solution of this incident, and let us know if what we hear all over Montreal is true. If we must have nothing but events that have actually occurred, perhaps those gentlemen might tell us how it was that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and my right hon. friend, the uncrowned king, according to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell)—I think he will be crowned himself instead of witnessing the coronation of His Most Gracious Majesty—let us know how it is that they came down one day to Montreal and anointed as their own candidate a young gentleman of that city, and as soon as they heard that our good friend Mr. Bergeron had manifested some idea of coming forward, they came the following evening to speak on behalf of their anointed candidate, and after they had ascended the platform in the city of Montreal they were obliged to change their tune and sing the praises of the present representative of St. James Division (Mr. Brunet), upon whose head they had been heaping maledictions for a fortnight or more previously. Those are events of which we would like some explanation from hon. gentlemen occupying their high position.

Mr. COCHRANE. How did he get here ?

Mr. MONK. Well, the question which my hon. friend puts brings us back to the very important statement in the Speech from the Throne in regard to Mr. Marconi, because, I may inform my hon. friend, we found out during that election campaign in St. James Division that we had nothing to learn from Mr. Marconi in regard to telegraphing and telegraphers, we knew all about it in this country already. Might I ask the right hon. the Prime Minister, since he has referred to Mr. Marconi's visit to this country, what department it was that made the arrangements with Mr. Marconi to which the Speech from the Throne refers ? Is there any special department charged with these negotiations ? None of these hon. gentlemen seem willing to give us any information upon that question. Might I ask the members of the government—I do so with the object of getting information—if these arrangements which were made with Mr. Marconi have been reduced to writing, and if so, is there

any objection on the part of the government to laying them upon the Table of the House?

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend will read the Speech from the Throne he will have his answer. The speech says they will be brought down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Do you want them brought down before the address passes ?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, probably suffering from those wicked dreams to which the right hon. gentleman refers, has found fault with the government because no reference has been made in the Speech from the Throne to the sending of the third contingent to South Africa. In this connection it seems to me that it may be stated that the government seemed to be imbued with the desire to keep from parliament information upon such an important subject as that to which parliament has a right. It is in consonance with the usual policy of the government to do every important act connected with the administration of this country without previously taking parliament into its confidence or keeping parliament informed of these important acts of administration. It is, I think, Sir, a proper interpretation of our modern constitutional parliamentary usages to say that the government is nothing more than a committee of parliament, but these gentlemen would fain bring us back to the times, about 150 years ago, when, in England, parliament was struggling for its privileges and the members of parliament were not vouchsafed the information which they possess to-day, because, if, as I pointed out, the government last year, during a session of parliament, in the month of March, offered to the home government to send another contingent to South Africa, why were we not taken into the confidence of the government and informed of the fact, as we had a right to be and why was not the message which was sent offering that contingent to the home government laid before us who are here as representatives of the people I would ask the government again if it has any objection to laying on the table of the House immediately the very text of the message which it sent to the home government at the time offering the third contingent.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not the slightest.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell), who is an old member of parliament, has found means to express a great deal of loyalty, for which I heartily congratulate him, and which leads me to believe that the county which accidentally has sent him to parliament this time is a very loyal county. I congratulate him upon his patriotic sentiments, because I remember that as the member for Kent, he was one of those who promptly whitewashed the government which had seen fit to provide our troops in South Africa, in case of emergency, as their sole recourse, with crumpled dog biscuit. But, if in this respect, my hon. friend has amended his ways, I regret that he has not seen fit, while praising the government as he has done, to make some slight allusion to a matter of some importance to West York, as well as to my own county, and which brought us both to Ottawa not many weeks ago. It was the question of the adequate and proper protection of our farmers and market gardeners. At that moment, both of us being here, leading important deputations from our constituencies, I heard my hon. friend take the government to task and strongly urge the government to grant some relief for the grievances from which the gardeners of his own county suffered. Does the right hon. Prime Minister not think that the government might have given us some assurance in the Speech from the Throne comparable with the assurances which were given at that time, before the election, that these grievances, which are serious grievances, and to which I will refer later on in the session, would be rectified, or does he think that the government very properly excluded any reference to that subject from the Speech from the Throne?

There is also the question of repatriation, which is of some importance, and which has not been referred to in the Speech from the Throne. We have the spectacle, as is well known, of large numbers of our most hopeful young men leaving, if I mistake not, the province of Nova Scotia, the province of New Brunswick, and in very large numbers, leaving Quebec, and probably Ontario, and starting off for the United States, whilst we are spending, and that was a question discussed during the last election in the vicinity of Montreal, fabulous sums to bring into the North-west Territories, into our own inheritance, to replace those who are leaving this country, people who have not the first right in that country, and whom it would be better to leave at home, and keep with us our own Canadians. Has the government any policy upon this question, and why has it not announced that policy? Would it not have been pleasant for us to hear from the government that they have some settled views in regard to a change in the system and that these views will be carried into effect during the present session?

My hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Bélland), whom I heard with very great pleasure this afternoon, and who speaks both languages, I think, in a manner which does him infinite credit, was obliged to go out of the Speech from the Throne. He did not find sufficient food for his eloquence in the speech, he went out from it, and spoke to us about the surplus we were to

expect. Let me say that, although no reference has been made in the Speech from the Throne to the expected surplus, I sincerely hope the time has passed when the Minister of Finance of this country will speak to us of surpluses that we know are buried every year in that bottomless pit which is called the Intercolonial Railway, or in other capital accounts. Let us, this year, at any rate, when surpluses are spoken of, know where these surpluses are that the people shall not be deceived any longer. I merely intended to point out some of the subjects upon which I think the public of this country—and we come here under considerable trouble—might have expected some utterance from the government. But we have ample proof, I think, that the Speech from the Throne has been prepared most hurriedly, from the fact to which I wish to call particularly my right hon. friend's attention, that there is no translation of that speech into the language which is most familiar to a large number of the members of this House, because I cannot call it a translation which has appeared in the 'Official Gazette,' and which is so full of errors. I heard with pleasure the eloquent treatment of the French language by the hon. member for Beauce, and I could not help regretting that he himself had not been charged with the translation of that important document. We had with us yesterday a number of gentlemen who do not belong to this country, and who represent foreign countries, and I think it is right and proper to say to the government that a document of this kind which is so largely circulated, should be translated properly. We hear a great deal sometimes about murdering the King's English, but I say that this is a most felonious assassination of the beautiful language of Molière and Racine, and it is very necessary that the party who has been charged by the government with translating that document should know that if it is necessary, we will bring the guillotine from France and chop his head off. With these few remarks, and with the hope that, although the session may be short, we will have from the government some positive statement of its policy upon some of the important matters to which I have had the honour to refer, I resume my seat.

At Six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. WM. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, I intend for a short time this evening to direct the attention of the House to one or two things mentioned casually in the Speech from the Throne, but things which I consider are of the greatest importance to the people of this country. In the speech of His Excellency there is a reference to the assassination of President McKinley. That was an incident that did attract the attention of all the world, but somehow to my mind there was a disposition in the United States and elsewhere to avoid the discussing of this question in the light of the real cause of the assassination. Contemporaneously with the assassination of the President there was a significant thing happening in the United States. There was a growth of trusts, a growth of monopolies that was unprecedented in the history of the world. Now not for one moment do I say in so many words that the assassination of President McKinley was connected with the growth of these trusts, but I do say that it is a significant fact that the two things were contemporaneous, and that there may be a connection in the way of cause and effect between these two. Last year the growth of monopolies reached its height in the United States. The development of trusts attained its greatest and most dangerous strength, and this development is a cause of the greatest anxiety and fear to those who are really studying political and social questions, not only in this country but in other countries as well. And what are these trusts doing? They are in the way of getting control of all the great railways; they are getting control of the great systems of transportation, and they are getting control of all the great industries. They have become so powerful that individuals who are really anxious for the welfare of the country begin to fear for the future. These trusts are sacrificing the interests of the people, and while I do not say that there was a direct connection between the growth of these trusts and the assassination of President McKinley, I do say that at that very time the public mind was alarmed as never before by the growth of these corporations which seemed to presage social disaster to the nation. If you want a specific instance of the growth of these corporations and the tyranny they exercise, I direct the attention of the House to the output and distribution of coal in the United States. If there is one blessing more than another that God has conferred on the people of this continent, it is a supply of coal sufficient to enable the people to have it put in their houses for $1 per ton. But this great coal supply has fallen into the hands of the coal companies, allied with the great carrying corporations, and the result has been that the coal is now sold at the enormous price of $4, $5 and $6 per ton when it should be sold for at most $1.50 per ton.

These huge corporations have become tyrannical in the treatment of their employees. As I said in Toronto a short time ago, they have become so tyrannical that an employee of theirs dare not confess at the present day that he is over 40 years of age. As an illustration of this kind of tyranny I may mention that the sale of hair dye in the United States is now something enormous.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN. That statement may cause laughter, but the fact remains that these corporations have become so tyrannical in the United States that a man over 40 years of age cannot hold a position. They have not increased the wages of their employees as they should have done ; but on the contrary they have reduced wages. They have become more tyrannical in specifying petty offences which if the men are guilty of they lose their employment. The great American people who claim that their country is the cradle of freedom are now oppressed under a slavery greater than the slavery that existed in the United States before the civil war. That is strong language, but there is not the slightest doubt that there is a new kind of slavery growing on the American continent. There is a slavery imposed by the trusts and the corporations greater than any slavery which existed before, and I am on this occasion taking the opportunity to warn our people in Canada to avoid if possible coming under the conditions which exist to-day in the United States. These corporations are grabbing all the power ; they are grabbing all the wealth, and what is worse, the liberties of the people are passing under their yoke. We are told that while the trusts have become powerful, the average wealth of individuals in the United States and in Canada has increased. I grant that to some extent, but compared with the immense growth of the wealth of the trusts, the increased wealth of individuals amounts to nothing. The wealth concentrated in the hands of these corporations to-day constitutes a menace to the welfare of the United States, and it will be a menace to Canada if the same conditions should come to exist here. Not only are the corporations in the United States depriving the people of their freedom, but they have got control of the legislative bodies of that country, they have got control of the press, and they think they will soon have control of the judiciary. There is one thing certain and that is, that they have control of the machines connected with both of the great political parties in the United States. That being the condition of affairs in the neighbouring Republic, there is a great social crisis approaching. The people are not satisfied with the existing conditions. They are not satisfied with the growth of power of these corporations ; they are not satisfied that their liberties are passing away and that a new serfdom is coming upon them. They are moving in one way or another to try and get rid of the existing conditions. That is the supreme issue in that country to-day. The men who are not mere politicians ; the men who are studying the great social questions there, are pointing out that the growth of the trusts and the tyranny of the trusts must in some way be counteracted.

Now, are we threatened by these corporations in Canada ? To my mind we are. We see signs every day of the growth of corporations in Canada in a way that is a menace to the people of this country and the political rights of our people. Look at what is taking place in parliament here, in our legislatures, and in our municipal councils. Things have taken place here in Ottawa in the interest of a corporation that have been in the nature of a raid on the political rights of the people. Look at what has taken place in the legislature of Quebec. That province has been raided up and down by the corporations. The city of Montreal has been raided in and out by the corporations to the detriment of the people. The same is happening to-day in the legislature of Ontario. The same thing has happened in the city of Toronto, and where is it all going to end ? In the speech of His Excellency a reference is made to the application of the Canadian Pacific Railway for increased powers in regards to its stock issue, and the government congratulates the country on the fact that this great corporation has been good enough to agree that the question as to the regulation of its rates and the interpretation of the clause in its charter relating to that subject shall be submitted to the courts. What does all that mean ? Here is a great corporation that is bound by its charter that its tolls shall be subject to government regulation when its profits amount to ten per cent on the actual cost of the road; and all we get to-day for the increased power of capitalization is a promise that this question shall be submitted to the courts. Why did the government not do what they did with the Canadian Pacific Railway on a former occasion ? If they gave the company this additional privilege, why did they not fix the date when the regulation of the freight rates of the railway should go into effect ? But all we get is this bald promise that this question shall be submitted to the courts. That again is an evidence of the growth of these corporations and the control they exercise over parliament and over this government.

Now, these great trust managers, these men who are in favour of all these great corporations, say that they have been created for two things : in order to cheapen production and in order to supply the capital necessary for the conduct of these great industries. I do not agree with that for one moment. If there is a characteristic of these corporations, it is that they do not reduce prices, but by monopolization they overcapitalize the corporation and force the public to give them hundreds of dollars for hundreds of dollars of watered stock. That is what the public get out of it. They simply get over-capitalization and nothing else. The other defence is that Wall street and the great money centres which are allied with these great corporations supply the capital, and that it could not be got in any

other way. I dispute both of these contentions. I say that all we get for the growth of these great corporations is not a reduction in prices, but simply an over-capitalization and a defrauding of the shareholders.

A year ago I pointed out in this House the danger there was of the Canadian railways passing into the control of the great railway corporations of the United States. The House did not quite take me seriously in that contention, and perhaps the country will not, but what do we see to-day? Is it not a fact that the Canada Atlantic Railway, which runs from Montreal to Parry Sound, and which was built largely with the money of the Canadian people, has passed into the hands of the Vanderbilts? The right hon. Prime Minister said this afternoon that whether it had or not was of no concern to him, and that he was not afraid of this invasion of American capital. The people of Canada, however, are, I believe, afraid of seeing the railways of this country pass into the hands of foreign corporations. We are told that the Canadian Pacific Railway is still Canadian owned and under Canadian control. We are told that while many of the shares may be owned outside of this country, still the ownership and control of the road is in this country. Well, I believe that that control has passed out of the hands of Canadians. I believe that Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) and the other Canadians who are on the directorate, are only kept there by the favour of the great American combine, and may at any moment receive a notification from Mr. Morgan and Mr. Hill that they are no longer in control. I pointed out the danger a year ago, and that danger is still more imminent to-day. The Canada Atlantic has gone, and I believe the Canadian Pacific Railway as a matter of fact, has gone, and that the Grand Trunk Railway will follow. And in that event, the future of this country is very much in doubt. Let American corporations control our railways, and they will soon control our political future. The right hon. the Prime Minister has said on different occasions that should our railways pass out of our control then the country will interfere, but it will then be too late. When Mr. Morgan and Mr. Hill control the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway as they do the Canada Atlantic, the right hon. gentleman says Canada will interfere. But on that day, when these fall, and foreign magnates control our railways, they will also control our politicians and legislatures. The one thing goes with the other.

The right hon Prime Minister this afternoon declared that he was not afraid of the invasion of Canada by American capital, and of the control of our railways passing out of our hands. But there is a member of this government who thinks somewhat differently. I refer to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). Speaking in Montreal on Saturday night, that hon. gentleman said:

> As a matter of fact the time might come when the Canadian Government will have to do with the Canadian Pacific Railway what the British Government did with the Suez Canal. The British cabinet had secured the Suez shares in order to protect Imperial interests, and a similar patriotic policy might some day confront the Dominion of Canada. There was no danger now, but no one could tell what the future might bring forth.

I believe that the Minister of Public Works holds pretty much the position I do on this question. If there is one thing necessary to the maintenance of Canadian independence, it is the control by Canada of its own railways, and I congratulate the Minister of Public Works on his course in pointing out the danger, and hope he will succeed in impressing these views on his leader.

Another subject which has come before the people, and which was started down in the city of Halifax, is the proposal to hand over the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway. If we should do this, what would happen? Vanderbilt or Morgan might secure the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and with it the Intercolonial Railway, which has cost this country so much. This proposition would simply mean handing over the Intercolonial Railway to the great railway magnates of the United States. Yet the people of Halifax asked the boards of trade of the other cities to join with them, and the Canadian Pacific Railway is, day in and day out, pulling the wires among the politicians and inspiring the newspapers to bring that scheme to a successful issue. Should they ever do so, we may bid good-by to all our national hopes, and to our future as an independent power on this continent.

Instead of giving the Intercolonial Railway over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in that way putting it under the control of Mr. Morgan and his associates, we should have prevented the Vanderbilt interest getting hold of the Canada Atlantic, by buying it ourselves, and extending the Intercolonial Railway over it. And instead of allowing the Rainy River Railway to fall into the hands of Mann & Mackenzie—and I have heard it stated that Mann & Mackenzie are but another name for J. J. Hill—this country should have built the Rainy River road itself and the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. We would then have had almost a complete transcontinental system in the hands of the Canadian people and under their control. But instead of doing this, we have given away immense bonuses and we have allowed the Canada Atlantic to pass under foreign control as well as the Rainy River road, if it be the case that Mr. Hill is the real proprietor. We have let the Crow's Nest Pass go into the

hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and any day we may find the Canadian Pacific Railway in the hands of Morgan and his associates. And now we have the modest proposal made that we should hand over the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

It is essential to our independence as a nationality that we should continue to hold the railways we have and that we should extend the Intercolonial Railway system, and take some means to prevent the control of our railways passing into the hands of the great American corporations. I am not afraid to say that I am in favour of nationalizing the whole railway system of this country. There is no other way out of the transportation difficulty, and I am risking my whole political future, whatever it may be, on that policy.

Mr. COWAN. What do you mean by nationalization ?

Mr. MACLEAN. That the state should own the railways as the state owns the railways in Russia, France, Austria, Hungary, and in our sister colonies of Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. COWAN. The same as we own the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. MACLEAN. Exactly.

Mr. CLARKE. And run them as the Intercolonial is run?

Mr. MACLEAN. Not necessarily. That is a very glib argument, but there is no connection between the nationalization and the maladministration of railways. On that point I will have something further to say later on.

I submit that there is no way of maintaining our nationality other than by nationalizing our railways. There is no other solution of the transportation question. Lord Salisbury said the other day that there was no great diplomatic issue to-day which did not turn on the railway question. They were all transportation questions. All this trouble in South Africa is really nothing but a railway question. It arose out of Cecil Rhodes dream of a railway from the Cape to Cairo. The root of all the worry in South Africa to-day is that railway question.

Mr. BOURASSA. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN. And there is no solution of this question other than state ownership. The argument is often used that government ownership necessarily involves an immense system of corruption and maladministration. I say that does not follow, and if there should be corruption it would be nothing to the corruption which is rampant in this and every other country where the great railway corporations exercise their influence. Whenever the proposal is made that we should extend the Intercolonial system, we are told that the people of Canada are corrupt. I resent that charge. It is not the people, but the rich men connected with the large corporations who are corrupt, and who do the corrupting. It is the railway corporations who are corrupt, and it is their corruption which is to be feared.

Now, another thing—and it is in line with what I said before—is that we should begin this work of nationalization in this country by taking over the telegraphs, and telephones and the parcel and express systems of this country. And I am surprised that the government, after all that they have said about this matter, after all that their friends have said in their newspapers and in other ways, have not come down this year with a proposition for the nationalization of the telegraph system of Canada. There is provision made for it in the law and it can be done easily. And, with the system nationalized it can be worked cheaply and well in connection with the post office.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is against it.

Mr. MACLEAN. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, I will leave him to speak for himself. We can easily make the experiment in connection with the telegraph and telephone systems as they have done in England in connection with the telegraphs.

Mr. CLARKE. That is right.

Mr. MACLEAN. And if it is right in connection with these things, it is right in connection wih the railways and other great means of transportation. The great thing in connection with the nationalization of railways is that wherever it has been tried it has succeeded, and wherever they have nationalized a portion of the railways they are carrying out the nationalization of them all. And, if other countries have done it, we can do it. It is no compliment to our people for any one to say that we are not able to do what other countries have done. We have as high a class of people, and I hope we have as high a class of public men. If the nationalization of railways has been a success in other countries and if every country in which it has been tried has found it a protection as against the growth of these great corporations, and above all if it is a protection to the nationality and an assurance for the future of the country, we must adopt it in Canada. And, if the national ownership of railways is necessary from a Canadian point of view it is equally essential from an imperial point of view I believe that, not only that we shall have the nationalization of railways in this country, but that the mother country will have the

same, and with that will come the nationalization of the cable system of the land telegraph system, and of some of the great steamship lines that connect one portion of the empire with the others. Now, as an evidence of the growth of the sentiment in favour of public ownership, consider what is taking place throughout the world to-day. Municipal ownership is one of the growing questions of the day. The idea of municipal ownership is being extended in a practical way in Europe and it has been begun in this country. There are several instances of it in Canada; and if you study the question as it is in Ontario to-day, you will find that what the people are talking of is the best means of bringing about the public ownership of the great franchises in connection with cities. The people are down on the monopolies, and they are trying in some way to get away from them, and the only way they can do it is by public ownership. The great argument in favour of public ownership of city franchises by the cities—and it applies also to the ownership by the country at large of the railways is that the problem before the men who have charge of the administration of one of these great franchises, when it is under public ownership, is how to supply the product whatever it may be, at the cheapest rate to the greatest number of people; but when the franchise is administered by a corporation, the problem is: How can we make the largest dividend on the greatest amount of inflated stock? That is the superiority of public ownership over private and corporation ownership. Every city that has gone into public ownership has succeeded; and the people of the cities of the United States and of the cities of Canada are, almost with one accord, in favour of this reform. When the next election is held in this country, I venture to predict now, there will be no issue but this question of the public ownership of these great corporations, the railways. We are talking of petty questions to-day. We must not forget that we are in a new century, and that there are newer and greater questions before us. The last century is gone, and gone with it are the questions that were identified with it. In this new century there is no question before the people of such magnitude and of such importance as the growth of the corporations and the necessity of getting rid of them in some way. And the only way to get rid of them, apparently, is by public ownership. If that is the case and if that is to be the issue, it is time that the people of this country were being educated on that question. It is time that the question was raised and the alarm given. It is very well for the Prime Minister to tell us that when the horse is stolen he will see to it that the door is locked. But that will not do. We must try in some way to take steps now to prevent the railways we have from passing into the hands of the great railway corporations of the United States. For, if we allow them to go, I contend that when that transfer has taken place, Canada's future as a nation will have gone, and the people of the United States will own this country. Now, hon. gentlemen on the other side, and especially the Prime Minister, as I said, express no alarm at this American invasion. Perhaps we should not expect anything more from the right hon. the Premier. Perhaps the party of commercial union, having failed in their former effort, will quietly assist in the new American invasion, the result of which can only be that the Americans will practically come into possession of this country. It may be that the old commercial union movement may seek to realize itself in this way. The Americans are becoming more powerful in this country. Industry after industry is passing into their hands, and out of the control of the people of this country. It is time that we did something to try to prevent it.

Now, I would like for a moment, having dealt with the question of public ownership and the growth of corporations, to refer to one or two things that have come up in the debate this afternoon, before I touch another point. If there is one thing that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) who moved the address, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Béland), who seconded it, boasted of, it was the great prosperity that prevails in this country. The Prime Minister took his cue from them. And, in some way, all these gentlemen identified this prosperous state of the country with the advent to power of the Liberal party. To that, I have just one answer to make, and it is in the form of a question. If Canada has been prosperous since the Liberal party came into power is it not because the Liberals failed to put into force the policy they declared for when out of office? They were to wipe the national policy off the face of the earth, they were to give us free trade as it is in England. Did they do either of these things? No; they adopted the national policy, and when they adopted it, the people at once saw that the country was not to be overturned, that the Liberals would not do what they had threatened to do. Thus, there was, at last, a united people in favour of the national policy and in favour of the development of the country. That is why the country is prosperous to-day. It is because you did not do what you said you would do, it is because you did not carry out the threats you made, it is because you adopted the national policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, which I am defending to-day.

Now, I wish for a moment to direct the attention of the House to the relations between Canada and the empire. The Prime Minister this afternoon referred to the sending of the last contingent in a way that was not satisfactory to me, and that I do not think will be satisfactory to the people of this country. All the justification he had for it was to say that he had allowed

enlistments to take place in this country. Well I do not think that statement will be satisfactory to our people, I do not think it will create much of a furore in the old country in our favour. I would like to have seen Canada pay for that contingent, and send it as a free gift to the motherland. Hon. gentlemen on the other side say that if we wish to make a contribution to England, if we wish to show our regard to the motherland, the way to do it is by giving a trade preference. Now I disagree with them entirely on that point. My idea is that the daughter state ought to recognize the mother country by standing by her in her hour of trial until the last dollar is spent, and in sending troops and men if necessary. A trade preference is not a contribution to the empire, it is a contribution to the manufacturers and workingmen of England at the expense of the manufacturers and workingmen of Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. To the manufacturers and workingmen of Germany, rather.

Mr. MACLEAN. And also to the manufacturers of Germany who come in by way of England. When hon. gentlemen say they have discharged their duty to the empire by giving the motherland that trade preference, and that consequently they were justified in sending the contingent over c.o.d., I take issue with them on both those points. I say it is just the other way : The contingents should be sent as a free gift, and there should have been no trade preference unless Canada got a trade preference of a similar character in return. But the empire to-day is being gradually welded together. Great Britain is passing to-day through a crisis, but the empire is gradually growing together. The people are looking forward to some kind of new movement, to some kind of new Imperial policy. Now what is that new Imperial policy to be ? If there is one thing that is forcing itself upon the attention of the people of the whole empire, whether in Great Britain, or in Canada, or in Australia, it is that the empire must no longer be exploited for trade purposes by outside and hostile nations. That is something that is coming home to the people of the empire from one end of it to the other, and most of all it is coming home to the people of England, to the people of Canada, to the people of Australia—that the empire is not to be exploited any longer for trade purposes in favour of the workingmen and capitalists of the United States. That is the great fact that is coming home to the people of the empire whether in the old land or in Canada, and it is the people of Canada who have led the way in that respect.

Now the great argument is that the empire is to be Americanized, and Mr. Stead has led in advancing that argument in a book which he issued recently. He holds out that the empire is being Americanized in various ways and it is in danger of being Americanized, it is in danger of being exploited for the benefit of the American people, of the American workingmen and the American farmers and capitalists. There is only one thing that is to prevent it, and what is that ? I have made the suggestion before that I make now, I think it is a practical suggestion, and it is this : That the Canadian system of national policy should be expanded into an Imperial policy for the whole empire. It will mean, a revolution in the fiscal policy of the old land. But they have asked us to make suggestions, and I am taking the liberty of making this suggestion, that the people of the old land should change their fiscal policy and adopt what we have found here to be equal to the occasion. We say to them : Your country will not be exploited, the empire will not be Americanized, if you will adopt this system. I have some hope that they will do so. I believe if the suggestion is made to them, if the right hon. gentleman when he is asked to make suggestions next June, if he is true to his country, if he is true to the policy that he is carrying out here to-day, he will suggest to them that the national policy which has succeeded in Canada is applicable to the empire and will succeed for the empire, and will build it up in the same way. Now it may mean a great many changes. It may mean that England shall adopt customs duties, it may mean that England will have to adopt a system of export duties, or rebates, or reciprocal treaties, some of which she has already. It may mean that she will have to adopt reciprocity in tariffs, and it may mean that she will have to adopt all the things that protective nations have adopted. But if she does adopt them she will find that they will hold the empire together, and they will keep it from being exploited by those hostile nations, and there is no other way of doing it.

There is no other solution for the problem but for the empire to adopt some kind of protection, some system like the one we have here in Canada to-day. That protective system, that parental system, call it what you may, has succeeded in the United States. It has made the United States the greatest country in the world. It has put the United States in the position that it holds to-day, a menace to the trade of all the rest of the world, and it is certainly a menace to the trade of England. The trade of the United States is growing, the trade of England is declining ; and there is only one way, to my mind, whereby a stop can be put to that state of things, and by which the empire can be built up, just as the different states of the American union were built up, and that is by the adoption of the principles of protection. I hope that when the Prime Minister goes over to England he will admit that he is a protectionist, that he is building up his country by customs duties, by rebates, by bounties on production, by subsidies to steamship lines, by the

employment of every arrow in the quiver of protectionists. He is bound to do that. He is bound to make that suggestion to the empire when he goes over there; he is bound to say it has succeeded in Canada, that it has succeeded in the United States, that it has succeeded in Australia—because they are going in for it there. There is no other way of unifying the empire, of binding it together, of promoting trade between the different sections of the empire, than by adopting a system of protection, or some system which will preserve the empire from exploitation by outside and hostile nations.

Now this principle of protection, which I say is just as good for the whole empire as it is for Canada, what is it based on? What is the difference between it and the principle of free trade? Free traders have always said that their principle was based on the brotherhood of man, they have always been preaching that. Well, it is not the brotherhood of man that rules to-day among nations, it is the law governing the struggle for existence that rules. Englishmen have been misled. For years and years they have been talking about the brotherhood of man, and now they are up against a struggle for existence. Other nations do not reciprocate. When England has opened up her markets to all these hostile nations, they have not shown any brotherhood, but they have exploited England. So that, the brotherhood of man is not a safe principle to go by and we must recognize the other principle that national life is a struggle for existence; therefore, each nation must take care of itself. Those who have favoured this free trade argument have also said that the least government is best. The contrary is true and with the growth of civilization the responsibilities and duties of government increase. Leave trade alone? No. As civilization increases the responsibilities of government increase, and you must do more and more for your country and not leave trade alone. The law with all these nations is a law of enlightened selfishness and that law must govern the empire, if the empire is to hold its own. The empire must find means of adopting an imperial policy on the lines which have been adopted in this country. The best proof of that system is that in the United States, where protection has been adopted, and where it has been carried out to the largest extent, it has resulted in two things. It has cheapened production and it has built up the country in a way that enables it to antagonize every other country in the world. If that is so, surely the time has come when the empire must adopt the protective system. A great result will follow from the adoption of the protective principle by the empire, and what is it? The moment the empire adopts the principle of protection and encourages trade between the different sections of the empire, that moment will the empire be treated better by these hostile nations. I do not say that we can teach the Americans a lesson by giving them a reciprocity of tariffs, but I believe they will learn something if some such treatment is accorded to them, and the first thing you will see is, that the moment the American nation finds the English market refused to it and a preference given to Canadian products, it will treat the British Empire in a very different way. You give the Canadian farmer a preference in the English market and keep out the American farmer, and the latter will assuredly do all he can to check the tail twister of the Eastern States. The Americans will change their whole attitude to the motherland and the empire. The moment a protective system is adopted from one end of the empire to the other, we will see the attitude of the Americans towards the motherland and towards this country greatly changed, and changed in the interest of the empire and of Canada. If that is the case, if the government of to-day is actually carrying out the principle of protection, if the attention of the country is called in the Speech from the Throne to the fact that the Prime Minister has been asked to go over to the motherland to take part in the coronation ceremonies and offer suggestions there, the Prime Minister is bound, when he goes over this coming summer, to say that the reason why Canada to-day is prosperous, as we have been told it is prosperous, is because we have adopted a national system of protection, that we are succeeding in it, that the United States has succeeded in carrying out that same principle, and that the empire will succeed if that principle is adopted for the empire. That is his mission, that is the duty before him when he goes over this summer. Will he discharge that duty? I say that he is bound to discharge that duty in the light of the statements made here this afternoon. This country, which is protectionist, this country, which resorts to customs duties, which gives a bonus on production and which proposes reciprocal treatment—

Mr. HOLMES. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. An hon. gentleman says no. I heard of a minister in the present government who said that the time had come when we will have to have reciprocity in treatment and reciprocity in tariffs, and we were told that there were to be no more missions to Washington. If this country is prosperous, as they say it is, and it is prosperous by reason of the principle of protection, then the Prime Minister is bound when he goes to England to advocate the adoption of the principle of protection and all that it involves to the empire at large. If that is done, the empire is bound to adopt a tariff for the empire, to have preferential trade between the different sections of the empire and a reciprocity of tariffs as between the empire and outside hostile nations. Then will the empire grow together and resume its old time leadership of the world. There

is no other future for the empire than the adoption of the principle of protection, and the point I wish to make after what we have heard this afternoon, is that the government, and especially the right hon. gentleman, are in duty bound to lay before the different members of the empire, when the consultation takes place during the coming summer the fact that protection must be the basis of the fiscal policy of the empire at large. That I consider to be the most important issue before the people of the country and that is the reason why I have brought it up here to-night. I have brought it up because if I have heard anything at all this afternoon I did hear the leader of the Liberal party declare in so many words that the principle of protection had made Canada prosperous, and if it has made Canada prosperous he should recommend the empire to adopt a similar policy.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to follow in the debate, but as I have an amendment to offer to the address, I would ask the government to consent to the adjournment of the debate, because this will raise a discussion. Therefore, I move the adjournment of the debate. Before the motion is adopted, as I would not like to take the government or the House by surprise, I am ready to give the text of my amendment which I will move on Monday. The text of my amendment will be this :

That the time has come when a railway policy should be framed by which the people of this country could expect some return for the enormous sacrifices they have made in order to further the development of their avenues of trade ; and especially to prevent our railway systems from falling under the control of foreign railway corporations.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That the order for the consideration of the motion for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, have precedence over all other business except Introduction of Bills, until disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of George Riley, Esq., for the electoral district of Victoria, B.C.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 9.10 p.m.

3

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 17, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

TELEPHONES AND TELEPHONE COMPANIES BILL.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York), moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2) regarding telephones and telephone companies.

Mr. SPROULE. Explain.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with telephones and telephone companies. It is based largely on the present general Acts respecting telegraphs, the clauses being very similar to the clauses of those Acts. For a moment, I desire to direct the attention of the House to the object which I have in view. The first clause of importance in this Bill is that the company has power to fix its tolls. The next clause provides that the company must give equal treatment; and the clause following that calls for government control, supervision and revision of those tolls. And, by tolls, I mean not only the charges made for messages, but the rentals of telephones. Under the Bill, all these tolls must be approved by the Governor in Council in the same way as are the rates of telegraph companies and railway companies. Another clause, in the same direction, provides that these tolls may be revised from time to time by the Governor in Council. It is also here provided that the telephone companies shall post up their tolls in their various offices. Another important clause, in the line of the general provisions I have referred to is one providing against unfair discrimination, while another clause provides that there shall be no rebates. A provision is made also for agreements between companies, just as, under the Railway Act, provision is made for agreement between railway companies, and as in those cases, the agreements must be approved by the Governor in Council. But the most important clause, and the one to which I desire to direct special attention, provides that every telephone company must give the right of way for the use of its system by every other telephone company, just as every railway company must give the use of its lines to other railway companies. At the present time we have one great telephone company in Canada—the Bell Telephone Company—which is in a position, at this moment, to refuse the use of its trunk line to every other company. This Act will compel the Bell Telephone Company and every other similar company to give what we might call running rights to other companies. There is also provision for the order of transmitting

messages, as in the law governing telegraph companies; and another provision giving the Minister of Justice the first right of use of the telephone system. Another very important clause, and one in the line of something to which I have directed the attention of this House more than once, empowers the government to take over the telephone system at any time in the same way as they are authorized to take over the telegraph system of the country. Still another very important point well worthy of the attention of the House, well worthy of adoption, is a clause which will have the effect of preventing any telephone company hereafter from discriminating unfairly against a rival line. For instance, the municipalities of this country are going in for a municipal system. But when the Bell Telephone Company or any other that at the present controls the business—as has been the case in the United States—hears that a new telephone system is being started they starve it out by competitive rates. In some places where a rival telephone system has been started and has been giving subscribers telephone service at from $25 to $35 a year, the big monopoly has come in and said to the local users of the new system : We will give you telephone service at $2 or $3 a year for three years if you will sign an agreement with us. They will not be able to do that by this Bill. They will have to treat every city and every village under like circumstances in a like way. There is also a provision that if the government desires to take over the lines the price to be paid therefor shall be subject to arbitration if the two parties cannot agree. The final clause is a repeal of a very obnoxious general Act that was passed in this country some years ago. I referred to it last session. It was done in the interests of the Bell Telephone Company, as I now find. This little Act that was put through this parliament some ten or fifteen years ago, was to the effect that the words 'telephone' and 'telephonic' were not to be construed as 'telegraph' and 'telegraphic,' notwithstanding the Act that the English courts had years preceding held they were one and the same thing. It is because of that little Act that the telephone companies to-day do not come under the Telegraph Companies Act. I propose in this Bill to repeal that clause. I regard this Bill as a very important one. I have had it drafted by a rather eminent counsel, it has been thought over very carefully. It is on the line of the petitions that are being sent into this House every day. I hope that when it comes before the House we will have the co-operation of the House and especially the co-operation of the government in giving the public some kind of control, some kind of regulation, of what is becoming one of the great monopolies of this country, and a monopoly that up to the present time does not treat the public fairly. The Bell Telephone Company have asked this parliament to increase their powers of capitalization and for other great privileges. But in asking for these privileges they have not been willing to make any concessions to the public. Now, I am not introducing this Bill with any antagonistic spirit to the Bell Telephone Company, but I am applying to the telephone companies the same general principles which this parliament has seen fit to apply to telegraph companies and to railway corporations.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Geo. Riley, Esq., member for the electoral division of the city of Victoria, B.C., introduced by the Prime Minister (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher).

CATTLE GUARDS ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act. He said : This Bill which relates to cattle guards is the same Bill as was introduced here by me last session, and which I am sorry to say did not get further than the committee stage, having been referred to a special committee. The law at present does not require railway companies to keep up cattle guards at crossings except as against animals under the control of a human being, and the Bill seeks to protect cattle when passing along a highway where there are railway crossings. It has been said that there is an ancient but unwritten rule that no member shall be allowed to carry a Bill through parliament during his first session; perhaps that accounts for the disaster that befell this Bill last session. But that time has now passed, and I hope this Bill may be more lucky during the present session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Campbell for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Before dealing with the particular point to which I wish to direct the attention of the House to-day, I desire to refer for a moment to a few paragraphs of the address.

In the paragraph relating to the assassination of President McKinley, I suppose the government really voices the feelings

not only of this country but of the civilized world, in saying that the time has come when legislation should be adopted to prevent, if possible, the repetition of such horrible crimes as the one which was perpetrated last year. However, as the paragraph states that we should join our efforts to the efforts of the United States, I merely wish to make a reservation. The tone of the press of the United States at the time of the assassination of President McKinley, and since, does not warrant us, I think, in promising to follow them in whatever legislation they may choose to adopt. We should not forget that anarchy and its doctrines, and its apostles, were not bred by the exercise of free speech and action, but were bred by the exercise of tyranny; and we should take proper care in seeking to extirpate this evil that we do not create another evil. Sir, if anarchism has found its way to America and threatens to increase here, it is not so much by reason of the existence of free institutions as of the debasement of moral ideas in modern life. Unfortunately for the neighbouring country, while it has shown during the last century the greatest development of material resources and the most wonderful material progress, the American people have been constantly taught that the possession of wealth, the accumulation of wealth, the combination of wealth, is the one great ideal to which humanity should look forward, and under this teaching the way has been prepared for the development of these anarchistic theories. The evil cannot be cured by law alone. I think the existence of the evil is due chiefly to the education which has been given to the people. But as long as the nation insists that in the common schools of the country nothing but technical education should be afforded to the young, as long as the old principle is forgotten that at the same time a child is taught the elements of science he should also be taught the elements of the moral law and be guided throughout life by the fear of God and by strict adherence to moral and religious principles, I fear that very little improvement can be expected from the operation of any laws that may be adopted. I say no more on this subject; but, while talking about the United States I may say that I was very much astonished with one word that fell from the lips of the right hon. the leader of the government relating to the Alaskan boundary. The right hon. gentleman said:—

> Neither have we mentioned in the speech of His Excellency, the Alaskan boundary matter, and the reason why we have omitted a reference to it is simply because it is to-day in the very same position it was in last year. It has made no progress since then.

And later on:

> I have to say to my hon. friend—

Referring to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax).

> That we have pressed as much as we could; nay more, I may say that we have pressed in season and out of season, on the Imperial authorities to bring that matter to a close.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an exact picture of the situation, but I think also that it is to be regretted that between last session, and this session, the British government have been brought to consent to the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. And, to all appearances, this has been done with the tacit consent of the government, whilst the rights of Canada and the rights of Great Britain in the Alaskan boundary have not made one step of progress. I am not referring to what passed in the Anglo-American Commission as I am precluded from it, but I am speaking of what was the general impression in England, in the United States and in Canada. No later than the months of November and December last, the then Minister of Justice in this government, the Hon. David Mills, whose authority on constitutional and international matters cannot be disputed, published two most remarkable articles in the 'Empire Review' of Great Britain, stating that Great Britain could not and would not abandon her rights in Nicaraguan affairs unless compensation should be given Canada in regard to the Alaskan boundary. Where stands the question to-day? In the Clayton-Bulwer treaty Great Britain had rights with the United States affecting only the continent of America. And she has now abandoned those rights without any regard to the interests of her Canadian subjects, and has not exacted anything for them. The only other treaty where she had purely continental rights, there was a proper cause for the application of the Munroe doctrine, it was this one having reference to Nicaraguan affairs and to the Alaskan boundary in which American interests were at stake. There was no question of bringing America under European influences. There were two questions in which Great Britain and the United States had rights. It was always said—and so much so that last year it was a current issue in the public press of the United States—that the stumbling block in the way of repealing the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was the obstinacy of the Canadian government in refusing, and refusing very rightly and very properly, to consent to the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty without compensation being obtained from the United States in the matter of the Alaskan boundary. However, a motion is on the Order paper for the correspondence relating to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and I hope that sound doctrine which was so well exposed in the British press by the late Minister of Justice will be made clear so that we will know the reason why the situ-

ation has changed so quickly and so thoroughly in a few days.

Now, as far as the paragraph relating to exhibitions is concerned, I entirely concur with the opinion put into the mouth of His Excellency. I had the advantage this last summer of visiting the Glasgow exhibition ; and it is a pleasure for me to say here in compliment to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and to his officials that the display of Canadian products at the exhibition was made not only in the most artistic way, but in the most practical way. The effect was heightened by the visit of the hon. minister who took every occasion to address the English and Scotch public. Our exhibition at Glasgow coupled with the visit of the hon. Minister of Agriculture has done Canada a great deal of good.

So far as exhibitions at large are concerned, I simply wish to make one suggestion in all friendship to the government. In every exhibition where we take a hand it should be made an absolute condition, either with the directors of these exhibitions, or with representatives of the British government when the British empire at large takes part in it, that Canadian products should not only be exhibited separately but the lists of competitors and the prizes should be given separately. We have been told very often that we have grown to be a nation. Twenty-five years ago I suppose we were not a nation ; but nevertheless, at the Centennial exhibition at Philadelphia, our representatives imposed upon the British officials the obligation of having special lists prepared of the Canadian exhibits and of having special lists of the prizes given. So that when the prizes were awarded, foreign purchasers could know, when looking at the list of winners, that one who had been awarded a bronze silver or gold medal, was a Canadian producer. At the Paris Exposition, twenty-four years later on, the names of Canadian prize winners on the lists were mixed up with the British, Australian and New Zealand competitors ; so that when they came to be looked over, the foreign purchaser looking through a list of fifty names, for instance, would not probably see the name of a Canadian producer, but would be more likely to call upon the merchant or manufacturer of the big cities of England than upon the merchant or manufacturer of Canadian cities.

If foreign exhibits are going to be made by Canada, it is upon one very straight condition that we should exhibit, and this condition is that we should exhibit as Canadians, that the prizes should be awarded to us as Canadians, it should be known that a certain number of Canadians have won prizes and their names should not be mixed up with those of other exhibitors coming from all parts of the empire.

Now, coming to the question of trade agents, I may say that I concur entirely in the projected policy of the government. I think it is a very good move and a move that should be extended ; but I may be allowed to add that this move will bring its full and proper fruit only when Canada secures the right of herself making her foreign commercial relations. Should we have agents at Paris, Bordeaux, Berlin, Hamburg or any other foreign city, foreigners will come to them to inquire about the laws of the country and the conditions upon which trade can be done with Canada. If we are bound to say that we cannot negotiate any arrangement whatever with a foreign country with which improved trade relations are sought we hamper our trade relations. I hope this will be one of the questions which the right hon. leader of the government and his colleagues will put before the Imperial conference this summer. It is perfectly useless for us to boast of being a nation, it is perfectly useless for us to seek to develop our trade if by becoming a nation we cannot exercise one of the most essential prerogatives of a nation, which is the full and complete control of its foreign relations and of trade matters especially.

This brings me to the two paragraphs relating to the coronation of His Majesty the King and to the Imperial conference which is going to take place next summer. I am not going to speak at length on this because I have also put on the Order paper a motion asking for the production of the correspondence and papers which have passed between the Canadian and the Imperial governments on that matter. I simply wish to draw attention to the fact that in these two paragraphs the question of trade only is mentioned. Of course, I have not seen that which I hope the government will give us the advantage of seeing before the session is over : the terms of the invitation sent by Mr. Chamberlain to the colonial governments and the terms of the acceptance of that invitation. But there are past facts which should be made the lesson of the future.

In 1897, without this country knowing it, although parliament was in session, an invitation was sent to Canada as well as to all the other colonies asking that representatives be sent to England, not merely to establish trade relations between the various parts of the British Empire, but also to take steps that would have the effect of blending the various parts of the empire together, both socially and politically, and further to consider the organization of the military defence of the empire. My intention is not to bring forward any controversial subject to-day, and therefore I shall not dwell upon that matter at any length. I do say, however, that unless Mr. Chamberlain's mind has changed much during the last four years—and I do not think that his reputation would lead to the conclusion that it has—

there are other changes than changes in trade matters contemplated. I hold that we should not now be placed in the same position as we were placed in 1897, of seeing our representatives go to London without our knowing exactly what are the subjects to be treated of at that imperial conference. What were the terms of the invitation of 1897 ? In his official despatch, dated January 28th, 1897, Mr. Chamberlain wrote :

> Should this invitation be accepted by the premiers of the self-governing colonies there presence in London would afford a most valuable opportunity for the discussion of many subjects of the greatest interest to the empire ; such as commercial union, colonial defence, representation of the colony, legislation with regard to immigrants from Asia and elsewhere, and other similar subjects.

That was a very broad programme, but it was never made known to the Canadian people. An order in council was adopted on the 15th of April by the Canadian government, and this order in council I have found in the British blue-books. Well, I don't think a Canadian should be compelled to search the British blue-books for information about what the Canadian government is doing. This was the report from the sub-committee of the Privy Council of Canada :

> The sub-committee further join in the hope expressed by the Right Hon. Secretary of State that it may be found possible to take advantage of the assemblage of the premiers of the self-governing colonies for the discussion of the many and important questions of interest to the empire, to which he has referred. The sub-committee unite most sincerely in the hope that the result of the approaching celebration may be such as will tend powerfully to cement the union between the mother country and her colonies, both socially and politically.

The House was then in session and continued in session for some months after. We had the announcement that the Prime Minister was going to represent us, and while I do not quarrel with any man who is in favour of changing the relations that may exist between Great Britain and Canada, I do say that when the Canadian government sent representatives to England with the object of discussing a change in these relations, the least that the Canadian parliament and Canadian people should expect is that they would be informed of it by the government, and not be obliged to search in British blue-books for an expression of opinion by the Canadian government on such an important matter.

Coming to the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which relates to the census, I may remark that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) criticised the government quite violently in this regard. I do not think that the facts justify the hon. gentleman in that criticism. What is the use of bringing forward in this House the argument : that because the Liberal party of some years ago accused the government of the day of pursuing a policy which caused the slow growth of the population, the opposition of to-day should say: 'This paragraph in the Speech from the Throne is not founded on fact because the increase in the population during the Liberal regime is no greater than it was under Conservative rule ?' For my part I believe that the government has painted the situation in its true light. There is no doubt that the result of the census has been disappointing, but there is no doubt either that this paragraph in the Speech from the Throne is perfectly true :

> There is good reason also to believe that the increase of population during the latter half of the decade has been very greatly in excess of the average of former years and that in the near future we may look for a much more rapid growth than occurred during the period covered by the last two censuses.

The constituency which I represent is in the midst of a colonization district, and I am myself a witness to the fact that during the first five years of the last census, not only was settlement at a standstill, but the people of our farming districts were leaving daily for the large Canadian cities and the United States. I believe—and this without any idea of flattering the government—that from 1891 to 1896 the increase in our population was at a standstill, not because the Conservatives were in power, but because of circumstances into which I am not going now to enter, our people emigrated more at that time than at any previous period. Within the last five years, twenty new parishes have been constituted in the region of the Gatineau, and in the La Lievre Valley and the Rouge Valley. Between 1896 and 1900, in my own constituency alone, not speaking of the neighbouring constituencies, six new parishes have been organized for religious and municipal purposes. In the district of Labelle the increase during the last ten years was 6,000, but I firmly believe that the whole of that increase took place during the last five years.

There is no doubt that something should be done to encourage and increase our population. The hon. the leader of the opposition has suggested a stronger help to industries, but for my part I would suggest a stronger help to farming and to colonization. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that industries in Cape Breton have attracted a large influx of population, but he has also admitted that there has been an enormous decrease in the rest of the province of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman may believe that were it not for the coal and steel industries of Cape Breton, these people would perhaps have remained in the rest of the province of Nova Scotia. but while it is better to have these people working in the mines and steel works of Cape Breton than to have them go to the United States, it would be still better to keep them on the farms. After all the bone and sinew of our country is its farming population. This is a farming community.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is not so.

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes. The true basis of a country is its farming population.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is not so.

Mr. FRASER. You are differing from your leader.

Mr. BOURASSA. Manufacturing industries do immense good in the country, but I say that the solid basis of a country is the prosperity of the farming community.

Mr. MACLEAN. And the industries.

Mr. BOURASSA. I say that the industries should be developed and should be supplied by the farmers, and that both should help each other.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. But to develop the industries to such a point as to attract the country people to the cities without at the same time trying to promote settlement in the country is, in my opinion, bad policy. I am nearly as much of a protectionist as the hon. gentleman is; I have always admitted it in this House. I am not a protectionist on principle. I am a protectionist because I consider protection our only safeguard against the trade invasions of the United States. But I say that along with a policy that will prevent American industries destroying Canadian industries, we should have a policy for giving a strong impetus to farming and settlement.

Again, I must pay a compliment to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). I am not always in the habit of paying compliments to ministers, though whenever I can do so, I do it with pleasure. I will also make a suggestion to the hon. gentleman. He and his officials have done a great deal to develop the farming industries of this country, especially in the market which is our most natural market—the British market—the most natural, that is, while we are deprived of the American market. I would ask the hon. gentleman if it would not be possible to adopt some scheme whereby greater uniformity of dairy products might be attained. If there is one impediment to our trade in cheese and butter, especially in butter, it is the fact that there is not sufficient control over its manufacture. One reason for this is the too great number of small factories. It has been suggested in the province of Quebec that the provincial legislature should do something in this matter; but as that would be an interference with the constitution, which refers to the federal parliament the control of trade, I would ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who has already done something for the establishment of cold chambers in the factories, if something could not also be done to discourage the building of small factories, which cannot make good products, but which try to compete with the best factories, and tend to spoil our markets.

With regard to the settlement of the country, I do not think it is just that the whole burden of colonization should rest upon the provincial government, I speak of those of the older provinces. In the western provinces the federal government, having control of the lands, fulfils the duty which in the older provinces devolves upon the provincial governments. We sometimes hear complaints of the heavy debt of the province of Quebec; but that debt is in a great measure due to the fact that the provincial government, though it has sometimes made mistakes, like other governments, has striven to keep the people of the province in the province. The result is not enormous, yet the province of Quebec is the only province in the Dominion which shows an increase in the rural population. In the other provinces the increase of population is confined to the cities. What is the reason for this difference? It is because the province of Quebec has spent money generously for the building of bridges, colonization roads and railroads, in order to open up the virgin parts of the province. I would like to see the federal government take a hand in this work. The provinces are not rich, their revenues are limited, and whenever there is an increase of population in any province, it is an increase of consumers, who add to the revenues of the federal government, but do not add anything to the revenues of the provincial government. On the contrary, they are a cause of more expenditure on the part of the province, on colonization roads, bridges and other improvements. Therefore, wherever there is a possibility of the federal government assisting in development and colonization work, it should be done.

Another paragraph of the speech upon which I want to say a word is that referring to the projected line of steamships to South Africa. I may say frankly that I am opposed to it—not on grounds of sentiment, but because I think there are many other countries with which Canada could develop a better trade. Very little permanent trade can be expected in South Africa. The mines will no doubt be reopened, and will no doubt flourish, because the tyrannical government of Mr. Kruger having been done away with, the mine-owners will be in a position to introduce their slavery system, which they had under British rule at Kimberley. But that trade, after all, is only a matter of a few years. The most hopeful expectations held out by expert engineers give to the mines of South Africa a probable existence of forty or fifty years, or perhaps seventy-five years at the utmost. Then, with the lines of communication already established with Great Britain, Germany, France and the United States, it is not likely that Canada can enter into a successful competition with these countries. Moreover, farming in South Africa has been destroyed, at any

rate, for years to come. The country has been devastated as Western Germany was devastated by Marshall Turenne over two hundred years ago.

The British government are proposing to organize a system of state-aided emigration to South Africa. Protests have been made against this in various colonies. The Toronto 'Globe' had an article last summer, in which it said that it was a poor return for the sacrifices which Canada and the other colonies had made for England to find England helping with her mighty influence and capital the settlement of South Africa at the expense of the other colonies. I do not know what has been the result of these protests. I hope that before the session is over the government will announce that they have protested most strongly against such a project; and when it is stated that the British government and the local authorities in South Africa are going to try to retain as settlers in South Africa our young men who have gone there, at the expense of Canada, to fight the battles of the empire, surely we are not going to make matters easier by establishing a direct line of steamships from Canada to South Africa. It is not my purpose to discuss that question to-day; but even if it was good policy for Canada to engage in the war in South Africa, surely there is not a man in this House who will assert that it is a proper policy for the Canadian government and parliament to help the British authorities to settle South Africa at the expense of this country.

This naturally brings me to the charge that was made against the government by the hon. leader of the opposition and his deputy, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) for not having mentioned in the Speech from the Throne the sending of the third contingent to South Africa.

I shall not discuss that question this afternoon, for I think it is of sufficient importance to form the subject of special debate and I intend moving later on for all the correspondence relating on the matter. But I wish merely to observe that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) are not in a position to arraign the government for not having announced this policy as a government measure, in the Speech from the Throne. When the policy was inaugurated, when the principle was laid down, that the Canadian government should commit itself and future governments to the participation of Canada in British wars, the two hon. gentlemen were the first to rise and unite with the government in the attempt to crush those few members who claimed for the Canadian parliament the right of independence and self control. Therefore the right to condemn the government for its action in this connection rests only with those few men who voted to proclaim that the independence of the Canadian parliament was paramount to Cecil Rhodes' South African scheme.

Before I leave this question I wish to make a reply to the right hon. First Minister, which I was debarred from making last session as the right hon. gentleman spoke after me. My right hon. friend taunted me last year, and repeated his taunt this session, that I had asked the Canadian parliament to blame the administration for not having prevented young Canadians going to fight in South Africa. Sir, I am too great a lover of liberty to have ever made such a proposition. I never asked this parliament to entertain for a moment the idea of preventing any body going to fight in South Africa or elsewhere. But there is an immense difference between preventing young Canadians going to fight in South Africa and allowing the British government to do in Canada, what they never before attempted to do, even when we were but a Crown colony. What I objected to last session, and what I shall always object to, as long as I represent any portion of the Canadian people, is that Canada should be made a recruiting ground for the British army. In taking this ground I was supported last year by such loyal organs as the Montreal 'Witness' and the Toronto 'Star.' These organs took this position, that while England, whenever she wanted men to fight her battles, should be allowed to obtain them freely in Canada, the British authorities should not be led to entertain the hope of making Canada a recruiting ground and coming here to get recruits which they could not obtain at home. The sending of the last contingent was not merely helping a few young men to go and fight in South Africa, but it was the beginning of a regular system of recruiting in this country for the British army—a system taken up four years ago by the British government, announced in the British Houses of parliament every year during the four last sessions, and the subject of correspondence between the British and Canadian governments during all that time,—if we are to credit the declarations made by British authorities in the parliament of Great Britain. On the merits of the war, I shall not say anything at present. But I wish to tender my sincere thanks to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) for having at last sounded the true note on that question. The right hon. Prime Minister has told us that this is a war for justice and liberty. The Liberals in England say it is a war of conquest and subjugation.

Mr. FLINT. No.

Mr BOURASSA. Yes, except a very small handful of them.

Mr. FLINT. Only a few cranks say so.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is a matter of appreciation. My hon. friend says a few cranks. Well, they comprise men such as Mr. Bryce, the Right Hon. John Morley, Sir

Henry Campbell Bannerman; and if we had a few such men in this House, it would be the better for the country. It is cranks like those who have done much to make England what she is to-day, and to give to our country the liberties we now enjoy. And were they to disappear, it would be an unfortunate thing for this country, for we would be abandoned to the policy of men who proclaim that military authorities have the right to go into free British colonies and suspend the operation of the law, and that which is England's greatest glory—the liberty of the citizen. To come back to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), he told us that all this trouble in South Africa was really at bottom nothing but a railway question—that it arose out of Cecil Rhodes' dream of a railway from the Cape to Cairo.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. While I am one of those who are ready to do much in order to perpetuate the power and glory of England and in order that Canada may remain as long as possible under free British institutions, I am not ready to take the money of the Canadian people and spend it in helping Cecil Rhodes to build a railway from the Cape to Cairo, and therefore I cannot agree with my hon. friend from East York in denouncing the government for not having expended a little more money on the troops who are fighting to build that railway. My hon. friend, like myself, is much interested in the railway question in Canada. Well, we have not too much money here and are not in a position to give away any of it as a gift to Mr. Rhodes and Mr. Chamberlain in order to assist them in their pet project.

This naturally brings me to the railway question; and let me say that the motion I have prepared and my remarks accompanying it, are not directed with any view of embarrassing the government or of criticising the policy of the government from a party standpoint. I notice in the Speech from the Throne a reference to the application made by the Canadian Pacific Railway for an increase of its capital and the paragraph concludes with these words:

> My ministers availed themselves of the opportunity to stipulate that the long pending question of the power of the Governor in Council to regulate the tolls of the company should be submitted to the courts for the judicial decision The correspondence and other papers will be laid before you.

This brings up a very important question. Here is a contract which was made, some twenty or twenty-five years ago, with a powerful corporation, probably the biggest railway corporation in the world under one control; and one of the powers, which we were supposed to have reserved in that contract, was the control of the rates by the government. Now, this is not the first favour that the Canadian Pacific Railway has asked of this parliament. Under all governments, they have come here year after year to get additional favours. And, now, we are faced with this situation—that it is only after we have given them millions upon millions over and above what they were entitled to under their contract, after we have given them charter after charter empowering them to control small branch lines that we are told that we are to have—not additional power—but simply the right to submit a question to the courts. Are they going to obtain their power to increase their capital before the decision of the court is reached? Are they going to obtain first the favour they ask, leaving us to a doubtful decision of the courts? Sir, I want to be perfectly clear on this point. From a certain point of view I am a Canadian Pacific Railway man. It is true, like all other Liberals, I, for many years denounced the Canadian Pacific Railway as one of the greatest scandals in existence—a scandal brought to pass by the Conservative party—and a menace to Canada. When I look only at Canada's interest, when I do not go outside of this country, sometimes I am inclined to think that such a huge corporation, extending its powers over all the provinces of this country, more powerful in itself than all the other railway companies in this country, may but be a menace to Canada. But, when I go across the border, when I come in contact with foreign capitalists, as I did when I was in Washington with the Anglo-American commission, when I hear, as I did—and I do not speak of what passed in the commission—when I hear foreign railway men tell me that, when they press upon the Canadian government the adoption of railway policy similar to that of the United States, when they urge the control of railways under similar provisions to those enforced by the Inter-State Commission of the United States, they have no intention of striking at the Grand Trunk Railway—that the Grand Trunk Railway is practically an American railway—but that the only railway which they have a grudge against, the only railway at which they are aiming is the Canadian Pacific Railway—when I look at the question from that point of view, then, I am a Canadian Pacific Railway man.

But that does not change the general proposition, that the time has come, as I believe, when this country should have a railway policy. We have no railway policy; we cannot pretend that we have. We give charters to almost everybody who asks for them, and we give plenty of money to those to whom we grant charters, reserving to ourselves but a very slight nominal control—and even that control we do not exercise; and, as in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway to-day, we are obliged to ask the intervention of the courts many years after the charter has been given. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has told us—and very

properly—that this was a vitally important question. Railway questions are almost the most vital in every country. And for this excellent reason—the railway industry is the only one that works in connection with every other industry. Whatever the development of trade, of farming, of manufactures, if we do not have the railway communication to bring our products to the sea-board, all our efforts at production are useless. But, with Canada, there is more in the question even than that. I say that the railway question is the basis of our national existence. And why? Without railways there would be no Canada. Canada geographically speaking, and looking at it from a purely natural point of view, is an absurd country. It was never intended by providence that a country should be divided from its neighbour by a line of three thousand miles not based upon any natural boundaries, whilst that country is divided within itself by obstacles that can never be wholly removed. We have three of four countries in one; and had it not been for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the maritime provinces and British Columbia would be now part of the American republic. Well, Sir, by building railways, we have given existence to this country; but the time has come, I think, when railways may be the cause of disrupting the nationality of this country which they have been the means of building up.

I am not going to enter into a long discussion of the railway policies of the various European countries. The one I am most familiar with is that of the French Republic. And, in my opinion, the French Republic has attained nearly the point of perfection so far as its railway policy is concerned. France started as we did, by granting subsidies; but did not continue that policy very long. Soon afterwards they adopted the system of granting annuities of ten or fifteen years to railways. Then, they abolished both subsidies and annuities, and gave a guarantee of interest as well as a guarantee of sinking fund. And what is the result? The first is that the state is interested in seeing that no railway shall be built unless it is useful and will bring in revenue. The second is that the shareholders and the men who loan money on the debentures knowing that the interest and also the sinking fund are guaranteed, will always give full value for the security. The issue of watered stock for building railways is unknown in France; all the money handed over to the railway companies for stock and debentures is put into the railways. The government does not give a permanent charter to a railway company, but gives a charter for ninety years. You may say that that is a pretty long charter. But, in a nation's life it is not so very long. The granting of this form of charter keeps the ownership of the railway in the government, while it does not charge the government with the duties of administration. Therefore, to compare our control of the Intercolonial Railway with such a system of government ownership is of no value, because the systems have no relation. The government ownership is clearly asserted—a company is not allowed to transfer its capital, or its route, or its rolling stock, without the permission of the government that owns it; yet, at the same time, the government is not loaded with the care, the responsibility and the inconveniences that would necessarily result from administering the road. After the expiry of the franchise, the whole thing returns to the government. Those who have received annuities are obliged to compute those annuities at 4 per cent, and the amount thus ascertained is deducted from the capital paid to them. In the case of those that received a guarantee of interest and sinking fund, the sinking fund is accumulated to be deducted from the price of the purchase. The guarantee is lost, to a certain extent, but that is compensated by the fact that, every time the net surplus of the company pays more than the interest that is guaranteed, it goes back to the state. For instance, supposing that 4 per cent is the guarantee for the railway, and the revenues of the railway yield only 3 per cent, then, the government pays 1 per cent to the shareholders and the holders of the debentures. But, if the amount paid by the railway company is 5 per cent, then 1 per cent goes to the State for compensation for what has been paid. The amount that had to be paid by the state increased for a number of years. But now it is decreasing, and the least optimistic of economists in France are able to point to the day when not only the railways of France will not be a cause of taxes laid upon the people, but will be actually a source of revenue, and their capital value a means of helping to extinguish the national debt. I do not say at present that the French system should be applied here. I am simply pointing out these facts to instance a country that is solving this railway problem in a marvellous way.

Now, I admit that our condition in this respect has arisen from the absurd physical form of our country. We have been obliged to build railways and to subsidize railways where no revenue could be expected. But, Sir, we have been wrong in this—we have granted too many charters. We have given charters right and left, not in accordance with the requirements of the country, but simply because a few schemers would come here—men without capital and without responsibility. To these men we would give the privilege of bonding their railway for more than it was worth and would give subsidies so large that, with the proceeds of the bonds and of the stock they

could raise enough to build the railway. What has been the result where railways were really needed ? The result has been that enormous profits have been gained by railway constructors without any return either of interest or of capital to the state. Everything has been lost to the state, and still we have exercised no control over the rates. When anticipations did not marterialize what has been the result ? Those railways have either been stopped in their construction, or new favours have been asked from the government.

A really useful railway, well located and required by the people is of great utility to the country ; but I say a railway which is badly located is most disastrous to the country. Take, for example, the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-west. In obedience to Imperial considerations, that road, instead of being placed where the natural requirements of the country pointed out, was placed where Imperial considerations would be best served. The result has been that for many years people who wanted to go to the North-west and settle went along the Saskatchewan and Qu'Appelle valley, but people who were attracted by railway communications and by cheap lands and who did not know the real conditions, settled along the Canadian Pacific Railway. Along that railway for 300 or 400 miles in the North-west you have a population that have good railway communication but they are settled on a barren soil with no timber and no water. In the Saskatchewan valley you have a population which was attracted by the natural resources of the country, who took up fertile lands where they could have timber and water. But they suffered from want of good railway communication, and when they had communication they only had it through branches of the Canadian Pacific Railway on which the company naturally were forced by circumstances to charge enormous rates. We can understand the complaints of the people of the North-west against the rates. But it cannot be denied that these rates have been more or less forced on the Canadian Pacific Railway on account of the bad location of the route.

Take the case in our own province where railways have been built for settlement purposes, and what has been the result ? Some of those railways have been well located, the country has been opened up, settlers have poured in, and industries have been established. But elsewhere, where railways have been built up by a few schemers with the object of obtaining money from the government and then abandoning the railway, what has been the result ? A few traders, a few settlers have been attracted there by the temporary activity arising from the construction of the railway. But when they found out that the circumstances did not warrant them in spending their money in settlement, they left the country. Where did they go ? Did they go back to the old settlement from whence they came ? No. Once they had abandoned their homes in the old townships or parishes and had spent all their money in these new regions where they had been attracted, they then went to the United States. Therefore, I say, Sir, that if some railways have been the means of building up this country and developing its resources, and have attracted emigrants here, on the other hand some railways, owing to the injudicious way in which they have been located, have caused many people to go to the United States. They have discouraged our population, they have inspired our population with a spirit of change, they have taken away from our farmers the desire to remain at home. Once they found out that the country was not a favourable one in which to settle they have removed and gone to another country. Take the regions traversed by the first part of the Northern Railway in the province of Quebec. There is a country where millions of dollars have been expended by federal and provincial governments to secure settlers. During the ten years from 1881 to 1891 the county of Terrebonne only increased its population by 80, though the natural increase must have been at least 3,000. In that region where a colonization railway was improperly located the result has been that it helped the people to leave the country, and that was all.

There is another important feature of this question which I wish to touch upon before concluding. By putting on the market unproductive stocks, railways have attracted British capitalists to invest in shares and to guarantee bonds on railways which did not justify the expense, and the result has been to discourage British financiers from investing in any Canadian enterprises. You have only to speak to a British capitalist of Canadian railways to make him shut his purse at once. When they saw that the Canadian government was granting charters to build railways, and that federal and provincial governments were giving subsidies, naturally they thought that the speculation was a safe one. They could not believe that a new country which desired to develop its resources would squander money upon any wild-cat schemes. The granting of these charters and subsidies, and the immense powers which the government had conferred on railway companies, have resulted in attracting British capital where the investors did not sufficiently examine the facts. They did not send any one to examine the circumstances, and the country which the railway was going to traverse, they were assured it was a good speculation by the action of the government, they invested their money, and the result is now. I am told, that they will not listen to you when you propose to them to invest in a Canadian railway. The only foreign capital we can expect is American capital. The Americans are getting control of our railways, of this

there can be no doubt. Let me quote a paragraph that appeared in the month of August last in a paper published in New York, which is reputed to be more or less an exponent of the personal opinions of President Roosevelt, I mean the 'Expansionist,' of New York. After speaking of the trade relations which are developing between Canada and the United States, it says :

> It is satisfactory to know that attention is being given by responsible and competent men in this country to the policy indicated in the foregoing and that advantage will be taken of the opportunity afforded by financial conditions to gain control of the transportation systems of Canada, as American capital is becoming a dominant factor in the development of Canada's forests and mineral resources. The two cannot be separated, but must be linked for the common benefit.

Not for the common benefit of both countries, but for the common benefit of both classes of American capitalists. Now, Sir, the Prime Minister told us the other day :

> If some American capitalists invest their capital in our railways, what is it for ? To so develop those railways as to enable them to carry the trade not only of Canada but of the United States to the seaboard. What seaboard may I ask ? The nearest and the cheapest, that is, the St. Lawrence river. Whoever has the control of any railroad will administer it for the benefit of his company, in order to make it yield the best returns possible. In my opinion, in the matter of transportation, geography is altogether in favour of Canada ; and far from frowning upon the investment of American capital seeking investment in these industries, I altogether welcome it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly, if American capitalists would come to this country as German, as British, as French capitalists, and invest their money in Canadian enterprises, and so to speak, make them Canadian, I would not have the slightest objection whatever. I have no objection to Mr. Eddy coming from the United States and developing that admirable industry which has done so much for the prosperity of Ottawa and Hull ; or to Mr. Clergue, or to the company at Shawinigan Falls, or at Grand'Mère, coming to Canada and developing the pulp industry. I have no objection of any kind to American citizens possessing any amount of capital coming in to assist in developing the country. My objection is not at all to be taken from that point of view ; but it is not capitalists of this kind that come here to take possession of Canadian railways and parade them as American railways. When a company like the New York Central takes hold of the Canada Atlantic Railway, when a company with a capital of $200,000,000 invested in the United States, takes hold of a small Canadian road worth only ten or twenty million dollars, it does not mean that profits will be sought on the Canadian route, built with Canadian capital for the benefit of the Canadian people, but that the Canadian road will be used if possible to increase the dividends on the $200,000,000 of American capital. That is the most natural explanation and it cannot be otherwise. It was so last year when 'La Patrie' of Montreal denounced the bargain that was entered into between the Manitoba government and Messrs. Mann and Mackenzie as being the attempt of an American syndicate to get hold of our western routes. It was not a question only of Messrs. Pierrepont Morgan and Hill making a few thousands of dollars of dividends in Canada; it was a question of the Northern Pacific Railway getting rid of Canadian competition and of using these new routes in the Canadian west to develop and concentrate the trade of Northern America upon their own routes. To this I take objection, and the strongest objection. I think, when the question is looked upon from that point of view, the Canadian people will never forgive the Canadian parliament for not taking the earliest opportunity of studying this problem. The thing is not always done by American capitalists and in future will not always be done in the way of purchasing railways. If they are bound to purchase a railway they will do it, but if they can, simply, by getting control of the points of communication between Canada and the United States, or if they can, by laying their hands upon our terminal facilities without being obliged to expend their money for the purpose, secure control of our railways, they will certainly do it. Therefore, the question is a broader one than the mere question of the buying or selling of a railway. In the city of Montreal, three years ago, a gentleman named Conners came there with an organized syndicate and made a most wonderful proposition to the people of Montreal for the building of elevators in that city. I am not an authority on these matters; I am speaking of them simply as a witness having no special interest in Montreal. At the time I asked myself what might be the interest of that man. With any man in general and with an American in particular, we should always put that question to ourselves. I knew that the Conners syndicate had large interests in Buffalo. I said to myself : That man cannot have any other purpose than to prevent building elevators in Montreal so as to keep the trade at Buffalo. But, people will say that he was risking money. If he was risking money he was securing in the rates charged at Buffalo greater profits in one year than the whole of the money he lost in three years here, and it was still a good speculation. Opposite the city of Quebec is the town of Lévis. There is an American gentleman who has been boarding in Lévis for a few weeks and who has been buying up the whole of what is left of the shore lands. It was the firm belief and I heard it expressed quite often by a gentleman well qualified to speak upon the subject, the late Mr. Dobell, that Lévis was destined to become one of the greatest ports in Canada because there were at that port such splen-

did water facilities. Has all that gone into the hands of an American syndicate ? What is this gentleman buying it for ? Is he buying it for Mr. Seward Webb ? We do not know. Perhaps he is buying it rather with the object of preventing any company or even the Canadian government, that will try to use the Intercolonial Railway, to develop the port of Lévis. There would be a good speculation in it for him.

How are we protected by the public press of the country on this question ? When it was known that the New York Central Railway Company had concluded to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway, I expected that the organs of public opinion in Ottawa, that have shown very often their loyalty to the British crown, and to the country, would express their indignation and fear. Not at all. They said there might be some danger but now we are going to reap some benefit; some big buildings are going to be erected in Ottawa. I may say that there is no city in Canada where two or three newspapers are not ready to help American capital to get possession of Canadian interests by leading public opinion in that direction provided that a few paltry local interests are safeguarded. I think it is the duty of parliament to consider how the interests of Canada are affected—look at the danger which is threatening. Let us take the example of the Grand Trunk Railway. It is not only a question of holding shares with these great railways. Here was a railway that was built with the money of the Canadian people, that obtained year after year favours from the Canadian parliament. No later than two or three years ago they had a grant from the Canadian parliament to widen the Victoria bridge, and they made a contract with the Canadian government. I do not want to discuss again that question; I do not say the contract was more favourable to the government than to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, but from the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway accepted it, it appears to have been a good bargain for the Grand Trunk Railway Company. One year after that grant was made they took the whole of the trade which they gathered from the west and carried it to the city of Portland. Here is a railway that starts at Chicago upon American territory, that passes along Canadian shores and reaps the fruits of the economy and industry of the Canadian people, which passes our Canadian ports, deprives Canadian labourers of the profit of handling the freight which it carries, and deprives Canadian steamship lines of the profit of carrying that freight to Europe.

Mr. MACLEAN. And gives the Americans cheaper rates than Canadians.

Mr. BOURASSA. Another point that I am not going to enter into, but it is only an additional point. Now, Sir, we have heard a great many things about the Canadian Pacific Railway. Two years ago we heard that on account of the excessive rates charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, a company was about to be formed in British Columbia to acquire and operate coal mines in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was the apparent reason. I do not know if the other reason given was true or not, but what is the result ? The result is that the Northern Pacific, Mr. Hill's property, having interested a few Canadian gentlemen, and I think even a few parliamentarians in this country, has got hold of coal mines in the west, is going to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from getting coal in these mines, is going to establish smelters on the Northern Pacific and carry the trade as much as possible from British Columbia to the American states. We heard the same remarks last year about the Manitoba railway legislation. We have now the Canada Atlantic Railway, which possibly will carry its trade to the port of Boston. The Grand Trunk Railway is carrying its trade to Portland. If we do not put a stop to that kind of a thing—if it be possible to put a stop to it—then before long this country will be divided into four or five sections. It will be no longer one Canada ; it will be five small Canadas, each of which will be a feeder to American transportation companies, to American labour, and to American capital.

From a national point of view, this is a matter of great consequence to us. Trade and commerce are the basis of the relations between all countries, and especially is that so here where our communities are separated by hundreds of miles of barren soil, and uninhabitable regions. The only affinity between British Columbia and the North-west Territories and Manitoba, and the central and eastern provinces is on account of the trade going through the Canadian railways. When British Columbia will do all its business in Seattle and San Francisco ; when Manitoba and the North-west Territories will do all their business in St. Paul and Duluth ; when Quebec and Ontario will do all their business in Portland, Boston, and New York, then the future of Canada as one country and one British colony will not be of long duration. I may be allowed to quote here words uttered last fall by the Countess of Aberdeen, speaking at Dundee. The first sentences merely explain what follows :

> Was not the gloom which over-hung the land due in great measure to the fact that this country had departed from the principles of Liberalism and erected in its stead a false and tyrannical patriotism, before which they must bow down or be crushed ? To throw doubt on the wisdom or justice of the present government was to brand themselves as traitors. We were squandering our sons and our money on the veldt of South Africa, and allowing Americans to buy up our commercial interests both in this country and in Canada. (' Times,' October 18, 1901.)

Sir, the interest of the British people is aroused on this subject. If they are be-

ginning in England to see the danger of the introduction of American capital—not under the ordinary form which capital uses to introduce itself into a country, but under the form of annexation by piecemeal—it is about time that we in Canada should give our attention to the matter.

It may surprise some members of this House to see that I am so much in earnest about the future of Canada in connection with the railway question. Some may think that there is a good deal of merely apparent sentiment, or of a wish on my part to play on the loyal feeling of this House. Well, it is not my habit to conceal my sentiments. I am as strongly opposed to American annexation as I am to British Imperialism. I am as strongly opposed to seeing the interests of this country merged in the interests of the American Republic, as I am opposed to seeing our interests merged in the Pan-Britannic scheme. Canada is big enough for me; Canada is good enough for me, and I want Canada for the Canadian people. Whatever may be our opinion otherwise, that is the policy that must predominate in this country if we do our duty to the Canadian people.

I do not want to make any special suggestion in this matter. I am no authority. I stand here as a witness on this subject. I read what is published, I listen to what is said, I regard what is going on ; that is all. I see that in place of the British pound coming to stimulate the industries of this country as was formerly the case, now we have the American dollar. Well, I have no objection to either the American dollar or the British pound provided one or the other becomes Canadian. I am not moving this amendment as a criticism of the policy of the present government or of the past government. It is a suggestion I am making. I am asking the government to accept my amendment in the spirit in which I move it, and the spirit in which I move it is this : That the time has come when the whole people of Canada should give their attention to this problem. What is the solution ? I do not know. Surely it is worth while studying the problem. Surely it is worth while finding if there be a solution. All the European countries have given their attention to this same problem. In France they have changed their railway policy three or four times. In Germany the railway policy was one of Bismarck's most ambitious schemes, but of course with his imperial mind he wanted to concentrate the whole of the German railways in the hands of the government. I am not saying that we should adopt the example of Germany or the example of France. I merely say that situated as we are, the railway policy obtrudes itself upon us more than in the case of any other country in the world, because here on this northern continent there are only two nations; one a small nation of five millions settling an immense territory to which railway interests are vital, and the other a population of seventy-five millions the most aggressive in trade matters of all the nations in the world, trying to outdo foreign capital and energy in every line of industries. It is time for us to be on our guard. If the government finds proper to accept my amendment, my only suggestion would be that there should be appointed a committee of this parliament that would study that question before the session is over, and if necessary that a commission of railway experts be also appointed to study the railway policies of foreign countries, to find out to what extent they would apply to our country, and to see how much of them would be applicable to us under our peculiar circumstances. In fact, I am simply asking that the government should give their attention to this matter and that the opposition should join with them. I believe that that committee should be composed of a very few men, and they being experts in the matter would study the problem and submit their project to the government. If it is not adopted then nothing is lost, but if a satisfactory solution is arrived at great advantage must accrue to the Canadian people. It is in that spirit that I move seconded by Mr. Puttee :

That the time has come when a railway policy should be framed by which the people of this country could expect some return from the enormous sacrifices they have made in order to further the development of their avenues of trade, and especially in preventing our railway systems from falling under the control of foreign railway corporations.

It will be noticed that I have not referred in the amendment to the introduction of foreign capital, but I have simply referred to the control of foreign railway corporations, which means capital that has been already organized in foreign countries for the building and exploiting of railways to be made channels for the diversion of our commerce to a foreign country. If this amendment be accepted it might probably come in the Speech from the Throne after the paragraph which relates to the extension of the powers of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). Mr. Speaker, the House, I am sure, has listened with a great deal of interest to the speech which has just been delivered by the hon. gentleman from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I must pay him this compliment, that he has been moderate. He has undoubtedly raised a very important question indeed, but at the same time a very difficult question to solve ; he has raised, in fact, the whole transportation question. My hon. friend has specially alluded to the intended purchase of the Canada Atlantic Railway by Mr. Webb and his associates. Before he had done so, my friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) had called the attention of the House to the same deal. We all know the location of that railway. It has

one terminus on the Georgian Bay, and the other at Coteau Landing.

Mr. EDWARDS. No, in the United States.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Its Canadian terminus, I mean. I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) has stated very clearly that the amendment does not imply a want of confidence in the government so far as our railway policy is concerned ; and therefore I would ask him not to insist on his motion. There is no use of placing the House in a false position by having a vote on the motion under these circumstances.

Well, Sir, how could this government prevent Mr. Webb and his associates acquiring the majority of the stock of the Canada Atlantic Railway held by Mr. Booth ? Perhaps it would have been possible for the Canadian government to have bought that stock. I suppose the Canada Atlantic Railway has cost in the neighbourhood of $15,000,000 ; I cannot say exactly what it has cost. We have contributed to it $2,000,000 or thereabouts if I remember rightly. That road is not completed ; it has not reached the city of Montreal. As I said a moment ago, its terminus on Canadian soil is at Coteau Landing, where Mr. Booth has been obliged to build an elevator and establish a line of boats to take his trade to the port of Montreal. Mr. Booth is a large owner of mills, and he has used his road largely in the interest of his own trade and his own mills, not only in this country but on the other side of the line—because, it may not be generally known, Mr. Booth has large mill property at Burlington.

In connection with his railway Mr. Booth has established a fleet of steamers on the lakes. So far he has not done a very large trade in Canadian grain ; he has specially dealt in American grain and other products. He has succeeded in establishing an international trade. He is carrying American products from Chicago, Milwaukee and Duluth, not only to the port of Montreal, but to Boston. Now, Mr. Speaker, what member of this House holding a responsible position would say that the Canadian government could carry on a fleet of steamers on the lakes and work up a trade with American products? It is not possible; it is out of the question. I have been five and a half years a minister of the Crown, and I know how difficult it is for a man, whatever his power or his ability may be, to decide matters which have to be decided on the spur of the moment. A minister of the Crown cannot take action unless his proposed action has been discussed and agreed to beforehand. How could this government undertake to compete with great American railways ? My hon. friend who was formerly Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) knows that when he was in office he could not have acted in any such way.

I am very sorry to disagree with some of my friends by saying that I do not welcome as much as others the purchase of Canadian railways by American capital. But how could we help ourselves ? This is the question. I would rather see Mr. Booth keep possession of his road and complete it to the port of Montreal ; but Mr. Booth has not done so. I am free to say that he has carried a very heavy load for one man. Mr. Booth has invested a large sum of money. He is a man of enterprise. I venture to say he has invested the last dollar he has.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is right.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We could not ask him to do more. The Canadian government could not buy that road. The Canadian parliament would not have approved of our doing so. Now, was there anything else we could have done ? My hon. friend suggested a moment ago a guarantee of the bonds.

Mr. BOURASSA. If my hon. friend will allow me, I have not suggested anything. I have simply spoken of the system that exists in France. All I have suggested is the appointment of a parliamentary committee.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite understand that. I fully agree that the question is of such importance that we must consider it. But at the same time, having given some attention to the transportation question, I say that the Canadian nation has no reason whatever for alarm if only we are true to ourselves. The railways are not the only means of communication throughout this vast Dominion. We have our waterways, and I hope this parliament will make up its mind never to give up the absolute right of control over our waterways. American capital can buy the Canada Atlantic Railway ; American capital may perhaps one day try to buy the Canadian Pacific Railway; but American capital cannot buy the St. Lawrence River. American capital cannot buy our national heritage on the great lakes. It cannot buy the French River route, a map of which I have placed on the table. Of course, if we should hand over our waterways to private individuals, then American capitalists might buy the whole thing, and on that point I feel just as strongly as my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa).

I have just mentioned the French river route. This may not be the proper occasion to say much about that route, but it forms, in my humble opinion, such an important part of our national transportation problem, that I would crave the indulgence of the House while I briefly refer to it. Suppose that to-morrow the Canada Atlantic Railway should be purchased by Mr. Webb and his associates, what would they do with it ? Nobody knows. But no doubt if we equip the ports of Montreal and Quebec properly,

these gentlemen may find it advantageous to send their trade by the Canadian route. That trade has no patriotism is a well known axiom, but nevertheless I agree with my hon. friend that if Mr. Webb and his associates are acting for the New York Central, it is not impossible that they may try to arrange a pool by which the New York route may be benefited at the expense of Montreal. However, the Canada Atlantic Railway is only one route and it has no western connections, which is another reason why it would have been unwise for this government to think of purchasing it. The Canada Atlantic is a mere summer road, and of course a local road, without any western connection whatever, whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway is a through Canadian road. I have heard people say that the Canadian Pacific Railway shares are not all held by Canadians. No doubt thousands of these shares are held in France, Germany, Belgium and elsewhere as well as in Canada. But it would be impossible for Mr. Hill and Mr. Morgan and others to buy Canadian Pacific Railway stock to such an extent as to control the road without the Canadian Pacific Railway directors' knowledge. That is out of the question. I was lectured by a Liberal paper, because, a few days ago, in Montreal, I ventured to say that perhaps the day might come when the Canadian government would be placed in the position of having to do what the English government did with the Suez Canal. I hope that day will never come. But speaking for myself I do not hesitate to say that if we ever should discover that Mr. Hill and Mr. Morgan and other American capitalists were taking hold of the Canadian Pacific Railway, our parliament would rise to the occasion and see that sufficient stock was bought by this very government to prevent such a deal. The Canadian nation cannot forget that we have invested both in money and lands $100,000,000 in the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, the Canadian Pacific Railway is so located that it will necessarily always be a Canadian railway. Well, in connection with that French river project, I say that with a very small expenditure of money we could easily, within two years give a navigable channel twenty feet deep from Georgian Bay to Lake Nipissing. The distance is only sixty-one miles and the elevation to overcome is only sixty-two feet. I have a complete plan of the work which it would be necessary to carry out in order to give twenty feet depth of navigation. When you have reached Lake Nipissing, you are only 360 miles from Montreal and 290 miles from Toronto. The Grand Trunk Railway is located on the south side of the lake at Callander, while the Canadian Pacific Railway is on the north side at North Bay. It has been said that, in taking the deep interest I do in that waterway, I am acting for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, I am an upholder of the Canadian Pacific Railway because it is a Canadian railway under our control, and because it is a great trans-continental railway, fighting for the trans-continental trade, against five or six powerful American corporations. The Canadian Pacific Railway will undoubtedly benefit by the deepening of the French river, but how much more would the Canadian farmers benefit? I say without hesitation that in one year the farmers of the North-west would benefit to the extent of a couple of million dollars by the deepening of that river. The province of Ontario has a very deep interest in this project. We must not forget that Toronto is a great manufacturing centre, and is connected by the Grand Trunk with Lake Nipissing.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the size of the locks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Three locks would do the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the capacity of the boats that will go through them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that boats carrying 200,000 bushels of grain could navigate that highway. It is, a very deep river indeed—not a small stream but a powerful stream—100 feet deep and fifty deep, and there are only a few obstacles to overcome. There is no engineering difficulty. Between Montreal and North Bay the distance is 364 miles. Between Buffalo and New York by rail the distance is 445 miles. Or in round numbers we have about 350 miles in favour of the Canadian route.

I am told that this French river scheme would kill our canals. Well, we have this year, according to the figures given yesterday before the Winnipeg Board of Trade, in Manitoba and the North-west 65,000,000 bushels of wheat. We have only about nine or ten weeks during the fall to move our Canadian crop. How many boats would it take to carry 25,000,000 bushels of grain by the French river route. It would take a fleet of about twenty boats with a capacity of about 200,000 bushels each. Suppose that we have this year, as I said, 65,000,000 bushels of wheat, how much more may we expect to see growing in our North-west Territories within the next five or ten years ? If our expectations are realized, if our hopes are not deceived, people will settle there in large numbers. If that is so, Sir, we are not going beyond our depth in expressing the hope, the confident hope, that within ten years, we shall have a crop of 200,000,000 bushels of wheat there. As my hon. friend reminds me, Sir Charles Tupper made that prophecy a few years ago. His prophecy has not materialized up to this date. But, this year, we had 100,000,000 bushels of grain, of which 65,000,000 was wheat. I think I am not making a prophecy that will not materialize when I say that it is possible, not only possible, but it is to be expected, that within five or

ten years, we shall have a crop of at least 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in our Northwest. I have estimated that it would require a fleet of twenty boats, carrying 200,000 bushels each to move a crop of 25,000,000 bushels by the French river route. This is on the basis of each boat making a trip a week. There would be plenty of trade left for our Canadian system of canals. I read in the Kingston 'News' a day or two ago that I was going to destroy that city if this French river scheme went through. Sir, there will be plenty of trade for the Canadian canal and for the French river route as well; there will be plenty of trade for all the ports and harbours on the lakes. That trade is going to-day to American ports—that cannot be denied. Perhaps that trade will go more and more to American ports if more Canadian railways fall into American hands. But, as I said at the opening of my remarks, the St. Lawrence river is our national property; and the Ottawa river and the French river are great national properties. When I speak of the project of improving the French river, I mean to convey the idea that it would be the beginning of that great national scheme of deepening the Ottawa river to connect it with the St. Lawrence river at Montreal. But that project would involve such a large expenditure of money that for to-day, I confine myself to the improvement of the French river. I have no data yet of the probable cost of the whole project from Georgian bay to Montreal. I am told that it is estimated to cost in the neighbourhood of one hundred millions. The Canadian government, the Canadian parliament, will not undertake such a vast expenditure of money now. But I think I am within reason, and I think I express the feeling of the large portion of the thinking business men of this country, when I speak as I do of the improvement of the French river. Of course, it must be well understood that I do not intend in any way to pledge the government to any project of that kind now. I am simply expressing the view that, as a member of the House, and even as a minister, I think I have a right to express.

Mr. CLARKE. If I may ask the minister a question I would like to ask if we are to understand him to say that, in the remarks he has just made, he does not pledge himself or the government to ask an appropriation this session to go on with the improvement of which he has just spoken.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no authority to pledge the House or my colleagues to an expenditure of that kind. I am dealing with the great transportation question and calling attention of the House and the country——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You are educating the government.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps not my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria), but some men who have less time than some of the rest of us have——

Mr. CLARKE. May I be allowed to ask another question before I forget it? I am sure we are deeply indebted to the hon. minister for the information he has given us about the French river route and the advantages to be obtained from the improvements he suggests. I would like to know what is the distance from the termini of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway to that particular part of the Georgian bay into which the French river empties?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a very small distance indeed. My hon. friend has only to look at the map on the table to see that. The Grand Trunk Railway is located at Calander, on the south side, and the Canadian Pacific Railway at North Bay on the other side. The distance is about three miles, and the two railways are, to-day, actually connected.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the distance from where the two railways meet to the point on the Georgian bay at which the French river empties?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The distance between Lake Nipissing and the Georgian bay is 61 miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Sixty-seven.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Sixty-one miles, navigable water nearly the whole way. The whole course of the river is nicely navigable, if I may speak that way. It is a very deep waterway indeed.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the hon. minister given us information or can he give us the information, as to whether there are any insuperable engineering difficulties in the way of having the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway build branch lines down that sixty-one miles to the great open water of Georgian bay, instead of committing the people of Canada to a large expenditure to improve the waterway of the French river?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not mean to say that I intend in any way to pledge the government to build a waterway. But I say, without any hesitation, that there are great engineering difficulties. But my hon. friend must not forget one thing—that large boats always seek to penetrate inland as far as they can. That is a law with which everybody is familar.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. minister be good enough to tell us how much nearer he brings navigation to Montreal than at the point where the railways strike the Georgian bay—how much nearer the navigation to Montreal would be than the

points the railways are on the Georgian bay and Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just stated that, between Montreal and North Bay the distance is 364 miles as against 445 miles between Buffalo and New York.

Mr. SPROULE. But what is the distance between Parry Sound and Montreal, and Midland and Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The distance is about the same.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, you do not make much by the change.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) must not forget that Midland is a port reached by the Grand Trunk Railway, and that nearly all the Grand Trunk Railway freight from Midland to-day goes to American ports.

Mr. CLARKE. How about Owen Sound ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a point a great deal further from Montreal, and, moreover, between North Bay and Montreal, the railway goes on a down grade. It is very difficult to-day for the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry grain, indeed almost impossible, because of the location of the railway. Now I ask the House not to lose sight of this fact, that up to this date, in spite of the fact that we have invested one hundred million dollars in the Canadian Pacific Railway, nearly all our Canadian crops are shipped through American ports. That fact cannot be disputed. There is a reason for it, and it is this: The Canadian Pacific Railway is located in such a way that it is too expensive to carry grain by rail from one point to another, in competition with American roads. I will say no more on this point.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the minister leaves that point, I would like to ask him a question. Boats carrying 200,000 bushels, which would be boats about 450 feet in length, would they go up to North Bay docks and Calander docks, or would they simply go to the west end of Lake Nipissing, and what would be the depth of water to be found in Lake Nipissing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is deep water in the middle of Lake Nipissing. It would be necessary of course, to build accommodation there, as everywhere else. Now, Mr. Speaker, I see the difficulty. Every local interest and every harbour which thinks it might be hurt by that great national highway, rises up and says: Don't make that great improvement, but continue on in the old way, and let American boats take our Canadian trade. That is the whole difficulty in a few words. Well, Sir, we have reached Montreal. A great deal has been said about the port of Montreal lately. I am very sorry that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is not in his seat. He told us a day or two ago that we are wasting our time in Montreal, especially.

Mr. KEMP. With the permission of the Minister of Public Works may I ask him just one question ? It has been stated that the mouth of the French river on the Georgian Bay is sixty miles from North Bay. May I inquire from the Minister of Public Works how many miles from the mouth of the French river on the Georgian Bay is the Soo line of the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot answer that question at the moment. The figures could easily be made out, but I have not got them under my hand.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). May I ask the hon. minister a question ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I cannot allow any more interruptions on questions of detail, but I will be glad to answer any general question. A good deal has been said about the port of Montreal. Perhaps too much discussion has taken place, but I could not help it. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier said that we have lost a year in building elevators in Montreal. Now that the attention of the House has been called to that question, I will be glad to take the House into my confidence. I may say at the outset that no time has been lost at all. Last year parliament voted $1,000,000 for the equipment of a port at Montreal and to build elevators and so on. The harbour commissioners who were charged with the disposition of that money, subject of course to the approval of the government, did not ask for tenders before the month of September last. It would have been impossible for any contractor to lay down foundations in Montreal during the fall. Tenders were asked, but no specifications or plans had been prepared. Mr. Kennedy, the chief engineer of the harbour commissioners, had only prepared what he styled a statement of the requirements, showing in general terms that the harbour commissioners wanted an elevator with a capacity of 1,000,000 bushels. Five tenders were sent in, Every contractor sent in his tender according to his own plan. There was consequently no lowest and no highest tenderer, every one, as I said, tendered on his own plan. Among the tenders sent in was one from Mr. Jamieson. When the plans were presented for my approval I noticed at once that the last sentence of Mr. Kennedy's recommendation of acceptance to the harbour commissioners, mentioned a test of the strength of the whole structure. Now, Mr. Speaker, the plans were subject to my approval. I had been entrusted by this parliament with the duty of carefully expend-

ing $1,000,000. In what position would I have been if I had blindly put my initials to such a qualified acceptance subject to a test of the strength of the whole structure ? I did what any other business man in this House, worthy of the name, would have done. I submitted the question of the strength of the structure to engineers. I chose two engineers of the Department of Public Works. I applied for advice to Mr. Vautelet, assistant engineer to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I may say that the reason I applied to him was because Mr. Vautelet is an expert in iron. He has studied in France, he was employed by the Canadian Pacific Railway, I may say, ten years ago. He is a Canadian, and one of the ablest men I know. Indeed he has prepared nearly all the plans for bridges in my department during the last ten years. The preparation of plans of iron bridges is a specialty with him, and I applied to him for advice. A test was made, and it was found that the structure was altogether deficient. I may say here to those who have experience that they made the concrete columns carry 86 tons per cubic foot, whereas concrete cannot carry more than 15 tons. Well, I could not approve of those plans. I have nothing against Mr. Jamieson whatever, very far from it. I would have only been too glad to give him, as a Canadian, my approval of his plans. Now the bins were of a new kind altogether. They were to be of corrugated iron instead of being flat sheets. In the United States there is only one elevator built with square bins, all the others in the United States are round bin elevators.

I would not venture to say that square bin elevators are no good, but there is one which has been built by Mr. Hill. Mr. Hill has able engineers at his command. All the same, Sir, his elevator is so weak, or deficient, that at this very moment engineers are engaged in the task of strengthening it. Instead of using riveting in his plan, Mr. Jamieson was using slids. Corrugated iron was too weak. Mr. Jamieson recognized that it was necessary to change his plans. He is now preparing new plans and if they agree with recognized principles I will be only too glad to say amen. I have nothing to say against the harbour commissioners, but I must call the attention of the House and the country to the state of affairs that has lasted so long in Montreal. I see in front of me hon. gentlemen who have been members of governments in the past. They know very well that they could never agree with the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. I am not the first minister of the Crown who has not been able to agree all the time with them. The great difficulty is that there are eleven of them. In the government we are eleven or twelve, but we have the same interest in view. We are representing the same interest, the interest of the country. Now, the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal are divided into groups representing different interests. You see, for instance, the shipping interest. The shipping interest has been representing so far all the lines of steamers. For the last fifteen years they have been discussing improvement. They had done nothing until we took office. Why was it ? I will say it ; because some of the old lines had every possible interest in not having competition. They did not want improvement. They had the port of Montreal for themselves alone. Well, representing the government of the country for the time being, I made up my mind that I would not be ruled by private interests. I had a great deal of trouble. It will come out all right because the country cannot fail to understand that this government has no personal interest in the matter. What did I receive a few days ago ? A public document from the shipping companies in Montreal in which they asked us to give exclusively to the lines that are coming to the port now the right to all the wharfs that are built in Montreal at the present time. They are coolly asking us to do that, to exclude tramp boats and every other boat that will be coming to Montreal. Some of the very same men a couple of years ago were denouncing, and are still denouncing, me because I have obtained from the House and from my colleagues money to carry out improvements in another part of the port of Montreal. They would take all the existing wharfs, all the wharfs that we are building now and they would exclude everybody else. They do not recognize that this country is going on. They decline to agree that they are not the only people living in the country and having interests in it. I do not blame them but I am obliged not to agree with them. Well, Sir, the port of Montreal is being equipped. The St. Lawrence river is being deepened and widened. I have said elsewhere and I say here again, that within two years there will be thirty feet of water between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the port of Montreal. Between Quebec and Montreal there are about fifty miles of dredging to be done. There are 18 miles of this 50 which we have dredged now. With the powerful dredge that has been built in Toronto it will take about two years to dredge Lake St. Peter to a depth of thirty feet and to a width of 500 feet, and there will then remain only 14 or 15 miles to complete that great national waterway between Quebec and Montreal. I say without hesitation that the ports of Montreal, Three Rivers and Quebec should be equipped without any delay if we want to take advantage of the immense trade that is in store for us. I know that perhaps it will be said that it will involve a large expenditure of money. I do not say no. I do not say that parliament is bound to go on without any delay whatever with these large improvements, but when I call the attention

of the House and the country to these improvements it is in answer to those who despair of the future. I do not cheer too much when I see Canadian railways falling into the hands of American capitalists, but I say that our waterways are of such importance, are such a guarantee that after all we have not much to fear. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has said that his motto is 'Canada for the Canadians'. He does not want the terminals of our great waterways and railways to fall into the hands of foreigners. Well, there is a way of keeping our national highways. It is to equip them ourselves and we are doing it and doing it rapidly too. We are equipping harbours on the great lakes, we are equipping Owen Sound, Midland, Depot Harbour, Collingwood, Meaford and the harbour of Port Colborne. Now, Sir, I ask once more, how can we expect trade to come to the Welland canal and to the Canadian system of canals when we remember that at Port Colborne, at the entrance of our Canadian sytem of canals, we have not the shadow of a harbour ? It is not creditable but it is true. There is Buffalo on the south side with its magnificent harbour works, with its fifty elevators, and twenty miles on the north side of Lake Erie is Port Colborne, the entrance to the most superb system of canals in the world, with no habour accommodation, and without any place for a ship to anchor in. How, under these circumstances can we expect trade to come to the Canadian system of canals? We are now equipping Port Colborne. Harbour works are now going on both in my department and in the Department of Railways and Canals. They will cost money but they will bring trade to the Canadian nation. In connection with our equipment on the lakes, will you permit me to say that the last century has been as this century is a century of equipment and organization. If a manufacturer wants to secure trade and to produce cheaply he equips himself in the best way possible. The nations to-day are great shops if I may speak in that way. We have such magnificent possibilities in this country that, if you will permit me to use a vulgar expression, we must equip our shop.

Amongst that equipment is included the harbour improvements, and the possession of Canadian bottoms on the great lakes. We have not to-day enough Canadian vessels on our inland waters to meet the requirements of the work we are carrying out, but thanks to the hopeful feeling which is prevailing over the land, new ships are being built every day. As to harbour improvements, look at what has taken place at Collingwood. The harbour was not deep enough and the government made it deeper, and the result has been the building of a large shipyard at Collingwood. There are two splendid shipyards in Toronto. We are building ships and I hope we will build more. I have on many occasions expressed the idea that perhaps if I were simply a member of parliament I might speak more freely. Nevertheless I fell confident that when a minister expresses his views on broad questions, he does not bind his colleagues in any way. May I be allowed to express the idea that perhaps it would be a good Canadian national policy to manage our affairs in such a way that we would have more Canadian ships built immediately. We have been giving bonuses to iron industries, and as a result we have splendid iron foundries.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we see great industries growing up on Canadian territory. We have the raw material to build the ships ; we have the men to build the ships ; we have the ability to build the ships and why should we not try our hands at it. I feel more Canadian every day that I know my country better.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I repeat that the more I know my country the more I love Canada and the more confidence I have in our future. Is it not a fact that very few Canadians know Canada thoroughly. We have travelled in Germany, in France and in England, but there are many able men even in this parliament who have never paid a visit to the Georgian Bay.

Mr. COCHRANE. We have no special cars to travel around in.

Mr. McISAAC. You have passes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Private cars form a necessary part of the equipment of any minister who wants to work. I would rather travel in an ordinary car any day of my life than travel in the modest private car I have and which does not cost anything to this country of ours. I repeat that we do not know this country as we should. If members of parliament, if members of the press, if our manufacturers and business men knew Canada better they would do more to develop it. We have the resources and I say we have the money. We have plenty of it, and we are having more and more every day since this country has been governed as it is at present. I do not know what the feeling of the House is, but I feel confident that on both sides there is a unanimity of opinion that the time has come when we must face the music. Our American neighbours are making very great efforts indeed to capture the trade of this continent. They have formed wonderful combines in railways and in industries in general. They are forming combines on the high seas, and if we in Canada do not move on and improve our waterways and our railways, we will be simply licked out of our boots. When trade has

taken certain channels it is very difficult indeed to divert it from those channels and it should be our aim to keep all the trade we have and seek for more.

My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has alluded to the coming visit of the Prime Minister to England, and he has expressed the hope that he will be informed of the object of that visit. Well, I think we know all about it. The Prime Minister has been invited to the Coronation of the King. I am not too strong an Imperialist. I am a loyal citizen but I do not desire any change in the condition of this country. We are a very happy people, I think. We have only to agree between ourselves, French Canadians, English Canadians and Irish Canadians to get along very nicely. We are happy as we are and I think there are not many people who believe that the Prime Minister and his colleagues who will go with him to England will change the constitution of this country. We will remain as we are, happy to form part of the British empire and a great empire it is. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) has expressed the opinion of the French Canadians when he said that we were as strongly against annexation as it is possible to be. The French Canadians are not so foolish as not to understand that they are better off to-day than they would be in that great American Republic, and what I say of the French Canadians applies to the English Canadians. We are better off as we are; let us stay as we are. We know where we are now, but we do not know where we would be on the other side of the line. The Prime Minister will represent this country at the Coronation with the same dignity and honour as on former occasions, and my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) may rest assured that the presence of the right hon. gentleman will not be fraught with any danger to Canada. The government is doing their duty towards themselves and towards the empire in attending the Coronation ceremonies. I, for one, am strongly in favour of the British tie. I do not know what Providence has in store for this young Canadian nation. We are ambitious, but we are better to-day under the protection of the British flag than we would be even if we were independent. I am sure that the House is greatly indebted to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) for having brought up this question and before taking my seat I will ask him again, whether he thinks there will be any good object attained by pressing this motion. His desire has simply been to call the attention of the House to a large and important question. Having done so, I again ask him whether it would not be wise for him to withdraw his motion.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I want to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he will supply the members of the House with paper copies of this map, and also with tables of the distances, and such information as will be necessary to enable them to give an intelligent and broad discussion of this scheme when it comes before parliament?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that two maps have been prepared under my care. One of them has been distributed already to a certain number of members of the House. To-morrow morning I hope to be able to have another supply of them, and in a day or two we shall have one hundred copies of them on canvas for distribution among the members. The hon. gentleman will find on that map all the tables of distances he desires to have.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I am aware that in the discussion on the address the widest possible latitude is allowed to speakers. They can speak on anything, even on subjects, such as transportation and education, which may not be referred to in the address at all; and we had a dissertation on the loyalty of my hon. friend opposite and his friends in lower Canada. It is not my intention to say anything in reference to the address. I do not know but that I might be restricted by you, Mr. Speaker, to the amendment which is at present being discussed.

I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I expected him to state some grievances at present existing in the country which required to be remedied, and to state the remedy he proposed for them. If I understand the object of his amendment, it is that in view of the large expenditure which has been incurred in this country from time to time on railway enterprises, some policy should be stated by the government in reference to those railways. I do not know what policy they could state. Is it a policy of assumption of the railways, as the hon. member hinted?—because he remarked that government ownership of railways existed in France and some other countries. If he was prepared for government ownership, then he ought to state the reasons why the railways should be taken out of the hands they are in at present, and placed in the hands of the government. Towards the close of his speech, without stating any particular grievance that he had against the railways at present, or any particular objection to any of our railways passing into the hands of foreign corporations, I understood him to suggest that a commission should be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the state of our railways at present and what arrangements ought probably to be made by the government in reference to them? Now, I may state that the railways of this country are under government control—that the government can legislate in any direction it pleases in reference to them. The railway system

which we have at present in this country is partly a government system; and if any fault is to be found with the railroads or their rates, the charge may be reasonably made against the government of the country that the management of these railways is not what it ought to be. I am aware that under the contract we have made with the Canadian Pacific Railway that railway is perhaps removed from that category; but with regard to our railways generally, Canada is in the same position as England. We have provided in the charters which we have granted to some railway companies, notably the Grand Trunk Railway, the means and the amount we have to pay if it should be necessary at any time to assume ownership of them. We can at any time assume them and regulate the rates, or do anything we like with reference to them. The danger seems to be that these roads which have been built for the development of this country may pass under foreign control.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I think he stated just now that in the charter granted to the Grand Trunk Railway Company there was contained power to repurchase.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, it decides the manner in which we can assume the road.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am rather inclined to think that was abrogated afterwards.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, it is in the Grand Trunk charter now, and it only follows the English charters.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But the hon. gentleman will remember that a great many alterations were made in that, and I think that at the time the company issued the subsequent portion of its bonds, that particular provision was abrogated.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. At any rate, the British North America Act gives us power at any time to take possession of the road, even if it is not provided in the charter. The danger at the present moment arises from some foreign corporation getting control of a railway in this country and using it, not for the benefit of this country, but for foreign purposes—notably the Canada Atlantic Railway, which is alleged to have been purchased by the New York Central. It is impossible to prevent people in any country from taking stock in an enterprise in any other country. It would be contrary to the policy of this country or of any other country to prevent foreigners taking stock in any enterprises whatever. What we have to do is to maintain control over the corporations themselves, and to see that no corporation which has its initiation or entity in a foreign country comes in and obtains control over franchises in this country. I tried to guard against that while I was Minister of Railways; and when the present Minister of Railways introduced a bill nominally in the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway, but in reality for the purpose of giving the Vermont Central Railway Company, a foreign corporation virtually owned by the Grand Trunk, but deriving its entity and powers from a foreign country, possession of a railway in this country, I pointed out to him the danger. I pointed out the same danger in the case of a foreign railway company obtaining control of the international bridge near Buffalo. The invariable answer to me was that they come under our Railway Act and under the power we have from time to time to alter our law in reference to railways. We cannot do that where a foreign corporation, perhaps backed up by the government of a foreign country, alleges that we are interfering unnecessarily with the working of the road, or with its earnings, or perhaps sequestrating its property. It could say to us, these people in good faith, under corporate powers, obtained possession of a railway in your country, and you must act in good faith towards that corporation in any legislation you adopt with reference to it.

The giving of corporate powers to foreigners will have the same effect as follows the granting in China or Asia Minor or other countries of concessions to foreigners. It enables these people to appeal to their own government to see that the rights granted to them are respected. But if we only give these franchises to corporations of our own creation, we can legislate regarding these corporations in any direction we like in the interests of the people. I do not see any danger or menace at present in the acquiring by any foreign corporation of any railway in this country, but if the necessity should ever arise, we can always legislate to compel railway companies to carry freight on the same terms for the people of this country as for the people of any other country. We can say to them: If you carry freight from Chicago to the seaboard and use for that purpose railways we have subsidized, you must not discriminate against the products of the people of this country.

Mr. MACLEAN. Why do we not do that now?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there any thing shown to-day which renders this necessary? It is time enough to do this when circumstances arise that require it, when there is a necessity for it. But no such necessity exists to-day.

As the hon. the Minister of Public Works says, a considerable portion of our products are shipped from a foreign country. What

we require to do is to develop our national resources, utilize the waterways which Providence has given us, and then we need not fear competition from any other country in the world.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And I am glad to see the Minister of Public Works take the stand he does. I intend later on speaking more freely upon this subject; but with reference to the building of this waterway to Lake Nipissing, I understand that the hon. minister intends to go on with this work if he can persuade his colleagues to support him. He is perhaps only feeling the opinion of the House to-day and he certainly will have my support in this undertaking. I spoke fully upon the subject last session and am fully committed to it. I welcome this suggestion of the hon. minister as the entering wedge of a scheme which I fairly believe will do more for the development of this country than any other I have heard broached during the past twenty years. And I will be glad if the Minister of Public Works has sufficient influence on his colleagues to have that portion from Georgian Bay to North Bay completed of what I call the Georgian Bay canal. When you have it built to Georgian Bay, the rest will soon follow. The interests of the people of this country, the development of our immense resources, will compel, no matter what government is in office, to finish the work from Lake Nipissing down to Montreal. I believe that this is a most magnificent scheme, the initiation of which is proposed by the Minister of Public Works. What the hon. minister proposes is only the initiation of the main scheme. What he proposes is the building of that small portion, sixty-two miles from Georgian Bay to Lake Nipissing, with a lift of sixty-one feet. That ought to cost—

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Inside of $5,000,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.—It will not cost that. It ought to be built for about $3,000,000. And I congratulate the hon. gentleman on having the boldness to state his views. I think we might take his speech almost as a ministerial announcement that if the feeling of the House is at all favourable, the hon. minister will have his way and that portion will be built. I congratulate the hon. minister upon his support of an enterprise which I believe will be of greater benefit to the country than anything else we can at present think of.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I rose to speak this afternoon as you left the Chair. I rose with the belief that the subject before the House was exhausted, and it was about time this debate was brought to a close, so far as the hon. members on either side in this House were concerned. But, knowing that there are a large number of independent men in the House on both sides, I consider it my duty to speak for them. Hon. members on this side who have discussed the King's speech, complained of the meagerness and smallness of the programme. Of course, when one has nothing to say, and not much time to say it in, you do not expect much from him. I suppose that is why the King thought proper to say so little in his speech. It seems that there is not much to do this session, so we could not expect the government to put forward a very long programme. I am sorry the Prime Minister is not in his place——

Mr. MACLEAN. Move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I am not like the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean)—I have no advice to give the Prime Minister. But I wish to say, that if the bill of fare is very small, possibly there is a reason for it. I remember reading a speech made by the Prime Minister at the Industrial exhibition at Toronto. If he is rightly reported, the right hon. gentleman stated that he himself had become a Conservative. I am not exactly certain whether that is so or not. He further said that he did not consider that a great deal of reform is now necessary in this country, the reforms that were necessary having been brought about. If that be so, the present government have accomplished wonders, in five or six years, because when they sat on this side of the House, everything was wrong. I am about as well pleased if the Prime Minister did turn Conservative. I know from experience that, as people grow older they grow more Conservative in their ideas. Some of you Radicals well know that if you had been able to carry out the ideas you had in your youth, dire calamity would have followed. So I can well understand that the Prime Minister could see that, if he had carried out some of his ideas it would have been a sorry thing for Canada. But when the right hon. gentleman says that there is little more to reform, I take issue with him. I know well that when the members of the government sat on this side of the House, they agitated for reforms that have not been carried out—and, what is more, they have made no attempt to carry them out. Why, according to these hon. gentlemen the Senate was in such terrible state that it needed reforming, if not abolishment. But now we find that some of the men who pronounced the Senate a set of old grannies of no earthly use are breaking their necks, almost, to secure appointment as members

of the Senate. Then, we know that taxation in this country is not what it ought to be. We know that a comparatively poor man, for instance, a farmer or a labouring man with a large family, must buy a considerable quantity of dutiable goods and so may be compelled to contribute more to the revenue than many another man who is a millionaire. Some steps should be taken by this government who profess to be reformers to mend this matter. And it seems to me that it would be easy to do it.

Mr. ROSS (Victoria). How ?

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I am satisfied that there is not a gentleman in this House but has been properly brought up; and any gentleman who has been properly brought up will keep quiet till I am through. I do not intend to discuss the amendment before the House, because, if I did, I might do as some of those who have discussed it this afternoon have done, even the mover—I might wander all over creation and finish up in the Georgian Bay canal. Referring to the first paragraph of the speech, the government may well be thankful to Providence for the bounties showered upon the country. I suppose the government will hardly claim credit for the great crop in the North-west, if they do, they might as well take the responsibility for the Chinch bug, the Hessian fly and the failure of the pollen of the apple trees to be so distributed as to assure a crop. We are all thankful to Providence, but, so far as the Speech from the Throne is concerned, the government might as well have left that paragraph out. What the government should do is to stimulate every man to industry, for it is the industrious man, the tiller of the soil, the man at the anvil and other toilers who build up a country—not the government. Governments can do but little. Of course, they can make some men rich, as they are doing; and they can make a great many of us poor by over taxation and by not distributing taxation in the proper way. However, I suppose we shall be able to discuss that subject during the Budget debate. The next paragraph is in regard to the visit of the present Prince and Princess of Wales, then the Duke and Duchess of York. I had the honour to ask the Prime Minister last spring if a programme would be prepared so that we working people might know where to meet our Royal visitors. We met them at different points of the Dominion, and I was proud to see the grand reception accorded them by the people, a reception that will redound to our credit throughout the British Empire, as their visit will assist us in many ways, and not least by helping to build up the country and add to its wealth. The next paragraph tells us of the assassination of President Lincoln——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Well, we always allow an Irishman to speak twice. Unfortunately for me in this case I am not an Irishman. I have had the pleasure of shaking hands with Mr. McKinley ; perhaps some of you who have had that honour did not confer any credit on Mr. McKinley. However, that was just a slip of the tongue—you all know who I mean. Now there is not a person in the Dominion of Canada who did not deplore that act. I am sure that anything this government could do, anything the people of Canada could do, to prevent anything like that occurring again, they would be only too pleased to do it. I think, perhaps, it will not only be a warning to us but it will be a warning to all civilized people to look more closely after men who are disposed to do such things.

The next paragraph, I see, deals with the census. Now I am sorry there are not some other members of the Cabinet in their seats because I would like to speak about them. I don't think the country will believe some of the bachelors in the Cabinet when they complain so much that Canada is not more populous than it is. There are some others besides bachelors in the Cabinet and in the House too, who perhaps don't like that very well. At the same time I think one good, first class, home-bred well bred Canadian, is worth half a dozen Doukhobors or Galicians. I think there are people who are not discharging their duty to the country as they should, they are not doing what they ought for this Canada of ours. Now that may be a subject some of you do not approve of, but it is the basis of our prosperity ; if not, why do we wail so much at the poor showing of our census ?

The next paragraph is in regard to Mr. Marconi. It is not necessary for me to say anything about the great Italian who is about to send messages through the air and talk between Great Britain and Canada without any wires. I think the government was justified in encouraging Mr. Marconi and every other man of talents and abilities to come to Canada. Therefore I think the government is justified in doing their utmost in giving him encouragement.

The next paragraph is in regard to exhibitions. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture is not in his place. But I can talk to him another day. The Minister of Agriculture and I ought to be particular friends, because we are working at the same job. I did not have the pleasure of visiting the Glasgow exhibition, nor the Paris exhibition ; but I had the pleasure of going to the Pan-American on two occasions. I was very much pleased with the exhibit Canada made there ; in fact in every department in which this country took part, she did so with credit to herself. I was much pleased with the Canadian exhibit, in fact every exhibit sent from the Dominion was a credit to us. I had the honour of speaking

at that exhibition before 3,000 people, and you may be sure that I held up the Canadian end of the argument, and a number of Americans there who were quite qualified to judge of these matters said they had no idea that Canada could produce any such thing. One gentleman on the grounds told me that he wondered how it was I had come all the way from Canada to the Pan-American, and I told him that I could almost throw a stone from there into our country. He seemed quite surprised. So you see I was not the only ignoramus who was there. I told them that I would never suspect I had not a Canadian audience before me when I saw the well dressed people and their good behaviour I was pretty sure that I had a Canadian audience before me. But when I told them that in Ontario, in Upper Canada, as it was then, when the first legislature met within 30 miles of where we were standing, the first law that was placed on the statute-book by that legislature was that no man should be permitted to own another man, then I got no cheers there, nor here either. But they did not see the point, and you do not. It took them a hundred years to reach the point that our forefathers reached at Newark. So you see Canada has always been in the vanguard of civilization, of liberty, of freedom and of justice. Now, Sir, I think that is enough. I could go on and tell you of many other things I said that might redound to my credit at that Pan-American, but I think that is enough.

Next, in regard to the revenue of this country. I am sure that every man on this side of the House and on the other side are only too pleased to learn that this country is prosperous. When the revenue is not raised from the proper sources then we have a right to complain. It is easy enough for this government to raise a revenue if they please, if they put the taxes high enough they can raise a high revenue. But the people of this country should not be taxed to death. The government should be economical in the management of this country, and take the taxes off the people as much as possible. So we need not boast so much about revenue, because it is easy for this government to raise a revenue. If I was Prime Minister of this country and had a large following at my back, if I had a large brute majority behind me, I could do as I pleased. I could get the revenue from whatever source I pleased. What I want is that the revenue shall be derived from the proper source. The next subject dealt with in the Speech from the Throne is the increase of market facilities. I am sure that on both sides of the House we are only too pleased to learn that we have established markets all over the civilized world where Canadian products are used. What we want is an open market. There is one little kingdom that is always ready to grant us an open market for everything we produce in Canada ; yet some hon. gentleman over here do not appreciate it. If I were asked to give the government advice like my hon. friend for East York (Mr. Maclean) I would give it different advice from that which the hon. gentleman gives it. I should ask the Prime Minister to take 40 per cent off the tariff on English goods instead of the 33⅓ per cent now allowed. I should also ask him to endeavour to have the embargo removed from our cattle. That is about the only embargo that we now have against our exports to Great Britain. I think that the proposition to send fast vessels to Europe and to Great Britain, if carried out, will be of very great assistance to us and I take issue with some of those hon. gentlemen who have argued here to-day that it would be an injury to Canada to have a fast steamship line runinng to the Cape. I feel confident that the Cape of Good Hope, and in fact the whole of South Africa, will some day be as we are in Canada, under one flag and one government, and when that result is achieved I am sure a great trade will be established between Canada and that country. I hope, in fact, I feel pretty sure, that there is spirit and enterprise and adventure enough in our young Canadian men to seek homes in that sunny clime, and wherever our Canadian boys go they are almost sure to be a credit to us. I think if a large number went to South Africa it would be well for us. We can raise more boys and import more. Let our young men go to the gold fields and become rich as some of them have already done.

The next subject which I find, and I have to take them up seriatim, is the invitation of the right hon. gentleman to attend the coronation. I would like to be a minister for a while. I had the honour myself of being present at the Queen's jubilee in 1887 and I would like to go to the King's Coronation in 1902. I do not expect I shall be able to have sufficient means to enable me to go. It will be one of the grandest jubilations that ever took place in Great Britain and I am sure that the representative of Canada will do justice to our country. I am sure the right hon. Prime Minister will bring the questions to be discussed at the conference to be held in London before the great men from the colonies in an able manner, and I feel confident that our representative will be no disgrace to Canada. The right hon. gentleman has represented us upon a former occasion. The Prime Minister was sent to Great Britain in 1897 by this government and we all know—since he is not here I may say a little more about him than I otherwise would—that his sunny ways won the favour of all parties in England. He was placed in the front rank of the procession and we know that he did great credit to us. I would not care if he had been the biggest Tory under heaven, if he had done as well as he did. He is a Frenchman and

he showed to the world that he represented 2,000,000 Frenchmen living under the British flag and that they enjoyed that glorious freedom and liberty which is dealt out to all classes of the people, high and low, rich and poor, of whatever nationality, creed or colour, showing that all are welcome in this Dominion and in the British Empire, if they behave themselves. I was pleased to know that the right hon. gentleman was enabled to show to the people of Europe that a statesman of French origin could speak in such terms of that glorious flag which has made the whole world bow in obedience to it. I hope that the Prime Minister, when he goes to England this summer, will be able to speak in similar terms of the flag and the institutions under which we live and hope that the men who go there to back him up will be no disgrace to him or us. We heard a good deal of discussion this afternoon in regard to the railway question, but I do not think it would be proper for me to take part in that discussion because it was irrelevant to the question. I agree with the idea expressed by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that the government should take some steps to bring about an improvement in the management of the railways in Canada. I do not remember exactly the words which were used by the hon. gentleman, but what I would do is this : I would advise the government, and I see there is one member of the government present, and he can tell the rest—I would tell the government—

An hon. MEMBER. There are two.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Beg pardon—two. I would tell them, and I want them to take this matter introduced by the hon. member for Labelle, into their serious consideration, that they should appoint, at this session, twenty-five of the brainiest men on both sides of this House to meet together in solemn conclave and take up this question of railways, their ownership and management, and consider how railways can be best managed for the good of the people of this country. I would like to have a committee appointed of not less than twenty-five of the best men. They are not all in the cabinet. Now, gentlemen, I am afraid you laugh, but I mean what I say.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) not to forget that he should address the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I beg pardon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is making a mistake in addressing members of the House and not the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). If I have made a mistake, I am quite willing to have it corrected at once. I did not intend to do it. What was the mistake ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a rule of the House, which says, that an hon. member addressing the House, should address the Chair and not address the members present.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Well, I have mentioned the word ' Speaker ' half a dozen times to-night. If I have not done it sufficiently, I apologize. Now, I think I have exhausted the subject. I have spoken half an hour and that is as long as I usually speak. I thank the House very much for the courtesy it has extended to me and I hope I will not bore the House much more this session.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, just for a few moments I wish to take up the time of the House in discussing the amendment made by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and also to ask the attention of the House to the serious condition of affairs that now faces Canada in connection with the question raised by that hon. gentleman. We had, this afternoon, a deliverance from the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) and what he said to the House I do not quite know. He did not speak for himself; perhaps he spoke for the constraint in which he is at present by reason of his association with the government. I believe that if the Minister of Public Works could express his own mind he would express a fear of the present situation. I believe he would express a fear of our railways passing into the hands of American corporations, and that he would if he could stir up his colleagues in order to save the situation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) took occasion this afternoon to bring forward the French river navigation project, and he brought it forward in such a way that he did not endorse it, nor did he say that the government was committed to it. Why he submitted the scheme to us I cannot quite tell. His argument was, that if our railroads are to be taken over by the Americans, then we have the system of canal navigation to fall back upon.

Mr. CLARKE. And the canal is not built.

Mr. MACLEAN. The canal is not built. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) did not answer the issue raised by the hon. gentleman from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), but, on the contrary, he evaded it. He gave the House no information, and he is not here to-night to give the House information. In reference to the Canada Atlantic Railway, the minister argued that the railways are no necessary part of the transportation system. He held that our whole dependence was on the canals, and then he launched his French river scheme. I was reminded of something that took place in this House last session, and, in all seriousness, I want to direct the attention of the House to that incident. There was a document circulated in this House, addressed to the Prime Minister and to the Governor in Council, and the sum

and substance of it was that the members of the House of Commons, having in view the solution of the transportation problem, petitioned the Governor in Council, and petitioned the Prime Minister, to commit the credit of Canada for $65,000,000, to be placed in the hands of a private corporation for the construction of the French river and the Ottawa ship canals. I would like that the members of this House who signed this document should stand up here to-night and justify it. And yet when that document was in my hands it was signed by 80 per cent of the members. There was another statement in that document to the effect that the signers would not regard the question as a political one. Well, sir, no member of this House can commit me to any such statement. No member of this House can commit me to the principle of giving $65,000,000 of the people's money to a private corporation. The administration that gives this money must take the responsibility for doing so, and those who sit opposite the administration are bound to oppose it. I challenge any of the men who signed that document to stand up here and to declare that they have committed me or committed the Conservative party to any such policy as that. I believe that the Minister of Public Works was in league with it. I believe he was willing to pledge the credit of this country to the tune of $65,000,000, to be given to a private corporation which was to own and to control the navigation of the French river and the Ottawa river. I regret to say that three-fourths of the members on the other side of the House and three-fourths of the members on this side signed that document, and I call on the Prime Minister now, and I call on the Minister of Public Works, to produce the document and let us know what the meaning of it is.

Mr. KEMP. Move for a return.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will move later on for the production of that document. The Minister of Public Works this afternoon relied on that canal project for the solution of the transportation problem, and he has been a party to the circulation of that document in the House. If that be so, what is the significance of his proposition that we should rely on the canals to solve the transportation question. The minister told us that the Canada Atlantic Railway was not an essential part of the transportation system. I call on the members from the maritime provinces to consider that. This government committed itself to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Quebec to Montreal, and that was done in view of solving the transportation question. If they were justified, as they claimed, in extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, they were justified in extending that system to the great lakes. They cannot justify their deal with the Grand Trunk Railway if it did not mean to put the Intercolonial Railway in touch with the great lakes and in touch with the traffic of the great west. If the maritime members have confidence in the government railway, if they have confidence in its extension to Montreal, they are the men who should stand up here to-night and urge upon the government the extension of the road to the Georgian Bay.

Mr. CLARKE. What did it cost to bring it to Montreal?

Mr. MACLEAN. I cannot give the cost at the moment, but I do say that the Intercolonial Railway is only at the beginning of traffic when it stops at Montreal. Its terminus ought to be on the Georgian Bay, and I go further and say that its terminus should be at the Niagara river and the Detroit river.

Mr. COWAN. What would that cost ?

Mr. MACLEAN. No matter what it would cost. If it proves to be the true solution of the transportation problem it will cost little compared with the advantages it will afford. If the government were in earnest, and if they were up to date, they would solve the question. It is not the money you put in the railways that counts; it is the traffic tolls that carry on the railways, and the people pay them. As I said last session, I repeat now : the government can take over the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway on an agreement to pay $1 a year rental and assume the liabilities. There is no great financial proposition involved, because, as I have said, it is the traffic that carries on the railroads, and not the people who put the capital in them. I do not agree with the Minister of Public Works that our canal system is the sole hope of the country. I say that the railroads are the complements of the canals, and if you are going to solve the transportation problem and are in earnest about it, you must take over the railways as well as the canals. The two go together. In view of the competition in the United States, in view of the acquisitive character of the people of that country, in view of the way in which the railway corporations of the United States are grabbing our railroads, there is no solution of the problem, there is no hope for a Canadian nationality, unless the people of Canada control the railways as well as the canals. Some gentlemen may say that there is nothing much in this contention, just as the Prime Minister says he is not afraid of the situation. But my opinion, supported by that of a great many experienced men, is that we must own the railways as well as the canals, and that if we are true to our country, we ought to have courage to take both under our control. If we had the courage to do what France and

other nations have done, what would be the result? What would happen to-day if the whole Canadian transportation system was taken over by the state and put into the hands of an administrator like Mr. Hays of the Grand Trunk Railway. In the first place, the whole system would be run at a much less cost, and we would have ten times the efficiency.

Once the state took over all these single track roads, they would be immediately converted into double-track, treble-track or quadruple-track systems. That means a great deal in the organization and efficiency of a railway and in the way of reduction of the cost of maintenance. One man or one body could administer the whole Canadian system of railways at one-half the cost at which it is administered now, with ten times the efficiency and at one-fourth the rates that now prevail. There is no other way of solving this problem. Of course, the plan is to bring forward one navigation scheme or one railroad scheme after another and have them bonused by this House; and we are told that this scheme or that scheme is going to save the country. But not one of them has done it yet, nor will it be done until the two systems of rail and water communication are bound together, and the Canadian people have the courage to own and control them for themselves. The Prime Minister to-day applauded the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals when he said that Canadians had no grievances against the railways running across Canada to-day. Haven't we? Where is the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren)? The other day the hon. gentleman, in addressing the dairy interests of Ontario, showed that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway were charging more for carrying the dairy products of Ontario than they charge for carrying the dairy products of the western states through Canada. There is a grievance. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart), says the government ought to correct it if it is wrong, and the Premier echoed his remark. But they are not doing it, and these railroads which we have subsidized so largely are actually discriminating against Canadians and against Canadian ports. The great Grand Trunk, to which we have given so much money, is building up Portland, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have told us that they will go to Boston if they are not given certain terms. If that is the condition of affairs in this country, it is high time that the Canadian people rose to the situation and took over these railroads and administered them in the interest of Canada. Mr. Speaker, it must come to that, and I thought the hon. Minister of Public Works, when he spoke this afternoon, would go in that direction; but he chose simply to bring forward another scheme entailing a great expenditure of some $65,000,000, as a means of saving the country in regard to transportation.

Now, I am here to protest against any more expenditure on behalf of private corporations in connection with the transportation problem, and I want some member of the government this evening to answer me in regard to the proposal to commit the credit of this country to the expenditure of $65,000,000 to enable a private corporation to take over the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Ship canal project. The question must be answered. When I saw that document at the close of last session I tried to get an answer. I was too late then; but we must have the answer now when the Minister of Public Works comes forward and tells us that the salvation of the country lies in this proposition—and I believe that he is in league with a private corporation to take over that proposition.

This Canada Atlantic Railway, of which we have heard so much to-night, would have been a first-class investment for this country to have taken over and made a portion of the Intercolonial. The Prime Minister says that it could not be done; the Minister of Public Works says that it could not be done. Why could it not be done? If they could take over certain little railways in the province of Quebec and bind them together and make them a portion of the Intercolonial, why could they not take over the Canada Atlantic? I believe they did desire to take it over, but they were too late. If it were taken over and made a part of the Intercolonial system, you would have a continuous system from the great lakes to the seaboard, owned and controlled by the Canadian people, and it would be a constant check on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. If you had the Intercolonial extended to the Georgian Bay, which could be done at a cost of $10,000,000, on which 3 per cent amounts to only $300,000 a year, what would happen? You would have the eastern end of a transcontinental system which would be competitive with the Canadian Pacific Railway. You would be in touch with Port Arthur, from which point you would meet the Mann & Mackenzie system opening to the west; and there is a great canal sytem projected from Port Arthur to the west which may be opened one of these days. Therefore it would be good national policy for the government to have taken over the Canada Atlantic Railway.

So I make the charge to-night that the Minister of Public Works, in bringing forward the scheme which he has proposed for the salvation of the country, is bringing forward the scheme of a private corporation, and not the scheme of the country. I also make the charge that if the government were honest in extending the Intercolonial from Quebec to Montreal,

they were in duty bound to extend it from Montreal to the Georgian Bay; because, I say it in all seriousness, there is no solution of the transportation problem but public ownership of the canals and public ownership of the railways, and putting an end to this giving of the credit of the country in order to grant immense bonuses to private corporations. There is no other way out. It is all very fine to bring forward the old ideas of the last century to settle these new questions of the twentieth century. They will not do. There are a new class of men and great new forces in the world to-day. Men are quicker, men are greater, public questions are wider, and they must be approached on new lines and by new methods. Do you know what is at the bottom of that Georgian Bay Ship Canal proposition? Let me tell you. The greatest water powers in Canada which have not passed into the hands of private corporations are, along the line of the French river and the Ottawa river, and the scheme is to bag all these water powers in connection with this canal proposition. It is nothing but a great exploitation scheme that might figure very largely in the next general election. I had almost expected that it would figure in the Ontario elections about to come off. For my part I take this occasion to repudiate that document, which I had in my hand, in my place, near the close of last session, and which, I believe has been presented to the Governor General in Council and the Prime Minister. And I ask the Minister of Public Works now whether, after the speech he made this afternoon, he will bring that document down, alleged to have been signed by members of this House, and explain how he can make the proposition he did in favour of the government constructing the French River canal if three-fourths of his supporters and a great many members on this side are committed to a proposition to give the credit of this country to the raising of $65,000,000 by a private corporation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have heard the suggestion made by my hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works to my hon. friend from Labelle regarding the withdrawal of his amendment, and I would ask my hon. friend whether he desires now to press the amendment or whether he will withdraw it.

Mr. BOURASSA. As I have already said, I have not brought this up as a motion of want of confidence or with the view of asking the government to commit itself to any policy whatever. But I consider the matter one of great importance, to which the attention of the government ought to be at once directed, in order that they may take occasion to study the question and come to a conclusion as soon as possible. If the government would announce its readiness to give the question its most serious consideration and come to a decision before the session is over, I am ready to withdraw the motion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I can relieve my hon. friend's mind with regard to our studying the question, for I do believe that the government have already given it serious study and consideration. Whatever difference there may be between the hon. gentleman and others regarding the motion he has presented, we all recognize that the transportation problem is a matter of the geatest importance to Canada. The difficulty with the hon. gentleman's motion is that it does not lead to anything in particular. It merely asserts that this is an important question, and if this were stated in any other form, we could all sympathize with the hon. gentleman and agree in the statement. However, he will have ample opportunity to bring up the question again, and he will lose nothing whatever by allowing it to rest for the present and withdrawing his motion. I can assure him that there is no disposition on the part of the government to do otherwise than assist in bringing the question before the House in an intelligible and useful form and in coming to a conclusion most satisfactory to the general interests of the country.

Mr. BOURASSA. After the explanation of the hon. minister, I am quite ready to withdraw the motion with the consent of the seconder.

Amendment (Mr. Bourassa) withdrawn, and motion (Mr. Campbell) agreed to.

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

That the said Address be engrossed and be presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this House as are of the hon. the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved :

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a committee to consider of a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved :

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—MAIN ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :—

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending June 30, 1903, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, February 17, 1902.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the message of His Excellency and the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1901.—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

The Report of the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30th, 1901.—Hon. Mr. Mulock.

The Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ending June 30th, 1901.—Hon. Mr. Tarte.

The Report of the Department of Justice for the year ending June 30th, 1901.—Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick.

The Report of Department of Labour for year ending June 30th, 1901.—Hon. Mr. Mulock.

The Report of the Department of Inland Revenue for the year ending June 30th, 1901.—Hon. Mr. Fielding for Hon. Mr. Bernier.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 9.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 18, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 4) respecting drainage on and across the property of Railway Companies —Mr. Cowan.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. Wm. Harty, member for the electoral division of the city of Kingston, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and Mr. Fraser.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1901.—Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright.

Report of the Auditor General, for the fiscal year ended 30th June 1901.—Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Tables of Trade and Navigation, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1901.—Hon. Wm. Paterson.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With the permission of the House, I beg to lay on the Table the report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose Standing Committees as follows :—

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lennox,
Barker,	Logan,
Belcourt,	MacKinnon,
Bennett,	McCarthy,
Blair,	McColl,
Borden (Halifax),	McIsaac,
Bureau,	Madore,
Casgrain,	Malouin,
Cowan,	Martineau,
Dugas,	Monet,
Emmerson,	Monk,
Fitzpatrick,	Morrison,
Flint,	Mulock,
Fraser,	Northrup,
Geoffrion,	Pringle,
German,	Russell,
Gourley,	Sifton,
Guthrie,	Sutherland (Essex),
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Lancaster,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
LaRivière,	Wade and
Lavell,	Ward.—45
Lemieux,	

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs

Archambault,	Johnson (Cardwell),
Avery,	Legris,
Bazinet,	Logan,
Bourbonnais,	Lovell,
Brunet,	McCool,
Casgrain,	McGowan,
Copp,	Matheson,
Earle,	Meigs,
Ethier,	Morin,
Farquharson,	Robinson (Elgin),
Gauvreau,	Seagram,
Hale,	Turgeon and
Harwood,	Vrooman.—26.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven members.

No. 3.—ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Angers,	Lang,
Archambault,	Laurier (L'Assomption),
Ball,	Lavell,
Barker,	Lavergne,

Bazinet,
Beith,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bell,
Bennett,
Bernier,
Bickerdike,
Birkett,
Blain,
Blair,
Borden (King's),
Bourassa,
Boyd,
Brock,
Broder,
Brown,
Bruce,
Bruneau,
Bureau,
Calvert,
Calvin,
Campbell,
Cargill,
Carscallen,
Casgrain,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Christie,
Clancy,
Clare,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Copp,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Culbert,
Davis,
Délisle,
Demers (Lévis),
Douglas,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Earle,
Edwards,
Emmerson,
Erb,
Ethier,
Farquharson,
Fielding,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Fortier,
Fowler,
Fraser,
Gallery,
Galliher,
Ganong,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gibson,
Gilmour,
Gould,
Gourley,
Guthrie,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hale,
Harwood,
Harty,
Henderson,
Heyd,
Holmes,
Horsey,
Hughes (Victoria),
Hyman,
Ingram,
Johnston (Cape Breton),
Lefurgey,
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Leonard,
Lewis,
Logan,
Macdonald,
Mackie,
MacKinnon,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),
MacLaren (Perth),
Maclean,
McCarthy,
McColl,
McCool,
McCormick,
McCreary,
McGowan,
McGugan,
McIntosh,
McIsaac,
McLennan,
McLeod,
Madore,
Malouin,
Marcil (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martineau,
Matheson,
Maxwell,
Mignault,
Monet,
Monk,
Morin,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Murray,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Osler,
Parmelee,
Pope,
Porter,
Power,
Préfontaine,
Pringle,
Proulx,
Puttee,
Reid (Grenville),
Riley,
Robinson (Northumberland),
Roche (Halifax),
Roche (Marquette),
Rosamond,
Ross (Ontario),
Ross (Rimouski),
Rousseau,
Russell,
Schell,
Scott,
Sifton,
Simmons,
Smith (Vancouver),
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stephens,
Sutherland (Essex),
Sutherland (Oxford),
Talbot,
Tarte,
Thompson,
Tisdale,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Turcot,
Johnston (Cardwell),
Johnston (Lambton),
Kaulbach,
Kemp,
Kendrey,
Kidd,
Vrooman,
Wade,
Ward,
Wilmot,
Wilson and
Wright.—178.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of twenty-five members.

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Avery,
Ball,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bell,
Bennett,
Birkett,
Bourbonnais,
Brock,
Broder,
Bruce,
Bruneau,
Calvert,
Carscallen,
Casgrain,
Cochrane,
Cowan,
Culbert,
Douglas,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Earle,
Ethier,
Fitzpatrick,
Fraser,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Gibson,
Gilmour,
Girard,
Guthrie,
Hackett,
Harty,
Hughes (King's),
Johnston(Cape Breton),
Kaulbach,
Kendall,
Kidd,
LaRivière,
Lavell,
LeBlanc,
Legris,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Lcy,
Macdonald,
MacKinnon,
Maclean,
McCool,
McCreary,
McGugan,
Marcil (Bagot),
Méigs,
Mignault,
Monet,
Monk,
Morin,
Morrison,
Pope,
Power,
Pringle,
Proulx,
Puttee,
Roddick,
Rosamond,
Ross (Victoria),
Russell,
Schell,
Stephens,
Sutherland (Essex),
Sutherland (Oxford),
Tobin,
Tolton,
Tucker,
Turgeon and
Wade.—77.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of ten members.

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Ball,
Bazinet,
Brown,
Brunet,
Cargill,
Clancy,
Clare,
Copp,
Davis,
Demers (Levis),
Demers (St. John),
Douglas,
Erb,
Flint,
Fortier,
Gallery,
Guthrie,
Halliday,
Horsey,
Hughes (Victoria),
Lang,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lefurgey,
Mackie,
McEwen,
McGugan,
Marcil (Bagot),
Matheson,
Maxwell,
Morin,
Puttee,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richardson,
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Rimouski),
Sherritt,
Smith (Vancouver),
Tolmie,
Tolton,
Turgeon,

Ingram,
Johnston (Cape Breton),
Kaulbach,
Kendall,
Lancaster,
Vrooman,
Wilmot,
Wilson and
Wright.—49.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven members.

No. 6.—ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Bennett,
Casgrain,
Clarke,
Davis,
Holmes,
Hughes (Victoria),
Hyman,
Johnston (Cape Breton),
Johnston (Lambton),
LaRivière,
Lavergne,
Loy,
Maclean,
McColl,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Oliver,
Parmelee,
Préfontaine,
Richardson,
Scott,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Taylor,
Thompson and
Tisdale.—24.

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Barker,
Bell,
Beith,
Bennett,
Bickerdike,
Birkett,
Blain,
Blair,
Borden (King's),
Campbell,
Carbonneau,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Champagne,
Clancy,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Demers (St. John),
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Fitzpatrick
Flint,
Fowler,
Fraser,
Ganong,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gouid,
Gourley,
Haggart,
Henderson,
Holmes,
Horsey,
Hughes (King's).
Hughes (Victoria),
Hyman,
Kemp,
Lancaster,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
LeBlanc,
Lennox,
Leonard,
Loy,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),
McColl,
McCreary,
McIsaac,
MacKinnon,
Madore,
Malouin,
Maxwell,
Monk,
Morrison,
Murray,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Pringle,
Riley,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Ontario),
Sifton,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Thompson,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Turcot,
Wade,
Ward and
Wilson.—72.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Angers,
Archambault,
Avery,
Barker,
Beith,
Bell,
Hyman,
Ingram,
Johnston (CapeBreton),
Kemp,
Kendall,
Kendrey,
Béland,
Bennett,
Bernier,
Bickerdike,
Birkett,
Blain,
Borden (Halifax),
Borden (King's),
Bourassa,
Boyd,
Brock,
Brown,
Bruce,
Bruneau,
Brunet,
Bureau,
Calvert,
Calvin,
Campbell,
Carbonneau,
Cargill,
Carscallen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casgrain,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Clancy,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Copp,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Culbert,
Delisle,
Demers (Lévis),
Demers (St. John),
Earle,
Edwards,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Farquharson,
Fielding,
Fowler,
Fraser,
Gallery,
Galliher,
Ganong,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gould,
Gourley,
Haggart,
Harty,
Henderson,
Heyd,
Holmes,
Horsey,
Hughes (King's),
Hughes (Victoria),
Lang,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavell,
Lefurgey,
Legris,
Lewis,
Lovell,
Loy,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),
McCarthy,
McCormick,
McEwen,
McIsaac,
McLennan,
McLeod,
Madore,
Malouin,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Mignault,
Monk,
Morin,
Murray,
Osler,
Paterson,
Pope,
Porter,
Power,
Préfontaine,
Puttee,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Restigouche),
Richardson,
Riley,
Roche (Halifax),
Rosamond,
Ross (Ontario),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Victoria),
Rousseau,
Russell,
Schell,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stephens,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Talbot,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Thompson,
Tisdale,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Wade,
Ward,
Wilmot,
Wilson and
Wright.—130.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 9.—ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Angers,
Ball,
Bazinet,
Beith,
Bell,
Bernier,
Blain,
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Logan,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Mackie,
MacLaren (Perth),
McColl,
McCool,
McCormick,
McCreary,

Boyd,	McEwen,
Broder,	McGowan,
Brown,	McGugan,
Bureau,	McIntosh,
Calvert,	McLennan,
Calvin,	McLeod,
Carbonneau,	Marcil (Bagot),
Cargill,	Martineau,
Carscallen,	Matheson,
Charlton,	Maxwell,
Christie,	Meigs,
Clancy,	Morin,
Clare,	Mulock,
Cochrane,	Oliver,
Davis,	Parmelee,
Delisle,	Pope,
Douglas,	Proulx,
Dugas,	Reid (Grenville),
Dyment,	Reid (Restigouche),
Edwards,	Richardson,
Erb,	Robinson (Elgin),
Farquharson,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Fisher,	
Fortier,	Roche (Marquette),
Galliher,	Rosamond,
Gauvreau,	Ross (Ontario),
Gilmour,	Ross (Victoria),
Girard,	Rousseau,
Gould,	Schell,
Guthrie,	Seagram,
Hackett,	Sherritt,
Halliday,	Simmons,
Harwood,	Smith (Vancouver),
Henderson,	Smith (Wentworth),
Heyd,	Sproule,
Hughes (King's),	Stephens,
Hughes (Victoria),	Talbot,
Ingram,	Taylor,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Tobin,
Johnston (Lambton),	Tolmie,
Kendall,	Tolton,
Kidd,	Tucker,
Lang,	Turcot,
LaRiviére,	Turgeon,
Laurier (L'Assomption)	Vrooman,
LeBlanc,	Wade,
Legris,	Wilmot,
Lennox,	Wilson and
Leonard,	Wright.—116.
Lewis,	

And that the said Quorum of the said Committee do consist of twelve members.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Before making the formal motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply, perhaps I should say that as the Auditor General's report has only now been placed on the Table, I quite realize that I should consult the wishes of my hon. friends opposite, before making the motion, by saying that though we are quite prepared now to proceed with Supply, and perhaps there might be some matters not debatable which we could deal with, however, in view of the fact that the report has only now been placed on the Table, hon. gentlemen might prefer to postpone going into Supply for another day, and if that is their desire, it is only reasonable that we should concur in their view. We have no objection to go on with Supply this afternoon, but if they prefer that we postpone it, of course I would not object to that course being pursued.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). The disposition of the older members on our side of the House is that we should have some opportunity of looking into the Auditor General's report before proceeding with Supply. There may be some items, possibly, that an examination of the Auditor General's report would not be necessary to enable us to deal with. But I think I am interpreting the opinions of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in saying that we would rather look at that important document before proceeding with Supply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the objection is quite reasonable, and I withdraw the motion.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 3.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 19, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That a Message be sent to the Senate requesting that their Honours will unite with this House in the formation of a joint committee of both Houses on the subject of the printing of parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, namely : Messrs Bennett, Casgrain, Clarke, Davis, Holmes, Hughes (Victoria), Hyman, Johnston (Cape Breton), Johnston (Lambton), LaRivière, Lavergne, Loy, Maclean, McColl, Marcil (Bonaventure), Oliver, Parmelee, Prefontaine, Richardson, Scott, Sutherland (Oxford), Taylor, Thompson and Tisdale will act as members on the part of this House on the said joint committee on the printing of parliament.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That a Select Committee composed of Messrs. Borden (Halifax), Bourassa, Brock, Calvert,

Casgrain, Clancy, Clark, Demers (St. John and Iberville), Flint, Fraser, Heyd, Hyman, Johnston (Lambton), Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Monk, Scott and Wade be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the Library ; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY INCREASE IN CAPITAL STOCK.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved for leave to place on the Table of the House certain papers in respect to the capital stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year ended June 30, 1901 (Marine).—Hon. Mr. Sutherland.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ended June 30, 1901.—Hon. Mr. Blair.

Civil Service List of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1901.—Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick.

QUESTIONS.

MONUMENT TO GENERAL MONTGOMERY.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Has the government received any application, and, if so, from whom, for permission to erect a monument or memorial to General Montgomery, who unsuccessfully assailed the city of Quebec, in December, 1775, with a force of American troops ?
2. Has the government granted the prayer of such application ?
3. Will the monument or memorial, if any, be erected on property belonging to the government of Canada ?
4. Have petitions been received by the government, if so, from whom, protesting against permission being given to erect such monument or memorial ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend, remembers I am sure, the answer which I gave last session to similar inquiries. I have now to inform the hon. gentleman that so far as my memory serves me at this moment there has been no petition presented to the government to have a monument erected to the memory of Montgomery. I am not aware that any protest has come to us. At all events no action has been taken on this matter since last session.

DOMINION CENSUS.—EXPENDITURE.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

What sums have been paid out to date in connection with the taking of the recent census of the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). These figures are in the course of preparation and will be down in a day or two.

Mr. CLARKE. The question stands in the meantime.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

MAIL STEAMERS.—RATE OF SPEED.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

What was the average speed per hour made during the year 1901 by steamships carrying British and Canadian mails from ports in the United Kingdom to Canadian ports ; and from Canadian ports to ports in the United Kingdom respectively ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). The average speed made by steamships carrying the mails from ports in the United Kingdom to Canadian ports was as follows : From 1st January to opening of navigation, Moville to Halifax, 10⅛ knots. Opening of navigation to June 30, Moville to Rimouski, 12½ knots. June 30, to September 30, Moville to Rimouski, 12⅛ knots. September 30, to December 31, Moville to Rimouski, 11 knots. Moville to Halifax, 11 knots.

The average speed made by steamships carrying the mails from Canadian ports to ports in the United Kingdom was as follows :

From 1st January to opening of navigation on the St. Lawrence, Halifax to Moville, 10½ knots. From opening of navigation to June 30, Rimouski to Moville, 12 7-10 knots. From June 30, to September 30, Rimouski to Moville, 12⅛ knots. From September 30, to December 31, Rimouski to Moville, 12⅝ knots. Halifax to Moville, 13⅜ knots.

N.B.—Allowance made in all cases for difference of time.

THE TUBERCULAR TEST.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

Is the government aware that at a meeting held on the 5th day of February, instant, in the city of Toronto, the following resolution was passed unanimously by the Shorthorn Breeders' Association : 'We, the members of the Dominion Shorthorn Breeders' Association, at our annual meeting, resolved that the tubercular test is unreliable, unnecessary, and in many cases injurious, and that we urge the discontinuance of the compulsory use of toxine by the Dominion Government Department of Agriculture ; and we also fail to see the object now of requiring 90 days' quarantine, as there is no contagious disease in Great Britain requiring its enforcement to such length of time.'

In view of the above action, is it the intention of the government to meet the wishes of the said association ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The government is

aware of this resolution. It is not the intention of the government to act in the direction indicated by the resolution.

RETIREMENT OF JUDGES.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

Is the Prime Minister correctly reported in the *Hansard* of April 24th, 1899, as having stated that 'the question of introducing legislation to provide for the compulsory retirement of county court judges in the province of Ontario who had attained the age of seventy-five years was under the consideration of the government.'

If correctly reported, is legislation to such end to be introduced this session ?

If such legislation is introduced, will similar legislation be introduced in reference to the Judges of the Supreme Court of Canada and Judges of the High Court of Justice in the province of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). It is the intention of the government to introduce this session, legislation for the purpose of supplementing that already in existence with respect to county court judges. So far as the Supreme Court and High Court of Justice is concerned, the matter has not yet been considered.

RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin) asked :

Is it the intention of the government to comply with the resolution passed during the last session relative to the appointment of a commission to inquire into and adjust all differences that may arise between the public and the railway companies of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I may say to the hon. gentleman that I hope to make a definite announcement to the House on this subject at an early period.

DURATION OF ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

Has the government considered the Act passed at the last session of the Ontario Legislation extending its duration ?

Has it allowed the Act or is it the intention of the government to disallow it ?

If it is not to be disallowed, what are the reasons for non-disallowance ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government has considered the Act passed at the last session of the Ontario legislature extending its duration. It is not the intention of the government to disallow the said Act. The reason is that the matter is altogether a domestic one entirely within the purview of the Ontario legislature.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

DISMISSAL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BELL (asked) :

(*a*) How many employees of the Public Works, Railways and Canals, Post Office, Marine and Fisheries, Customs and Inland Revenue Departments have been dismissed between July 12th, 1896, and January 1st, 1902 ?

(*b*) How many of these dismissals have been made for political reasons ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will have to ask my hon. friend to be so kind as to move for a return for this information.

I. C. R.—NUMBER OF OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BELL asked :

What was the total number of officials and employees, temporary and permanent, and what the total salaries and wages of the Intercolonial Railway on June 30th, 1896, and on December 31st, 1901 ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will give the same answer to this as was given to the last question of the hon. gentleman.

CONSULAR AGENCIES IN CANADA.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

Has the custom of flying the flag of the nation represented at consular agencies in Canada been discontinued ? If so, why ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The custom of flying the flag of the nation represented at the consular agencies in Canada has not been discontinued.

PORT DUFFERIN WHARF.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. What is the total cost to date of the shed on the government wharf at Port Dufferin, Halifax County ?

2. What is the total amount of wharfage collected at the government wharf at Port Dufferin ?

3. What is the total cost to date of the breakwater at Hawbold's Cove, Beaver Cove, in the County of Halifax ?

4. What is the total cost of the wharf at Atkin's Point, Harrigan Cove, Halifax County ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte).

1. $214.10.

3. Hawbold's Cove, Beaver Cove. This department has no record of any work of that time.

4. Harrigan Cove. Wharf, total cost to date, $1,461.71.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland) In answer to the second question, I may say that the total amount collected for 1899, was $510.57 ; for 1900, $138.11, and for 1901, $49.18.

THE CENSUS.—MR. COTE'S CIRCULAR.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. What was the total number of replies, by provinces, received to the circular issued on or about the 1st day of March, 1901, by Mr. Thomas Coté, Assistant Census Commissioner, to certain clergymen, asking for the name, the age, and the occupation of every person formerly resident in the parish or territory over which such clergyman exercised spiritual oversight, who had emigrated to the United States during the twelve months preceding the said 1st day of March, 1901 ?

2. What was the total number of persons so reported as above as having emigrated to the United States from each province of the Dominion during the year ending with the 1st March, 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon Sydney Fisher).

1. Seventy replies in all were received, sixty-five from the province of Quebec, one from New Brunswick, three from Ontario, and one from Prince Edward Island.

2. The number of persons reported by the parish priests as having emigrated to the United States during the twelve months preceding the 1st day of March, 1901, is 870; twelve in New Brunswick, seventy-nine in Prince Edward Island, 779 in Quebec. There are also 108 families reported as having left the country, but their names and the number of their members were not given. One family was reported from Ontario and 107 from Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the exodus had stopped.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a very small number.

BRONTE HARBOUR.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

How much money has the government expended on Bronte Harbour improvements to date ?

Is it the intention of the government to finally complete the proposed improvements during the coming summer ?

What additional sum will still be required to complete the works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). Up to this date the total amount spent on Bronte harbour has been $11,211,349. If my hon. friend will kindly look at the estimates for this year he will find that the sum of $3,000 has been placed to the credit of that work.

POSTMASTERSHIP OF MILTON, ONTARIO.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. How long has the postmastership of Milton, Ont., been vacant ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to fill such vacancy before the holding of the next provincial elections in Ontario ?

If so, who will be appointed to the said office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). There is no post office known as Milton in the province of Ontario. There is an office of that name, but it is situated in the united counties of Shelburne and Queens, and the office of postmaster there is not vacant. Perhaps my hon. friend refers to the post office in the county town of Halton, and if he means that, it is known in the Post Office Department as Milton East. If that is the post office to which the hon. gentleman alludes, I will be happy to consider the question so amended and will give the information another day.

Mr. HENDERSON. It never has been called Milton East.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is the answer the department gives me. That is the departmental name of it.

BRONTE HARBOUR LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to erect, during the current year, a lighthouse at Bronte Harbour, in conformity with assurances given during the general elections in the year 1900 ?

2. Has the location of said lighthouse been fixed, and at what particular point will it be placed ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that this question is out of order, as it embodies a statement, which is a subject of controvery.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will eliminate the words ' in conformity with assurances given during the general elections in the year 1900.' Will the hon. gentleman allow the question to be answered in this form ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). There appears to be no file in the department regarding this matter.

THE DUTY ON TOBACCO.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

What was the total amount of duty collected on tobacco for the year ending 30th June, 1901 ?

2. How much of this amount was due to the additional duty imposed in the session of 1897 ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). The duty on tobacco collected during the year was $3,337,848.28 ; on cigars, $837,433.69; total, $4,175,281.97. The answer to the second question is; $1,026,265.72 on raw leaf; on cigarettes, $180,551.38; total, $1,206,817.10.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). I will supplement the answer with the following, in regard to the customs duty :—

1. The total customs duty collected on tobacco (including raw leaf samples) for the year ending 30th June 1901, was $108,649.69.

2. Of this sum the amount due to the additional customs duty imposed in 1897 is $15,708.54.

OAKVILLE HARBOUR.

Mr. HENDERSON asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to place in the estimates, this session, a sum sufficient to complete the construction of docks, repairs and dredging in Oakville Harbour?

2. What is the estimated amount that will be required for such purpse?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that he has only to be kind enough to look at the estimates to find that the amount of $4,000 has been placed there to the credit of Oakville harbour.

PROTECTION OF OYSTER FISHING.

Mr. HACKETT asked:

1. Have any regulations for the protection of the oyster fishing in the province of Prince Edward Island been issued by the government of Canada during the last year?

2. Is the lifting or digging of mussel mud by farmers prohibited in certain rivers of said province within lines defining boundaries?

3. What are the names of rivers so protected, and in which of the counties are they situated?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland):

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Trout River, Prince County; Bideford River, Prince County.

EMPLOYMENT OF MR. ERNEST KEMP.

Mr. HACKETT asked:

1. Is Mr. Ernest Kemp, the so-called oyster expert, employed during the present winter on the government steamship 'Stanley,' plying between Summerside and Cape Tormentine?

2. If so, what are his duties, and is he required to report to the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland):

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

TRANSPORTATION QUESTIONS.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked:

1. What is the distance (*a*) from Chicago to North Bay? (*b*) from Fort William to North Bay?

2. What is the distance from, each, Chicago and Fort William to Thessalon?

3. How many miles is Thessalon distant from Montreal more than North Bay?

4. How many points on Lakes Huron, Erie and Georgian Bay do the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railways each touch? What are those points?

5. What would be the cost of the proposed canal into Lake Nipissing from Georgian Bay?

6. What is the average depth of water in Lake Nipissing?

7. What would it probably cost to double track each of the following roads, and reduce the grades to 5-10 from the lake ports to Owen Sound, Collingwood, Midland, Parry Sound, Thessalon, Sault Ste. Marie, Fort William, Sarnia, Goderich, Kincardine, Port Elgin, Southampton, Wiarton, Sandwich, viz.: the Grand Trunk Railway, Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada Atlantic Railway?

8. What is the distance from, each, Owen Sound, Collingwood, Midland, Parry Sound, the mouth of the French River, North Bay, and Thessalon, to Montreal?

9. What ports are there on the 'North Shore' of the Georgian Bay at which the 'Soo Line' of the Canadian Pacific Railway touches?

10. What is the distances of each of these by rail from Montreal?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). As far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, I lay on the Table of the House a map which we have prepared, which contains a good deal of the information which the hon. gentleman desires. A good many of the things which he is asking for cannot be produced in the House without a motion being made and a statement being prepared. Other departments will answer for themselves.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). So far as the question touches the Department of Railways and Canals, I have prepared a statement in answer to the question of the hon. gentleman so far as it is possible for us to answer them, and, if the hon. gentleman will permit me, I will hand the answer to 'Hansard.'

1. The distance from Chicago to North Bay is 598 miles and from Fort William to North Bay 544 miles (by water).

2. The distance from Chicago to Thessalon is 368 miles, and from Fort William to Thessalon, 320 miles (by water).

3. Thessalon is 212 miles further from Montreal than North Bay (by rail).

4. The Grand Trunk Railway touches Lake Erie at the following points:—

It touches Fort Erie, Port Colborne, Port Dover, Port Rowan and Port Stanley and the Georgian Bay at the following points: Wiarton, Owen Sound, Meaford, Collingwood, Penetanguishene and Midland. It touches Lake Huron at the following points: Sarnia, Goderich Kincardine and Southampton.

The Canadian Pacific Railway touches at no point on Lake Erie. On Lake Huron it touches at Spanish River, Cook's Mills and Algoma Mills. On the Georgian Bay it touches at Owen Sound.

5. I cannot say at present.

6. I cannot say at present.

7. I cannot say at present.

8. The distance by rail to Montreal from Owen Sound is 461 miles; from Collingwood, 428 miles; from Midland, 457 miles; from Parry Sound, 384 miles; from mouth of French River, 433 miles; from North Bay, 364 miles; from Thessalon, 576 miles.

9. The 'Soo Line' does not touch any point on the Georgian Bay; but on the north shore of Lake Huron, it touches the following points: Spanish River, Cook's Mills, Algoma Mills, Thessalon.

10. From Spanish River to Montreal, 515 miles; from Cook's Mills, 528 miles; from Algoma Mills, 538 miles; from Thessalon, 576 miles.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle) (Translation) moved for:

Copy of all papers and correspondence exchanged between His Excellency the Governor General, the Canadian government, or any of its members or departments, the officer commanding the Canadian militia, and the British authorities, in relation to the South African war, its conduct and its settlement; and the sending or recruiting of Canadian troops to South Africa,—for the three last years.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that some of these documents were brought down during the first session following the sending of the troops to Africa. I make this a general question, in order to cover all documents exchanged between His Excellency the Governor General, the Canadian government and the British authorities, in relation to the sending of the first and second contingent of the South African police force, and of the last contingent; including the correspondence exchanged between the Imperial authorities, the Canadian government and the South African authorities. In short, I ask that all matters concerning the South African question, and relating to Canada directly or indirectly, should be deposited before the House.

I make this motion, seconded by Mr. Monet (Laprairie-Napierville).

Motion carried.

DISALLOWANCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA LEGISLATION.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle) moved:

Copy of all papers and correspondence relating to the disallowance of chapters 11 and 14 of the statutes of 1900, province of British Columbia, viz.: 'An Act to regulate immigration into British Columbia,' and 'An Act relating to the employment on works carried on under franchises granted by Private Acts.'

He said: I may say that the papers which I wish specially to have laid before parliament are those relating to the request that has been made by the British authorities to the Canadian government to disallow this legislation. Of course, the papers should include all the correspondence that has taken place between the British government and the Canadian government and all the correspondence that has taken place between the Canadian government and the government of British Columbia; so that we may know exactly where each of these three governments stands upon the question of disallowance of provincial laws.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver). I desire to second the motion before the House, because the information asked for is of very great importance, as it relates to the question of Chinese and Japanese labour in British Columbia. I would like to take this opportunity of asking the government when they will be prepared to bring down the report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into this question, which report, I presume, is already in their hands.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). So far as I know, the report of the Royal Commission has not yet been handed over to the government. It will be presented to the House as soon as it is received.

Motion agreed to.

EMBARGO IMPOSED BY THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT ON CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle) (Translation) moved, seconded by Mr. Monet (Laprairie-Napierville) for:

Copy of all papers and correspondence exchanged between Canadian and British authorities, with reference to the embargo imposed by the British government on Canadian cattle.

I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) for a moment, while making this motion, Mr. Speaker, and before going any further, I must declare at once, that all correspondence exchanged in the matter, if any, should be deposited before this House; but if the hon. minister tells me that there exists no corespondence in the matter, then I will let my motion drop.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). There is very little correspondence on this subject in the department. I might, however, take the opportunity of saying to the hon. gentleman and to the House that when I was in England last summer I had a number of personal communications on this subject with the hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Minister of Agriculture there. I laid before them with all the force of which I was capable the facts of the case and the reasons which led me to believe that the occasion was opportune for a different treatment of Canadian cattle in the home market from what has been accorded to our animals lately. I was met with the reply that the question was now a question of statute or law, and not in the power of the government or the department to regulate it by order in council or by departmental action. The gentlemen whom I met informed me that they did not believe it was possible to amend the law in such a way as to enable Canadian cattle to enter

freely beyond the ports of debarkation. I pointed out—and I am glad to say that what I said was not in any way controverted—that the cattle in Canada to-day are remarkably free from any disease—that our Canadian cattle to-day enjoy a reputation for health certainly inferior to none in the world, and superior, I believe, to those of most other countries. The point was raised, however, that this was not the real objection at the present moment. Hon. Mr. Hanbury said that while he was quite ready to admit that Canadian cattle were perfectly healthy, disease might break out among them at any moment, and in such case the re-imposition of the old embargo would be a difficult matter, as it would cause greater disturbance in the trade and make the condition of affairs worse than if a settled policy were followed. In that view I did not agree, but I was perfectly powerless to influence the decision of the Imperial government. While I was in England many of those interested in the removal of the embargo communicated with me and pointed out that large interests in the old country desired the freer entry of Canadian cattle and the abrogation of the law compelling their slaughter at the port of debarkation within ten days of their arrival. I replied to these gentlemen that while I and my colleagues took every opportunity of urging our views on the government, nothing we could do would be nearly as effective as the efforts of the British people and their representatives themselves. The British people particularly interested did bestir themselves and a number of meetings were held. I had the opportunity of meeting the Board of Trade in Glasgow and also a deputation from the Board of Trade in Aberdeen, and a number of other associations communicated with me either personally or by letter. This agitation culminated, shortly after I left England, in a meeting between Mr. Hanbury, Minister of Agriculture, and a large gathering called by the Board of Agriculture in Scotland. The meeting took place in Edinburgh, and the views of those who desired the embargo removed were laid before the Minister of Agriculture. But his reply was entirely unsatisfactory. Mr. Hanbury said that so long as he remained Minister of Agriculture, he would neither make nor advise any change in the law. And while the views he put forward and the arguments he used did not appeal to me as at all sufficient, at the same time they showed the evident determination of the British government to maintain the status quo, and as the present British government is likely to remain in office some time longer, we may dismiss the idea of getting any concessions in the immediate future.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the embargo apply to cattle from all countries?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, it applies to all cattle coming into the United Kingdom from all countries. The argument was made that Canada was treated just the same as any other country, but Canada was not so treated in the past. In the past Canada enjoyed a privilege which the others did not. That was withdrawn, in the first instance, by the scheduling of our cattle in 1892, and afterwards the law was changed so that all cattle from foreign countries must be slaughtered in the port of debarkation, and Canada and the other colonies were included in the term 'foreign countries.' We are to-day in exactly the same position as all other countries, but previous to 1892 we were in a better position.

Mr. BOURASSA. I understood the hon. minister to say that there is some correspondence, and as I intend bringing the matter up again before the House, I shall not go further into details. I wish, however, to take objection to the remark of the hon. gentleman that we should leave this thing at a standstill. I was in England at the time the hon. gentleman speaks of, and I know what he did, I know the lectures he delivered and the efforts he made to have the embargo raised, and I know also how these efforts were seconded by some of the stock raisers in Scotland. Surely at a time when we are told that the attention of the British government and public is so much given to Canadian affairs, we should not submit to this injustice without making the strongest protest. The reason given by Mr. Hanbury is not the real one, but of course it would not do for him to give expression to the actual reason why this embargo is imposed. A government wedded to free trade would hardly be expected to declare that the reason which is at the bottom of this restriction is that some wealthy stock raisers in England do not want Canadian competition. Yet, really it is nothing else than a measure of protection against Canadian competition. A few cases of pleuro-pneumonia from Canada, or rather from the United States, furnished a pretense for adopting it. But the disease was stamped out in this country, and there was no further reason of continuing the embargo. Nevertheless the British government passed a statute and branded our cattle as being infected with the disease, although as a matter of fact that disease is much more prevalent among the British stock. And were it not for this statute, which was passed in order to protect the big stock raisers in England, British stock raisers would take Canadian cattle to improve their stock. If the British stock raisers want protection against Canada, let them frankly say so and not brand our cattle as being diseased and poisoned, while at the same time they are much sounder than the British stock. Returning this summer, I came across with an English stock raiser, and a wealthy English merchant from Birmingham. We talked about this matter.

The merchant said to me : 'Of course, the statute as it exists, is a fine thing for my friend—referring to the stock raiser—it is a great thing for him and for others engaged in the same line of business. But, he added, whenever I want to be sure that I am not going to be poisoned, I do not buy the beef raised by my friend, but make a point of asking for Canadian beef.' I said to him : 'If you are so sure that our beef is better than yours, how is it that you leave your government and the protectors of your stock raisers to brand our cattle—and to announce it to the empire and the world—as being poisoned with pleuro-pneumonia.' I hold, Mr. Speaker, that we ought not to allow this session to pass without protesting by resolution, and without appealing to the British government which is supposed to love us so much, to do something to remove this crying injustice.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). This is a vital question to the farmers of Canada. But, possibly, it can be discussed to greater advantage after the papers are brought down in response to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bourassa's) motion. I desire to say, however, that I am informed and believe that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) when in England during the past year, made a very broad statement to the effect that Canada did not ask any preference in the markets of Great Britain, that what we had done in the way of giving a preference to Great Britain was a free gift—we asked nothing in return. Now, if that is the hon. gentleman's view, I think that the appeal of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) to the Minister of Agriculture to secure the removal of this embargo will not avail very much. I think that some person who holds a different opinion from that attributed to the Minister of Agriculture will have to be appealed to if Canada is to obtain any advantage in the British market

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It is somewhat refreshing to hear the explanation given by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) to account for the refusal of the Imperial government to remove this embargo—it is especially refreshing to one who has been in this House for any length of time, and remembers the attacks that were made on the late government when the embargo was put on. The contention of hon. gentlemen opposite who were then on this side was that the embargo was due to the fact that the government of that day were too lax in their quarantine regulations governing cattle from the United States, that there was a danger of importing contagious disease with the cattle from the United States, and so we might naturally expect such an embargo to be placed on our cattle going to Great Britain. It was stated that if the government did their duty and exercised a little of the sunny ways for which hon. gentlemen then on this side were peculiarly noted, there would be no difficulty in getting the embargo removed. They said, in other words, that if able men occupied the treasury benches and made proper representation to the Imperial government, and also improved the quarantine regulation on cattle coming in from the United States, there would be no difficulty in having the embargo removed. The revolutions of time have led to these hon. gentlemen being charged with the duties of looking after this matter. They have, as they say, improved the quarantine regulations between Canada and the United States. And the hon. Minister of Agriculture goes over to Great Britain and asks the Imperial government to remove the embargo. The answer is, practically : We will not do it. Why ? The hon. minister gives various reasons; but, in my judgment, considering the information as it appeared in the press at the time of the hon. minister's visit, the reason for the non-removal of the embargo was that it was a protection to the agriculturists in England and Scotland. Of course, the representatives of the Imperial government did not state that exactly. But they admitted that there was no disease among Canadian cattle. That being so, there was no object in keeping on an embargo intended to exclude diseased cattle from Canada. But notwithstanding this, the embargo is not removed. The hon. minister tells us that it is embodied in the statute, and the statute cannot be changed. Why cannot it be changed ? We change statutes every year of our lives, and the Imperial parliament does the same. I think there is a great deal in what the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has said. I read in a British paper sent to me, I presume by the hon. minister himself, that the hon. minister stated to the English people : The preference we have given you in our markets we have given you freely, and we want nothing in return—we do not ask to be placed in a better position in your markets than outsiders are. And this he stated at the very time he was there asking for concessions and consideration. I do not think there is much Imperial policy in that. I do not think the expression of such an opinion will help to build up the inter-Imperial relations that we should like to see exist between the colonies and the mother country. In fact, the hon. minister went over to ask a concession, and when there, declared that he did not want concessions. It seemed to me more like child's play than what might be expected from an intelligent statesman. I do not wonder that the British government did not remove the embargo, particularly when the quarantine regulations which were said to be too lax in 1890 and 1891, are very much more lax to-day. British statesmen are aware of that as well as the Minister of Agriculture. The hon. gentleman, there-

fore, went over to Britain without being fortified as he should have been had he desired to accomplish anything.

Motion agreed to.

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY AND ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle) moved for :

Copy of all papers and correspondence exchanged between Canadian and British authorities in relation to the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, and the settlement of the Alaskan boundary.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I shall be obliged to ask my hon. friend not to press this motion. As he is aware, the negotiations regarding the Alaskan boundary are still going on. The correspondence is not complete and is not in form to be brought down. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will withdraw his motion.

Mr. BOURASSA. Can the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) say if it will be possible to bring down the correspondence relating to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am afraid that the two cannot be separated.

Mr. BOURASSA. Will the right hon. gentleman be in a position to make another statement about this question before long, or, at least, before the present session is over?

The PRIME MINISTER. That depends on what turn the negotiations with regard to the boundary may take. If the negotiations are not complete I shall feel it my duty to resist any motion for papers. If the correspondence is brought to a close and if the negotiations are ended, there will be no difficulty about bringing down the papers. In the meantime I am obliged to ask that the motion be withdrawn, or, if not, I shall feel it my duty to ask the House to negative it.

Mr. BOURASSA. Of course, I quite understand that if the government have made up their minds—and I do not say they are wrong—it is useless for me to insist. For in moving for this correspondence, it is useless for me to hope to secure a majority of the House to support me. However, I will not withdraw the motion before I take occasion to state again that the country expects something—not so much concerning a settlement of the Alaska boundary question very soon, because I think our chances of securing a settlement of that question are further off than ever—but of knowing for what reason the British government have consented to the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty apparently without the slightest effort having been made to secure for Canada a settlement of the Alaskan question. I will not say a final settlement by treaty, for we never asked for such a settlement by a treaty. We have only requested that the treaty which was made between England and Russia and which created the difficulties between England and the United States, after the United States bought the rights of Russia, should be submitted to arbitration. The only thing which the Canadian government, in the name of the Canadian people, asked from the United States government was a consent that this question should be treated exactly according to the same procedure as that followed in the settlement of the Venezuelan question. Certainly this request was in itself a most reasonable one. Not only have the efforts of the International commission been brought to a standstill, but here we had a most favourable occasion, the last of its kind, to ask the United States to consent to the reconsideration of one treaty by England sacrificing some of her conceded rights in another treaty; but Great Britain sacrificed her acknowledged rights, rights given to her by the letter of the treaty, and did not secure for her colonial kinsmen of Canada some consideration, for those rights which she abandoned to the United States, in the form of a consent to an interpretation of the existing treaty by a judicial tribunal. I say the position is most unfair to Canada.

I am not one of those who ask favours from Great Britain. I am not one of those who are in favour of Canada taking risks and entangling herself in British difficulties, and I do not ask Great Britain to be entangled in Canada's difficulties. But surely, under a British government which proclaims that for the love of her colonies, Great Britain is ready to any sacrifice, and under a Canadian government which proclaims that for the love of Great Britain, Canada is willing to make any sacrifice, when it is only a question of obtaining that our rights should be submitted to a judicial arbitration, I think the least we could expect is to be treated as any foreign country would expect to be treated by Great Britain. Have we come to that point that Great Britain can count upon our devotion to such an extent that, even where we had acknowledged rights, she will not make the slightest efforts to have those rights acknowledged ? Sir, it would be most regrettable that this session should end, and that the Prime Minister and his colleagues should go to the foot of the Throne without the Canadian people knowing whether in fact they have been sacrificed by the British government in this matter.

I do not wish to refer to a past debate, but I have already stated that it was published time and again in the American papers that the only obstacle to the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty for the past few years, was the refusal of the Canadian

government to consent to that repeal unless the Alaska boundary question was submitted to arbitration. Well, Sir, where are we ? Has the Canadian government consented to the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty without the Alaska boundary question being—I will not say settled—but at least considered ? Or is it a fact that the British government has consented to the repeal of that treaty without even consulting the Canadian government ? I think we should know what has taken place.

For six months the Anglo-American commission sat in Quebec and Washington. We had there four representatives of the Canadian government, most able representatives who certainly did their duty to Canada on that occasion. I may remark that I was a personal witness to the efforts and to the intelligence displayed by the Canadian representatives on the Anglo-American commission. Moreover, we had there a representative of the British government appointed for the especial purpose of aiding the Canadian delegates with the influence and strength of the British government so as to secure a fair treatment of the question with the American representatives. I am not at liberty to say to what degree the Anglo-American commission had progressed in their work; but this I am at liberty to state, that after they had sat for six months——

Mr. COCHRANE. We know pretty near.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, hon. gentlemen opposite must acknowledge that I am pretty free in my talk with the government, as a rule, especially for the last two years. Therefore in saying this it is not at all with the intention of flattering the government. Hon. gentlemen can easily understand that when thirteen or fifteen subjects, which were afterwards swelled to some seventeen subjects, were submitted to the commission, it was at least possible that an understanding could have been reached on ten or twelve of those subjects, without an understanding being arrived on the two or three last ones. Therefore it is very possible that, though the apparent result of the commission has been nil, a good deal of work was done nevertheless. In fact I may repeat after what the Prime Minister told us the next year after the adjournment of the commission, that a good deal of work had been done, that the negotiations had been fruitfully conducted until the Alaska boundary question came up and proved the stumbling block which interrupted the work of the commission.

But what happened after that ? One of the Canadian ministers, who was on that occasion one of the British plenipotentiaries, the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davies, went to London and passed three months there. For what purpose ? He was candid enough to tell us when he came back from England that after the Anglo-American commission had sat for six months, after they were supposed to have had at their back the influence of the British government, he, Sir Louis Davies, was obliged to pass three months in London to convince Mr. Chamberlain's officials that they should not side with the American government, but with us. Sir, I think that was a most unfortunate statement, but I think it was just as well that it should have been made. It is true that it made known to the public of the United States that in dealing with the government of Canada they were not dealing with the British authorities. But it is just as well that the public of the United States and the public of Canada should know that while profuse compliments were being paid to us in the newspapers of Great Britain, and by the speeches of public men in the British parliament, still, when it came to the point of helping the Canadian cause, the British officials sided with a foreign government. It is just as well we should know this, and that we should have it from a high authority, because if you only learned it from myself, no doubt the very loyal gentlemen who are representing here the most loyal element of our population, would say : 'Oh, this is only the Fenian talk of Bourassa !' But we know it from a gentleman who was a representative of the British government, and a representative of the Canadian government; and we have it now confirmed by the further fact that the British government has sacrificed us in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

Another member of the Canadian government, the late Minister of Justice, Hon. David Mills, published in the British press two very valuable articles stating that in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty Great Britain had acknowledged and secured rights on the continent of America, that those rights she could not sacrifice for the sake of her own honour ; and more than that, if she had any consideration whatever for her Canadian subjects she had no right to abandon one iota of that treaty without at least securing to the Canadian people the acknowledgement of their rights in the Alaska boundary. Great compliments were paid to those articles. The London 'Times' and the whole of the British press, I may say, thought Mr. Mills's statement of the case was a most excellent one, but, again, as on the embargo question, as on the question of immigration, and I may say, as upon every question with which we have had to deal where Great Britain had to side either for or against us, we were given compliments but no acts. Compliments were paid to the articles of Mr. David Mills, but eight days afterwards the rights of Great Britain were sacrificed and the rights of Canada were not given any consideration. I do not blame the government for not bringing the corres-

pondence before the House and the country. No doubt as long as the question is a question we cannot have the correspondence, but when will the question be closed? Are we going to be told year after year that negotiations are still going on? Negotiations may go on for a long while. The American government have no interest in settling negotiations. They hold Canadian territory. They have everything they want. It is not the interest of the American government to close negotiations or bring them to a satisfactory termination. It is not for the interest of the British government because, in this case as in the case of the Alabama claims and in the Trent affair, in this case as in all past cases, the British government will side like providence with the big battalions. Unless the influence of the British government is exerted to protect Canada we may be sure that we will never see that correspondence. I am ready to withdraw my motion, but I would not have withdrawn it without speaking my mind clearly upon the matter. In this matter I am not expressing only my own mind, or only the minds of those who may be opposed to the British government or to Canadian policy towards the British government, but I may say that the Ottawa 'Citizen,' the leading organ of the Tory party in the capital of Canada, published one of the strongest articles possible when it was announced that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty had been repealed. It said that when the American nation was a small growing nation the British press and public were always talking of it in a paternal, supercilious way, but the moment the American nation became a big nation, Great Britain was grovelling and humiliating herself and trying to do everything at the expense of Canada for that country. The next day another article was published in the same newspaper saying that since 1813 there was not one case in which the British government had not sacrificed Canadian interests in favour of American interests. I leave it to gentlemen who think we should do so much to prove our love for the British empire to say whether it is not about time that we should have other evidence besides that of the love of the British newspapers, and British speeches,—whether we should not have a little practical love and be considered as having rights that should not be sacrificed on every occasion for the benefit of the United States.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would not be drawn into a discussion, at this moment, of the question that is involved, not in the motion, but in the speech of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). If he is not satisfied with the condition of the negotiations which have not resulted in a treaty in regard to the Alaskan boundary and which have resulted in an arrangement in regard to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, he is quite within his rights in bringing in any motion he pleases of censure on the British or Canadian government, but, on the question of the production of papers, what I have told him about the papers I repeat, that the papers cannot be brought down for the simple and obvious reason that the negotiations are still pending. The speech of the hon. gentleman is, to say the least, out of place. I am not, more than the hon. gentleman, an admirer of British policy on the continent of America. We have heard it before and for my part I am sorry to say that in many cases Canadians have believed that they have not got their fair due in the past perhaps, but while I make no bones at all about this question and while I am quite free to give my own opinion on this question, I hope we have not come to this that we want Great Britain to go to war with the United States, if, may be, negotiations are continued a little longer than we wish them to be on a matter of long-pending difficulty. We want to preserve good relations with our friends and neighbours to the south of us even though on some occasions our patience is sorely tried. I am sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) would be the last man to suggest that the British government should act like Mr. Kruger and send an ultimatum to the United States. We want to exhaust all means of finding a solution of our difficulties and we do not want to have difficulties with our neighbours. I believe the House will agree with me that we will do better to wait for a few months, or if need be one or two years and try to secure a peaceable settlement of that long-pending question. I am sorry that matters have been so long delayed as they have been, but at all events, it is preferable, and I think I am speaking the sense of the House when I say that we should endeavour to have a practical and peaceable solution of this difficulty. The negotiations are still pending. I hope that before the House prorogues I may perhaps, make a statement to the House on the question because I may say that the question has been engaging the attention of the British government and of the Canadian government as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as it is necessary to preserve friendly relations with the United States no one has any fault to find with what the right hon. the leader of the government (Rt. Hon Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said, but there is this to be observed that the settlement of the Alaskan boundary may be postponed for an indefinite period. The government has been dealing with this question for some three or four years now and since this time last year the right hon. gentleman informs us that not the slightest progress has been made. That position of affairs may continue for ten, fifteen or twenty years. During the whole of that time as has been pointed out, the people of the United States are in occu-

pation of territory which we think belongs to Canada and the simple question is whether or not, during all the time that this matter may remain unsettled without negotiations really being continued at all, we are to be kept out of possession of the papers relating to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. My right hon. friend will see that this is an extraordinary condition of affairs. I do not fully sympathize with everything that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has said, here, to-day, but I do see a great deal of force in the suggestion which he has made. Suppose that negotiations are nominally continued but nothing is done from year to year. My right hon. friend, or whoever happens to be the leader of the government comes down and says: Nothing has been done; we cannot get anything done. The government of the United States refuses to submit this question to arbitration and so long as it refuses to do that there would be a dead lock in regard to it. During all this doubtful future period are we to be kept out of the papers relating to a treaty which has been abrogated and relating to a transaction which has been closed? I can recognize the difficulty which the right hon. gentleman has mentioned that possibly the correspondence which has taken place in regard to this matter may include references to the settlement of the Alaskan boundary, but I do not see any difficulties in eliminating from the correspondence that portion which relates to the Alaskan boundary and laying before the House the portion which relates solely and exclusively to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques-Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I venture to suggest to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), if he deems it necessary, to withdraw the latter part of his motion in regard to the settlement of the Alaskan boundary. We have, in the statement of the hon. gentleman, some very important admissions. We have the admission that the commission, if I understand him rightly, endeavoured vainly to have the matter of the Alaskan boundary referred to some outside authority for decision.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MONK. We have that admission, and under these circumstances, the commission having failed to obtain that reference, I do not see why the hon. gentleman has not the right to insist upon the correspondence which has passed between the two governments after the commission had ceased to sit, being brought down. It seems to me a logical and proper demand to make. If after that time, correspondence took place between the governments, surely we are entitled to have this correspondence. We should have it. Having that admission from my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) it seems to me that we are clearly entitled to have the correspondence which had reference to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. That is a settled matter; it is a finished matter. I have no doubt that in the British House of Commons that correspondence will be obtained without any difficulty whatever. If the hon. gentleman wishes to withdraw a portion of his motion, I beg of him to leave in that part which calls for the correspondence referring to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. I, for one, wish to see that correspondence, and I do not think that the motion referring to it should be abandoned upon such illogical grounds.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). Mr. Speaker. I have never agreed with a single word that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has uttered in this House either last year or this, until to-day. In fact he has stabbed me to the heart on many occasions as he has stabbed every right thinking loyal British subject in this country. Perhaps my language is strong, but at all events I wanted to make this statement on several occasions last session. I wish to say now, that this subject must be treated during this session in a more substantial manner. It is the most important subject that is to-day before the people of Canada. I was glad to hear the Prime Minister criticise the course of the English government. I am an Imperialist after the strictest sect of the Imperialists, but I want to disassociate the conduct of the Imperial government for sixty years from the conduct of the people of the empire, who would always have defended the government in maintaining their rights even at the expense of war. There is enough loyalty and national feeling in this country to have carried us safely over those disastrous negotiations which we have always had with the United States. But we have always found ourselves in the position that the British government has sold out the interests of the people of Canada, for what they supposed to be Imperial interests. I say that it would have paid the empire a thousand times, to have fought the question out, and I say that as a Canadian, knowing well that the field of battle would be on Canadian soil. But, Sir, I will go into the trenches and take my wife and family with me and stay there for two years if need be to fight for the rights of Canada. I will stay in the trenches to fight the men who refuse to treat the people of Canada honestly. The day has gone by I hope when there is a cowardly Canadian on the soil of this country. The older men of this House may fear war, but I think that the younger generation of this country are not frightened of war. I will face the problem of war to-morrow rather than feel my spirits crushed by cowardly concessions. The spirit of manhood is more to me than cowardly concessions for the sake of peace.

From 1830 to the day of the Fashoda, we had nothing all over the world but a series of the most disastrous humiliations, and it got so that no true Englishman would dare take up his paper at the breakfast table, without fearing to read of a cowardly concession in some quarter of the world that would make him blush. Old Gladstone gave away the whole empire of Africa. We would have had every square mile of Africa if the English government had not been cowardly. It is time for this House of Commons of Canada to speak out. I claim that hereafter, we in Canada will have as much right to discuss the foreign policy of England as have the men gathered in the House of Commons of England. What right have these people gathered around the steps of the Throne to have any more say than we have here in the discussion of the foreign policy of England. I trust that in ten years the House of Commons of Africa, which I hope to see established, and the House of Commons of Australia, and the House of Commons of Canada; the three speaking together will control the little blockheads that sit in the great hall of St. Stephens when they go wrong. I heard a story a few days ago explaining why it was we had such stupidity in the Commons of England. They say men are examined before they are nominated to a seat in the English House of Commons to see that incipient imbecility is thoroughly well established, and unless it is, they cannot be elected. I claim for the House of Commons of Canada a more intelligent grip of foreign affairs affecting the empire than they have in England to-day.

What we want now is a full discussion in this House so that this ministry will know that the time has come when if they sacrifice one foot of Canada soil we will hang them as high as Haman. If it is necessary to fight the Yankees we will fight them within twenty-four hours, and after six months we will capture their capital and annex their country to Canada.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have a slight correction to make in what was said by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. member has a right to speak. He has already spoken twice on the question.

Mr. BOURASSA. It is just a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has the right to make a personal explanation, but he just stated that he wished to make a correction.

Mr. BOURASSA. It is an explanation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) said that I admitted that the commission had not secured the submission of the Alaskan boundary question. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the Prime Minister said that two years ago. I cannot consent to separate the motion in the manner suggested by the hon. gentleman, because I am sure of one thing, and that is that if there is correspondence relating to the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, it cannot be only in connection with the Alaskan boundary. It may be that I will bring up the matter in another form before the session ends.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). The remarks of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier are perfectly proper. This treaty has been abrogated for some time past. We have had the opinion of the late Minister of Justice published in the newspapers, and spoken of in the highest terms by the 'London Times' and other papers in the centre of the empire, in which he states that this treaty should not be abrogated until there was a settlement of all the questions pending between the United States and Great Britain, and especially this very question affecting Canada. Surely we have the right to see that our representations on that question were properly put before the Imperial authorities, before this treaty was abrogated, especially when we have the statements of the member for Labelle, who is the secretary of that commission, appointed by the Imperial authorities with the consent of the government of Canada, that Great Britain opposed our efforts to have the settlement of the Alaskan boundary question placed before that commission. This is the astounding statement made in this House of Commons, and yet it is made on the authority of the secretary of that commission.

Mr. BOURASSA. The statement was made by Sir Louis Davies, one of the plenipotentiaries.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The statement is made on the floor of this House to-day by the secretary of the commission, who has an Imperial appointment in his pocket. We have at least the right to get a statement from the government of this country and from the right hon. Prime Minister, as to whether there is any truth in such an extraordinary statement as that. It is at all events a very sound reason why we should have all the correspondence in reference to this question, and every document in connection with it placed before the people of this country, so that we may not be forced to depend on ex parte statements. We should at all events have a denial, or if necessary an affirmation of the statement made here, with reference to the conduct of the Imperial authorities in this matter.

Motion (Mr. Bourassa) withdrawn.

THE CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox) moved for:

Return showing the names and number of men employed on the 200 acres set apart at the Cen-

tral Experimental Farm, Ottawa, as a farm proper to be handled as farm, that is, as any farmer's farm might be handled ; mentioned in the evidence of J. H. Grisdale, Esq., given Thursday, April 11th, 1901, at the morning session of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. The number of employees and the wages paid to each employee. The total crop of various kinds grown on said 200 acres, and the amount said total crop was sold for.

The PRIME MINISTER. Stand.

Mr. WILSON. I do not propose to discuss this question now. I only move for information.

The PRIME MINISTER. I understood the hon. gentleman to ask that this motion should stand. If he wants to move it now, there is no objection.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copy of all papers and correspondence relating to the Coronation of His Majesty the King ; the Imperial Conference which is to be held in London, and the appointment of Canadian delegates to the same.—Mr. Bourassa.

Return showing :—

1. The amount of money spent each year from June 30th, 1891, to June 30th, 1901, on immigration.

2. The number of immigrants reported each year to have settled each year in the Dominion of Canada during the ten (10) years from 1891 to 1901, and the total for the ten years.

3. The number of immigrant agents employed by the Dominion government each year in Great Britain and Ireland from 1891 to 1901, and the total amount paid each year to the said agents, and the amount spent each year for printing and other expenses by the said agents.

4. The number of immigrant agents employed by the Dominion government each year in the continent of Europe from 1891 to 1901, and the total amount paid each year to the said agents ; and amount spent each year for printing and other expenses by the said agents.

5. The number of immigrant agents employed by the Dominion government each year in the United States of America from 1891 to 1901 ; and the total amount paid each year to the said agents ; and amounts spent each year for printing and other expenses by the said agents ; and by the government of the Dominion of Canada. —Mr. Wilson.

Return showing :—

1. The names of all employees in the post office at Belleville, Ontario, on June 30th, 1896, together with the age of each, date of entry in the service, and the salary of each on the said date.

2. The number of employees dismissed from the Belleville post office since June 30th, 1896, with cause and date of dismissal.

3. The number of employees superannuated, the date of their superannuation, reason for their superannuation, how much superannuation allowance has been allowed to each ; giving the names of all said employees so superannuated who have asked to be superannuated.

4. The number of employees employed in the Belleville post office on first January, 1902 ; what were their names and the age and salary of each employee on said date, and date of appointment.—Mr. Wilson.

For correspondence between the department of the Interior or the Minister of the Interior, and Mr. C. R. Devlin, with reference to a letter that appeared in 'United Canada' on the 11th May, 1901, and a letter that appeared in the 'Montreal Hearld' on 18th May, 1901 ; in both of said letters Mr. C. R. Devlin made certain statements regarding members of this House.—Mr. Wilson.

Copies of all letters, telegrams and other correspondence between the governments of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, or any members thereof, respecting trade transportation, cable and other subjects of intercolonial concern.—Mr. Campbell.

Copy of all correspondence, petitions, Orders in Council, and any and all documents in connection with the demands of the Provincial Legislature with regard to the school lands in Manitoba ; moneys derived from sales thereof, together with interest accrued thereon.—Mr. LaRivière.

1. Copies of all applications for any portion of the ground covered by the Matson Concession (so-called), or Lease No. 9, in the Yukon district.

2. Copies of all applications for any portion of the ground covered by the Doyle Concession (so-called), in the Yukon district.

3. Copies of all applications for any portion of the ground covered by the Bronson & Ray Concession, in the Yukon district.

4. A memorandum showing the date on which the application in the Bronson & Ray Concession was granted.

5. Copy of the application for all lay-overs in all these cases.

6. Copies of Orders in Council or other authority under which the Minister of the Interior granted any lay-over in these cases ; and copy of the material, reports or other evidence upon which such lay-overs were granted.

7. A description of the Boyle Concession and a map of same.

8. Copy of the application for Boyle Concession.

9. The exact terms of the application in the case of the Milne Concession.

10. The dates on which this application was made and granted.

11. Map showing ground covered.

12. The date when the application for the Slavin & Gates Concession was made and filed.

13. Copy of Green's original map, with copy of field notes attached in the case of the Slavin & Gates Concession.

14. Copy of telegram from the Deputy Minister of Interior to E. C. Senkler as to the boundaries of this concession, dated on or about the 5th June, 1891.—Mr. Taylor.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—INTERNAL ECONOMY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) delivered a message from His Excellency The Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :—

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved Minute of Council, appointing the Honourable Sir Richard Cart-

wright, G.C.M.G., Minister of Trade and Commerce ; the Honourable William Stevens Fielding, Minister of Finance ; the Honourable Joseph Israel Tarte, Minister of Public Works ; and the Honourable James Sutherland, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 13th Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled : "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

Government House,
Ottawa, 18th February, 1902.

ADJOURNMENT—MINISTERIAL EXPLANATION.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the House adjourns I would remind my right hon. friend that the explanations usually given when changes are made in the cabinet have not yet been forthcoming. We have been in daily expectation of hearing the right hon. gentleman explain the reasons for these changes, and particularly why the well known meritorious claims of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) have again been overlooked. If the right hon. gentleman will be good enough to give us these explanations now or at some early day, we shall receive them with great interest. We would also like to know whether the changes made are likely to result in any change in the policy of the government.

I would like also to say to the right hon. gentleman that I propose bringing to his attention in the House, on the first occasion that offers, the advisability of our passing some resolution regarding the baseless charges which have been made against the British forces in South Africa. I simply mention this now in order that the right hon. gentleman may take it into consideration, and will take another opportunity to urge, if necessary, the reasons why a resolution of this kind is advisable. I believe that such a resolution can be so framed as to receive the unanimous support of this House and would be most happy to co-operate with the right hon. gentleman in the matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. I shall take an early opportunity of gratifying the rather fastidious curiosity of my hon. friend with regard to the changes in the cabinet. So far as my information goes, those explanations are only given when changes are made that involve a change of policy, as for instance when a member of the cabinet withdraws because of a difference of opinion between him and his colleagues. Nevertheless I shall waive all technical objections and take the very next opportunity to give my hon. friend the information he desires.

With regard to the other matter which my hon. friend has mentioned, I would simply observe that in matters on which it is desirable that we should take unanimous

action, it has always been customary for the leader of the opposition, so far, at all events, as my own experience goes, to bring them privately to the attention of the First Minister before making reference to them in the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 4.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 20, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

GERMAN DUTIES ON IMPORTS FROM CANADA.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

What discriminating duties does Germany now impose upon the following Canadian imports, viz.: Apples, butter, barley, beans, buckwheat, clover seed, oats, pease, rye, wheat and agricultural implements ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I think the expression 'discriminating duties' in the question is apt to be misleading. I do not think it would be correct to state that there are discriminating duties in Germany against Canadian products. Germany has two tariffs ; one of a favoured character which is extended to countries having treaties with Germany ; the other applies to the countries with which Germany has no treaties. Canada having no treaty with Germany, her goods are made subject to the higher tariff, but there is no specific discrimination against Canada.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I be allowed to say that about two years ago——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I beg to move the adjournment of the House. About two years ago the same question was asked by the Hon. Mr. Foster, then a member of this House, in exactly the same words, and it was answered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I thought that was a good precedent, and I adopted the same words for that reason, thinking the Minister of Finance would give me an answer as the Minister of Trade and Commerce answered the same question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have answered the question of my hon. friend. I say that there is no discrimination against Canada, but Canada having no treaty with Germany, our goods are subject to the higher tariff. I did not refuse to answer the question.

Mr. HENDERSON. The conditions are the same now as they were at the time the question was asked before, and I simply took that as a precedent, and thought the

question would be answered in the same way. I beg to withdraw the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no motion made, and I would respectfully ask honourable members not to move the adjournment for such purposes, because any question may be brought up on a motion to go into Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend wants to ascertain the two scales of duties on the specified articles, I will get the information for him.

PRINTING OF BALLOTS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Casgrain—asked :

1. By whom were the ballots used in the last election of St. James Division, Montreal, printed ?
2. How many ballots were printed for said election ?
3. What was the cost of said printing ?
4. Why were not said ballots printed at the government Printing Bureau ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). To the first and fourth questions, the answer is that the ballots were first printed at the Printing Bureau according to the form prescribed by the statute, a copy of which I now lay upon the Table of the House. The ballots so printed were sent to the returning officer, with the particulars—the names of the candidates, etc.—left to be printed at the local printing office. In this case the particulars were printed at the office of 'La Patrie.' The cost was $19.25. The number of ballots so sent for St. James division was 11,000.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Casgrain—asked :

1. By whom were the ballots used in the last Laval election printed ?
2. How many ballots were printed for said election ?
3. What was the cost of printing said ballots ?
4. What is the total number of persons employed at the government Printing Bureau ?
5. How many have been dismissed since 1st January, 1901 ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The answer is similar to that given to the previous question. The ballots were first printed at the Printing Bureau, and were then sent to the returning officer with the particulars left to be printed at a local printing office. In the case of Laval 6,000 were sent. I think the number of electors there is about 5,000. The local particulars were also printed at the office of 'La Patrie.' I have not yet the information as to the cost. The number of employees in the Printing Bureau is 440. None have been dismissed since Jan. 1, 1901, but 26 have been suspended.

TELEGRAPH LINES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Casgrain—asked :

1. What is the total amount expended by the government on telegraph lines in British Columbia and the Territories since the 1st September, 1896, up to the present time ?
2. What proportion of this total amount has been expended under contract and tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Hon. J. I. Tarte). If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to make a motion, the whole statement will be brought down.

PAYMENT TO NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Casgrain—asked :

1. What is the total amount paid by the government to the Montreal 'Herald' newspaper since the 15th July, 1896, up to the present date?
2. What is the total amount paid by the government to the Toronto 'Globe' during the same period ?
3. What is the total amount paid by the government to the Halifax 'Chronicle' during the same period ?
4. What is the total amount paid by the government to 'Le Soleil' of Quebec during the same period ?
5. What is the total amount expended by the government in the relief of distressed Canadians abroad during the same period ?
6. Why is not the entire government printing done at the government Printing Bureau ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The information relating to questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 is already before the House, and will be found in the Auditor General's reports for the several years, the items being particularly mentioned. In answer to question 5, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior will be able to give the information, he hopes, to-morrow. To question 6, it is not always possible for the Bureau to do the work required by the government promptly, and therefore a portion of it has to be sent outside.

EMPLOYMENT OF OSCAR BEAUCHAMP.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Is Oscar Beauchamp in the employ of the government, and what position does he hold at St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary ?
2. When was he appointed to such position ?
3. On what recommendation has he been appointed ?
4. Is the government aware that Oscar Beauchamp, deputy warden of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, was one of the most active organizers of the last election in Laval, in favour of Charles A. Wilson, one of the candidates ?
5. Has the government been informed that the same Oscar Beauchamp organized public meetings in favour of one of the candidates in the said election ?
6. What attitude does the government purpose taking in regard to public employees who take active part in a Federal election ?
7. Have the employees of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary the right and permission to make use of the government horses and vehicles for the purpose of political organization in a Federal election ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick) :

1. Oscar Beauchamp is deputy warden of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. He was appointed on the 21st February, 1899, on the

recommendation of the then Minister of Justice. To the fourth and fifth, I say no. With respect to the 6th and 7th, certain vicious practices had crept into St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary previous to 1896, and we have done our best to suppress them, and I hope we shall be able to do so in the near future.

PHYSICIAN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Has the government appointed a successor to the late Dr. Fortier as physician of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary ?
2. If so, who has been appointed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick) :

1. Yes.
2. Dr. Adolphe Allaire.

POSTMASTER OF ST. JEROME.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Who is the postmaster of St. Jérome, county of Terrebonne ?
2. Has the government been informed that Daniel Longpré, postmaster of St. Jérome, during the last election, remained actively working in favour of Charles C. Wilson, one of the candidates, in the county of Laval ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). The answer to the first question is Dr. Daniel Longpré. The government has not been informed that Daniel Longpré, postmaster at St. Jérôme, during the last election, remained actively working in favour of Charles C. Wilson, one of the candidates in the county of Laval.

ST VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY COAL SUPPLIES.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Who is, or who are, the coal supplier or suppliers to St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary during the year 1901 and 1902 ?
2. What amount of coal has been purchased for that institution from the 1st of April, 1901, from each of the suppliers ?
3. What prices have been paid for each kind of coal purchased ?
4. Were public tenders called for ? If so, in what newspapers and at what dates were they published ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick) :

1. E. Cavanagh & Co., contractors for hard coal ; T. F. Moore & Co., for soft coal ; A. Baile, for coal screenings.

2. No coal was purchased between April 1st and June 30, 1901. The following quantities have since been purchased :—E. Cavanagh & Co., 1,350 tons ; T. F. Moore & Co., 1,053 tons; A. Baile, 825 tons.

3. Furnace coal, $5.53 per ton ; egg coal, $5.66 per ton ; stove coal, $5.89 per ton ; soft coal, $4.33 per ton ; soft coal screenings, $3.70 per ton.

4. Public tenders were called for. The advertisement inviting tenders was inserted in the following papers published in the province of Quebec :—Montreal—'Herald,' 'La Patrie,' 'Witness,' 'Shareholder' ; Quebec—'Le Soleil,' 'Telegraph'. Sherbrooke—'Le Progres.' St. Hyacinthe—'L'Union.' 'La Tribune.' Three Rivers—'L'Etoile.' Arthabaskaville — 'L'Union.' The advertisement was issued by the King's Printer on May 31st, 1901, but the department is not aware of the exact dates on which the advertisement was published in the several newspapers.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the year 1901 ; also Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the same year.—Hon. Clifford Sifton.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND COMMUNICATION.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (East Prince) moved for :

Copies of all petitions, letters, telegrams or correspondence of any kind during the past year between the Board of Trade of Charlottetown and Summerside, Prince Edward Island, and the Ministr of Marine and Fisheries, or any member of the government, with reference to the placing of the winter steamer 'Stanley' upon the route between Summerside, Prince Edward Island, and Cape Tormentine, New Brunswick.

He said : Last year I brought this matter before the House and took occasion to point out the obligation which the Dominion is under to keep up steam communication at all times of the year between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and the unsatisfactory manner in which that obligation is performed. I also pointed out that the shortest and safest route both for passengers and freight was between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, and that the steamer 'Stanley,' which was then lying at Georgetown at the disposal of the government, should be put on that route in order to ascertain its practicability. Some of the men most experienced in navigating through the ice in our province were confident that this route was very practicable, but the test was continually postponed on untenable excuses. The piers were not in repair, although the Department of Public Works had ample time to put them in condition, and had promised to do so. At all events the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not take any action apparently on account of local prejudices, with which he was shackled and to preserve his eastern support, but now we have a new Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), who is apparently actuated by a desire to have the best route between the island and the mainland put to a proper test. He has had the 'Stanley' put on this route, and the result has been eminently

satisfactory, in spite of the obstacles thrown in the way of giving the route a fair and impartial trial.

I have in my hand a copy of a letter addressed to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries by the Summerside board of trade, which I propose to read to the House :

February 13th, 1902.

Hon. James Sutherland,
Minister, Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir :—After patiently watching the operations of the 'Stanley' on the Summerside—Cape Tormentine route, we are compelled to enter a protest against the manner in which, the intentions of your department are being carried out.

From the first it has been glaringly apparent that the heart of the captain and of the entire crew, has been averse to the success of the test of this winter route.

Without going into a detailed history of the working of the ship from the first, we beg to submit a few of the more recent incidents. It has been claimed that a cordon of ice had formed near the outer edge of the harbour board ice by a strong westerly gale a few days previously, through which Capt. Brown claimed it was almost impossible to put the steamer.

On Tuesday, 4th inst., some 60 or 70 men accompanied the ship—sent out by the board of trade—with the intention of cutting through the cordon. The steamer went out at an exceedingly rapid rate, taking about thirty minutes to get through a cut of about 3½ miles. The men worked where directed by the officers of the ship, for about three hours, when the steamer was backed up avoiding the cutting made, and went through by another way without assistance and without much difficulty ; she returned the same evening without going to the edge of the board ice.

On Wednesday, 5th, again accompanied by 25 men she went out rapidly to the place she left the previous evening ; she was run into heavy ice and stuck. The first officer directed the men to clear away the ice from the bows, which, from the experience of the day before, the men protested against doing, but a captain of the ice-boat service—who was a passenger—indicated another route. The latter route was bushed and the steamer went through it into open water without further difficulty, showing conclusively, that the steamer, properly managed, could have been put through this cordon without any outside assistance.

Having got through into open water at one p.m., instead of proceeding on her voyage to Cape Tormentine, which she could have done quite easily, and where she could have reached without difficulty, she proceeded to within two miles of Carleton Head, island side, with a clear lead of water four miles ahead and two miles wide, turned and came back to Summerside, arriving at four o'clock, p.m. It will be observed that the steamer was more than half way to her destination, returning thence to Summerside in less than two hours when she could have reached her destination in much less time.

On Thursday, 6th, she left Summerside at 7 a.m., and instead of going through her cut as rapidly as she did on the two previous days, when the men who were sent out to assist, were on board and as she did on the previous evening when returning, she took three hours in making the distance to the board ice. No condition of weather obtained to account for this difference; and had she gone this morning as she did on previous days,—and as we are satisfied she could have done—she could have reached Cape Tormentine quite easily and returned that day. Instead, she only succeeded in going about half the distance when it commenced to snow, when she returned to the board ice where she remained until the following morning.

Instead of getting away next (Friday) morning at 7 o'clock as she should have done, and made the trip while the weather was clear, she delayed till 9 o'clock a.m., before leaving, with the result that she again met thick weather and did not cross till the next day, Saturday, when she reached Tormentine at about mid-day. She lay at Tormentine till Monday morning, 10th, when she returned to Summerside ; since when and up to this writing, even worse manipulation has been going on. For instance, on Wednesday, 12th, she left here at 7 a.m., arriving at Tormentine at 11.15 a.m., with only two cars of freight to discharge,—one to take in. And notwithstanding the most favourable conditions, she lay there all night.

On Tuesday, 11th,—the finest day of the winter—she lay at the wharf at Summerside making no attempt to effect a crossing. And so it has been from first to last, with other instances even more glaring than those related. In addition to this we have to say, that the captain's language in the presence and hearing of passengers has been such as to call forth indignant protests on their part.

It is just possible that these difficulties have arisen through the captain's age and consequent timidity, which last characteristic appears to be most pronounced. We have also, good cause to believe that the agent of the department at Charlottetown is aiding and abetting, if not directing, the captain in the adverse manipulations of this ship. In a word, the whole course of this test has been, and is known to have been, a farce, which we respectfully ask the department to investigate and amend.

To avoid a repetition of the difficulties complained of, we would suggest, that with the captain—or with another captain, if the department sees fit to displace the present officer,—an experienced ice-boat captain be employed by the department to act as an ice pilot.

We have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servants,

D. H. CURRIE,

On behalf of Council, Summerside Board of Trade.

This document contains specific charges against the officials of this boat, and implicates also the agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Charlottetown. It is a direct impeachment of the captain—one that calls for an immediate investigation. If the captain of the 'Stanley' is too old or too timid, he should be discharged and a younger and more capable man put in his place. There are certainly other men competent to take charge of the boat. If, on the other hand, he is acting under the advice of the agent in Charlottetown, who appears to be of too vacillating a nature and incompetent to direct the operations, the sooner that official is removed the better. All we ask is that the test, which the people of Prince Edward Island have been for years

calling for, should be given every assistance by the department. So far it has proved successful, and should not be further hampered by any incapacity on the part of the officers or agent of the department.

There is another cause also which operates against the complete success of this route. Although the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been apparently doing everything possible on his part and is evidently not cognizant of the actions of the officers of his department or of the 'Stanley,' he evidently has not the co-operation of the Post Office Department. We find that when this boat was put on the route and was making daily trips, carrying passengers and mails, private individuals, on two different occasions, had to hire special trains to carry passengers and mails from Summerside to Charlottetown. This is a condition of affairs which should not be allowed to exist in this twentieth century. Every facility should be given for the transmission of passengers and mails, and such neglect on the part of the government should meet with prompt condemnation. We were promised a dredge at Tormentine last year to facilitate the landing of freight from the 'Stanley.' And, notwithstanding the promise which was, as I believe, made by the department, the dredge was taken down and was kept at work practically doing nothing all summer, in the locality of Murray Harbour. All I wish to say further is that, the superiority of this route being established, it seems too bad that the intention of one department should miscarry by the non-co-operation of other departments. I would respectfully ask the Minister of Public Works to do all in his power to put the pier at Cape Tormentine in proper condition before next season. I would also ask the Postmaster General to see to it that we have train communication along with the boat. Since the mail has been transferred, as it has been during the past week, when the Str. 'Minto' was fast in the ice, I notice we are getting our mails more regularly and the steamer is making more regular trips, showing that, when the department takes hold of the matter, owing to the necessity of transporting the mail, the officers are ready and willing to perform their duty. I conclude my remarks by asking the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to investigate this matter at the earliest possible moment and have it put to rights.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince, P.E.I.) I desire to make only an observation or two in support of what has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey). This question has been brought to the attention of this hon. House many times in the past. And it will be brought to the attention of the House many times again, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, so long as justice is not done to the people of Prince Edward Island.

Last year, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that time was absent in Prince Edward Island when the discussion of this subject came up. The two boats, the 'Minto' and the 'Stanley,' were blocked in the ice between Georgetown and Pictou, and the hon. gentleman, after coming here from Prince Edward Island, was obliged to admit that he had been imprisoned for twelve days in Prince Edward Island because the government steamers could not keep up communication with the mainland. In calling attention to these matters, we are not speaking solely in the interests of the people of Prince Edward Island, but in the interests of the people of Canada. For, the people of every province have large dealings with the people of Prince Edward Island, and immense quantities of manufactured goods and other merchandise from all parts of Canada are being sold in the island province. It is very necessary in the interests of all who engaged in or benefited by that trade that communication should be maintained in the winter as well as in the summer, as was guaranteed to the people of Prince Edward Island at Confederation. Sir, after this matter had been brought up last year, and after it had been admitted that communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland had not been maintained, what did the government do ? So clear was it that the terms of Confederation had not been fulfilled and that communication had not been maintained, that the government actually gave compensation to the extent of $30,000 a year to the people of Prince Edward Island for non-fulfilment of these terms. I believe that if both these boats had been kept on between Georgetown and Pictou, instead of having one running between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, communication would not be kept up constantly with the island. But if the advantages of the western route are recognized, and if these boats are efficiently managed, there need never be any occasion for further demand for compensation. The steamer was brought there at the urgent request of the people of Prince county. And I wish to say that I do not blame the hon. minister, for I believe that he has done his very best in this connection. He saw that there were two boats and that, in justice to the people of the western part of the province, one should be brought there to keep up communication. We have no fault to find with the hon. minister in this regard, but we do find fault with the captain of the boat and his officials. We were told last year that the 'Stanley' could not ply to Cape Tormentine, because there were not proper terminal facilities for handling the freight. Last year the government—I do not know which department—constructed there a good warehouse. I was surprised, when I last crossed from Summerside to Cape Tormentine, to find that that warehouse was packed with goods from every province intended for consignees in Prince Edward Island. But,

owing to the incompetence and neglect, and want of energy, of the captain of the boat, these goods remained in the warehouse for days before they could be transported to Prince Edward Island. I took occasion to travel by that boat. I am a strong advocate, as strong as my abilities will permit, of testing the western route. On Thursday, the 6th of February, I sought to cross from Prince Edward Island by that boat on my way to the Capital. We had a fine morning. The people of Summerside had turned out en masse the day before to cut through the cordon or ice bridge that had formed at the mouth of the harbour. We went that Thursday morning from the wharf to the outer edge of the cordon in about two or three hours. The captain made an attempt to push on to Cape Tormentine to land his passengers. He went about a mile or so outside the harbour into the straits of Northumberland, where there was nothing but floating ice alternating with great stretches of open water. Yet, the captain turned around, and in the evening we were at the mouth of Summerside harbour, after losing twenty-four hours of precious time. But I would like to remark that, whereas the usual time of leaving Summerside wharf is seven o'clock in the morning, on this second day, though the weather was fine and everything favourable for a start, the captain did not leave his berth until nine o'clock. On Friday we started again and made progress through the ice until within a few miles of Tormentine wharf when a snow storm came on and the captain returned again to Summerside harbour. If he had left in the morning at seven o'clock he would have landed the passengers at Cape Tormentine as he was required to do by his instructions; but after being in the Straits all of Friday, on the next Saturday afternoon he landed us at Cape Tormentine. I can assure the minister that this letter of the Summerside Board of Trade conveys to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the sentiment of the people of that section of the country, and of the people of Prince Edward Island generally. I can assure him also that this is not a party question. The Hon. R. C. McLeod, President of the Summerside Board of Trade, is one of the members of the Liberal government in the province of Prince Edward Island. The gentleman who wrote this communication, Mr. D. K. Currie of Summerside, is the editor of the 'Pioneer,' the government organ in that town. It is therefore not a party matter. It is simply a case of the people of the western end of the province standing up for their rights without any bias of party feeling. We are asserting our rights, we are asking what is only a matter of justice. As I said before, so far as the minister is concerned, there is not a word of complaint, but in connection with the captain and the officers of that boat there is great cause for complaint. I don't want to say here that the captain, using his judgment, was not perhaps correct, but I say that what has occurred, according to this memorandum of the Board of Trade to the minister, requires to be investigated. Let him ascertain whether it was owing to any want of energy, any want of push, or old age, or whether it was owing to any political influences surrounding him in the east end of the island. It is said that many people living at Charlottetown and at Georgetown are opposed to this western route. If it was any of these influences that I have mentioned which delayed the boat which was sent there for the purpose of making a thorough test of the navigation of that route, I say the matter should be investigated, and the men who were guilty of culpable neglect or worse, should be dismissed from the government service.

This may be the last for some years that you will hear of this matter, because I trust that the minister will act, having now proper facilities at Cape Tormentine. I am sorry to say that when it became known that the dredge 'Prince Edward,' used for dredging the harbours of Prince Edward Island and the neighbouring coast of New Brunswick, had been ordered to Cape Tormentine in connection with the opening up of the route there in order that the steamer 'Stanley' might lay alongside of the pier, then there was some political action by people living east about Murray harbour, people having political issues at stake, which took that dredge away from where she had been ordered by the department, for the purpose of advancing certain political interests in another direction. I say it was a mistake, more than that, it was wrong to take that dredge away because a few individuals in the eastern end of the province required her services in order to advance their political interests. All we want in the western part of Prince Edward Island is justice and fair play. That is all we require of this government. We may fight them hard, and we do fight them hard, and they fight us hard, but we do not want them to use the public money of this country for the purpose of advancing the political interests of the local government at the expense of the people of any section of this country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). I am sorry indeed that the hon. gentleman has yielded to the temptation once more of speaking of things that he does not seem to know much about. There is, as we all know, a place called Cape Tormentine, he should know all about it, and still he speaks of it as if he did not know anything about it. When we took office, there was a wharf there, a pier that had been built with material that the worms had eaten up almost entirely. The work could not hold together, as my hon. friend should know. We had to repair that work

at great cost. We could not repair it as fast as my hon. friend would have liked, perhaps, or would have done if he had had half a million dollars at his disposal. The work was badly built, we could not rebuild it, and we have been repairing it. It is not our fault that the condition of affairs exists there of which the hon. gentleman complains, it is the fault of those who built the pier, and my hon. friend should know it. He does know it, but of course he has exaggerated the evil and has made a false impression on the House. The work was badly built, and we could not rebuild it in a day or two. Nor can it be said that the dredge should have been sent there some time ago. Sir, there is in this country a very important island called Prince Edward; a dredge was set apart for the benefit of Prince Edward Island. There is also a place on Prince Edward Island called Summerside. When we took office there were no harbour works there. I have given a contract for the erection of harbour works, and my hon. friend, instead of giving credit to me, sacrifices me to the best of his ability, and tries to create a bad impression on the House against my department. In two words, the works at Cape Tormentine built by the former government were no good, they had been destroyed when we took office, and on this side of the island there were no works at all. We are now erecting these works, and the hon. gentleman is not pleased. Well, I cannot at the present time do anything more for him, except to invite him to exercise a little more moderation when he speaks of things for which his political friends in the past are to blame.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). There can be no objection to bringing down the papers moved for by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey). I must, however, express some regret at the feeling that has been exhibited by the members for the county in discussing the efforts of the captain, under the direction of the department, in endeavouring to find out whether it is practicable to have winter navigation between the points named. Remembering the discussions that have taken place in parliament in years past, and the manner in which this matter has been often pressed upon the attention, not only of the present government but of former governments, on representations made by the Board of Trade of Summerside, and having at our disposal the government boat 'Stanley' I thought it was better to make an earnest, businesslike and honest effort to see whether there was a practicable winter route betwen Summerside and Cape Tormentine. I took counsel with the committee of the board of trade, and I must say that I have discussed with them almost everything in connection with this matter, and accepted their suggestions in almost every respect. After deciding to go on with the trial, and giving instructions as to how it was to be carried on, the board of trade expressed their approval of everything that was done. I must admit that probably as the head of the department I went further than is usual in cases of this kind, because I recognized, and recognize now, that we were risking property, and perhaps the lives of the officers on the boat, and of the passengers that might be on that boat, by forcing the captain to take more risks than in his judgment he thought he should. However, as I said at the request of the members of the board of trade, and hearing what they had to say, and remembering the criticisms of the past, I have pressed upon the agent in the island, Mr. Lord, I think his name is, and the captain of this boat the great necessity of trying to remove any cause of criticism and fault finding with regard to the effort that was made.

My hon. friend, although representing that district, cannot help but know that there is something to be said on both sides and that while he may earnestly think that this route may be successfully navigated I may say that I only hope with him that it may be found to be so. There have been found in the past, and I am afraid in the present trial, great difficulties to contend with. In view of the criticisms that have been made of the representative of the department on the island and of the captain of the boat—I may say that the council of the board of trade, in the hon. gentleman's constituency spoke of the captain, who has been in charge, in the highest possible terms characterizing him as a man capable of undertaking the work and one in whose integrity they have every confidence. At their suggestion I took a pilot living, I think, in Summerside; at least a man who had been on that route for a great many years for a commercial company, so that it would give the greatest possible satisfaction to the people of the district to know that they had a man in charge in whom they had implict confidence and who was also familiar with every foot of the district, both land and water. Further than that I would like to take this opportunity of saying that I think my hon. friend is somewhat mistaken in regard to the feeling of the people of the eastern portion of the island, or of Charlottetown. When the matter was under discussion I received a resolution from the Board of Trade of Charlottetown, a competing port, I suppose, requesting that an effort should be made to find out whether winter navigation could be maintained or not; so that, officially, I have no reason to believe but that the people of that city and of that section of the island were in full sympathy with every effort which was being made. I am told that in the past certain little jealousies had existed, political and otherwise, but so far as I am concerned I can assure my hon. friend who

has spoken I have not the slightest intimation from any representative or individual, but what was favourable to going on with this work and making every possible effort to carry it out successfully. I think I may say to the House that I went just as far as it was possible for a minister taking the responsibility in giving instructions to the captain and officers of the boat to make every effort to carry out this work. I may briefly refer to the instructions given to the officers in charge. The agent was instructed to :—

Direct the captain to proceed to Summerside to be in readiness for beginning trips between Summerside and Cape Tormentine when the Steamer 'Northumberland' is withdrawn.

If I understand it the steamer 'Northumberland' is a boat belonging to a commercial line which does the work in the summer time and as soon as it is found to be dangerous on account of ice the government steamer would be ready to be put on this route.

It is the purpose of the department to keep up communication as far as possible by giving this new route a fair trial and every possible effort should be made by you consistent with the safety of the ship and mails, and the lives of the crew and passengers to keep the steamer running. The department will rely upon your discretion and judgment to make the experiment as successful as possible and also to determine whether the winter route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine is practicable.

I may say to the members from that locality and to the members of the board of trade who represented the citizens of the district and on whose representations I authorized this trial to be made, for fear that something might arise such as the hon. gentleman has referred to here to-day and because there would be differences of opinion, that I went to the length that in case of any difficulties being met with, before taking any action to stop the effort that was being made, the captain was instructed to consult with the hon. Mr. Yeo, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) and the members of the council and the board of trade. It reads here : 'The members of the Board of Trade of Summerside'. I thought it was the council only that I had in mind. If so, this instruction has gone farther than I intended ; therefore, he was to consult with the members of the board of trade before ceasing the effort that he was directed to make. He was also given full authority to wire the department under any circumstances. In conclusion I may say that so far as I am concerned and so far as the officers of the department were concerned, there was nothing suggested to be done by the representatives of the district but what was done and as evidence of that I have had letters, and I have a resolution passed by the people of the district, expressing great satisfaction that the action was taken and that the details of it were being carried out. Although I cannot agree with the criticisms that are being made of the captain to show that at least I am still honest and desirous of making every effort to have this work carried out I may state that yesterday I sent this telegram on the receipt of the letter to which the hon. gentleman referred.

Ottawa, 19th February, 1902.

Hon. R. C. McLeod,
Summerside, P. E. I.

I am in receipt of resolution from Summerside Board of Trade. The department has every confidence in Captain Brown's ability and integrity but I would be willing nevertheless to send down Captain McElhinney the nautical adviser of the department to advise with you if desired.

(Sgd.) JAMES SUTHERLAND.

I have gone futher ; I have asked them to suggest to me the name of any one with the technical knowledge necessary under these circumstances to take charge of the boat. If my hon. friend will suggest a man of character and ability to assist in carrying out this work to see whether or not there has been any lack on the part of the department or of the captain and officers of the boat, I would be only too glad as the head of the department to see that his suggestion is adopted and that every effort possible is made—I may add consistently with using reasonable judgment, and with considering the safety of property and of lives. I do not think that my hon. friend, or any other hon. gentleman, would ask me to insist upon the captain or the officers of the boat committing a useless reckless act. I have made inquiries and even from the members themselves I have the highest recommendations of the captain of the boat who is described as a man of ability and of character and I would be very sorry to know that there is any reason for feeling that he had not been making every effort in the direction in which he has been instructed to proceed. I have chosen I believe, an officer of standing, being at the head of this branch, a man who I am told is familiar with the locality and I believe every person—at least representative men in the island on both sides of politics—have every confidence in his integrity and ability in connection with this matter. Instead of stopping here, or admitting any defeat in the trial that we are making, I would be pleased to have him go down there and advise with the board of trade and with the members of the council in regard to this work. I have no objection to bringing down the papers in connection with the matter.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (East Prince, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I may just say for my own part and for my constituency that we have no intention of finding any fault with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) for the action he has taken in the matter, nor can any fault be found with the instructions he has given to the

agent of the department down there. Still the charges made might very well occur under these instructions without any fault of the minister. Whatever communication or conversation he had with members of the board of trade at the time the arrangement was made, this letter came to us from the board of trade and we were bound to take notice of it. The board of trade is a non-political body and it has for its president one of the members of the local government, which is Liberal. Coming with such strong protestations against the officers and the captain of the boat, we simply had to bring it to the notice of the minister that he might take action on it. For my own part, I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been doing all in his power, in the light of the knowledge at his command, in the interest of that route.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Statement in detail showing the quantity of vegetables imported from the United States and entered at the ports of Montreal and Toronto during the years 1900 and 1901 respectively, as well as of the amount of duties collected by the government of Canada during the said two years, at each one of the said ports.—Mr. Leonard.

Copies of all petitions, resolutions, letters, &c., addressed to the government in relation to an increase or a readjustment of the duties on vegetables, and of all replies sent by the government to said resolutions, petitions and letters.—Mr. Leonard.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Charges of management, $181,743.80.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The principle item of the increase in this vote is $10,000 for the printing of Dominion notes. That is due to the fact, as the House will readily understand, that the circulation of our Dominion notes is constantly expanding, and also to some extent to the fact that there is a demand on the part of gentlemen both inside and outside of parliament, that we shall supply more notes and cleaner notes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been criticism that the notes are not as good as they ought to be, and in order to do away with the necessity for that criticism we intend to try as far as possible to give a constant supply of new notes. That, together with the expansion of circulation, called for an increased appropriation.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the minister calling in old soiled notes as rapidly as possible?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. Perhaps I ought to explain that the banks can almost always obtain clean notes if they desire to issue them. I suppose it is a matter of opinion as at what stage a note becomes unfit for circulation. Some bankers would be very fastidious while others might not be so. Our rule is to supply clean notes whenever the others are returned to us. We intend to do that on a larger scale in the future than in the past, in order to meet the disposition of the public to have clean notes. I do not want to adopt the rule of the bank of England, which is that when a note is once issued and returned it never goes out again. I think we can meet the wishes of the people by a moderate extension of our present system.

Mr. HENDERSON. The action of the minister is very commendable, especially in view of the existence of small-pox throughout the country. I know that bankers are very much annoyed about the condition of these bills and they would prefer very much to have a frequent issue, instead of being compelled to handle these old musty notes which no doubt tend to spread disease.

Mr. SPROULE. They should disinfect them.

Mr. OSLER. I am glad to learn from the Minister of Finance that he proposes to expend more money in the printing of Dominion notes. I think he is rather out when he states that the government is always ready to supply the banks with clean notes. To my knowledge it is a most difficult matter to get from the Receiver General new $1 bills or any kind of $1 bills at all in some seasons of the year. It is almost impossible in Toronto to get a sufficient number of $1 bills to supply the every day requirements of the banks, and so they have to use the old bills over and over again. I am glad to see an increase in this item if it will result in giving a plentiful supply of fairly clean government notes of the smaller denominations.

Governor General's Secretary's Office, including A. F. Sladen at $1,700, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $10,740.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a slight increase, chiefly owing to the advancement of Mr. Sladen, who is virtually one of the Governor General's private secretaries. The other increases are $50 and $30 statutory increases to one clerk and one messenger.

Mr. SPROULE. You have an increase in this department of nearly $1,000—quite a respectable increase. There were increases last year and the previous year as well, so that you seem to be running it up pretty rapidly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think the number of the staff was increased, but one or two gentlemen in the office have been advanced, for reasons

which I think are satisfactory to the Governor General's secretary.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the reason for the clause, 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act?' Has he not passed his examination?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, but he could only be given a $50 increase by the usual method. This gives him a larger sum.

Office of the King's Privy Council of Canada, $31,240.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister explain the increase?

The PRIME MINISTER. A new chief clerk is appointed, Mr. F. K. Bennett. He is simply transferred from the first-class without any increase of salary. One junior second-class clerk is promoted to the second class. He now receives $1,000, being at the head of his class, and the change involves an increase to $1,100. There is an increase of $30 for a mesenger and the usual statutory increase of $50 for each of the others.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that you give the statutory increase of $50 in only a few instances.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is pretty generally given.

The PRIME MINISTER. So far as my department is concerned, I have found all my officers to be deserving of the statutory increase, and I have given it to all except one who was at the highest of his class, and I promoted him.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are you increasing the staff by appointing another first-class clerk?

The PRIME MINISTER. No. Mr. May, who is promoted, has been twenty years in the service. The number of officers is exactly the same as last year—twenty-three.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this Mr. Bennett the man who was engaged in the Post Office Department?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, he has been in the Privy Council office for twenty years.

The Department of the Secretary of State, including W. Foran at $1,400, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $38,510.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The increase is due to thirteen statutory increases of $50 each, one special increase to Mr. Foran of $100, and a statutory increase to a messenger of $30.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister explain why it is that the government appear now to have adopted the principle that not only are all the civil servants eligible for the statutory increase, but all are entitled to it, whereas in previous years it was repeatedly said that only those would get it who were recommended as specially deserving.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think the government has any different view as to the legal aspect of the case. We have been advised that as a matter of law or right, these gentlemen are not entitled to it. Its payment is discretionary, but the discretion is being exercised this year and last year more liberally than previously.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has every officer who has been reported by the deputy as entitled to the statutory increase got it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And only those who are reported get it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Except in one case, in which the name is specially mentioned.

The Department of Public Printing and Stationery, $30,300.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The increase is explained by thirteen statutory increases at $50, one promotion, which adds $100, and two $30 increases to messengers.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Who is the person promoted?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. G. Andrews.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was there a vacancy in the superior class?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The number of second-class clerks provided for is the same as last year. So I presume there must have been a vacancy.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did every one in that department who was recommended by the deputy get the statutory increase?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is my information.

Office of the Comptroller of the N. W. M. Police, $10,850.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In this office, which is under the control of Mr. White, there are five different employees, each of whom has been in the service ten years and more. To each of these has been recommended an increase of $50 and to each the increase is given.

Mr. SPROULE. I have some inquiries to make regarding this branch, which I suppose I may make just as well on further estimates.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend has any inquiry to make he may make it now or later on when the further estimates come down.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be more convenient then.

Office of the Auditor General, $31,612.50.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). There is a small increase here of $275 but the statutory increases cover that and a great deal more. There has been some re-adjustment in the office so that the full amount of statutory increase is given to all those entitled to it without our requiring the full extra vote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the nature of the re-adjustment. This office is costing us a good deal, and it is time some reduction should be made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can hardly hold out the hope that it will cost any less, for there is no diminution of zeal in any respect on the part of the Auditor General and his officials. I think that the expense is not excessive considering the work done, but whether such a large book is required is another question. There has been one officer superannuated and some changes owing to promotions. The officer superannuated was receiving a salary of $1,800, and it is that saving which has enabled the statutory increases to be paid with a very small total increase in the vote.

Mr. SPROULE. How long was that officer in the service who was superannuated?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was there the full twenty-five years. He was a very old official—Mr. Simpson, and in the superannuation returns the hon. gentleman will find all the particulars.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board, including J. Fraser at $2,400, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $52,312.50.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an increase here of one in the number of officials but a diminution of the total cost. That has been brought about by filling the vacancies, which have occurred through death and retirement, with younger men at lower salaries. Two gentlemen died and one was retired.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What salary had Mr. Fraser before ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He had $2,200 and is now placed at the maximum of a chief clerk. He is one of the oldest officers in the service and has been practically doing the work of the Dominion bookkeeper for about a year, owing to an older official, and a very valuable man, being an invalid and having had a year's leave of absence.

Department of Inland Revenue, $35,460.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. minister state how he has been enabled to make a saving here of apparently $2,800 ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). The position of commissioner was abolished. The Deputy Minister remains at the same salary $3,200, and also the chief secretary. There are seven first-class clerks, the same as last year, and nine second class instead of ten. One of these was transferred to the Trade and Commerce Department, making a diminution in salary of $1,100. We propose to increase a number of second juniors from three to five. This is done with the view of transferring them from the temporary service into the permanent service to which they properly belong.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount of superannuation allowance which the retiring commissioner receives ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVNEUE. If I am not mistaken, it is $2,800.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then the whole saving is only $40 because the commissioner is paid out of the superannuation fund.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it intended to fill the assistant commissioner's place in the future ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE No, that position is abolished.

Mr. BENNETT. On page 18—K of the Auditor General's report I find some pretty large items for the purchase of methylated spirits. I find Gooderham & Worts down for $2,438 and the Hamilton Distilling Co., $4,605. Are tenders asked for or are the prices fixed by the department ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I understand that the price is fixed by the department. The department is entirely free to buy where it pleases.

Mr. BENNETT. To what extent are these spirits purchased in the course of a year ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I could not say now, but can bring down the exact figures.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it intended during the coming year to purchase in the open market on tenders or simply let the price be fixed by some party in the department?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I presume the same course is followed as in the past, but I shall inquire and let my hon. friend know what the department propose to do in the future.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The sales of methylated spirits are made by the department at a fixed rate ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The same to all consumers ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. As the matter is at present as well as we can understand, there may be a combination of the vendors of methylated spirits, and by agreement with the department they fix the price; and those who, in turn, wish to purchase practically fix the price to themselves. For, the minister states that no tenders are asked for the purchase. It seems odd that any department of government will purchase thousands of dollars worth of an article without providing for open competition.

Civil Government—Department of Agriculture, $62,262.50.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is an increase of about $2,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). While there are some changes, the increase, apart from the statutory increases, amounts to $1,600. Additional expenditure is made necessary by the appointment of two more examiners in the patent office. The increase due to this change is $2,200, but other reductions will bring the net increase down to $1,600.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have all the statutory increases granted been recommended by the deputy minister ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By the acting deputy minister.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. minister given the increase to every one to whom it is recommended by the acting deputy minister ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. This item includes a vote to Miss E. A. Rodman 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' Why is this provision necessary ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Miss Rodman passed the civil service examination some years ago, but was not appointed on the permanent staff until she was over the age provided for by the Act.

Civil Government—Department of Marine and Fisheries, $64,430.

Mr. SPROULE. There is quite an increase here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). The increase, if I figure it rightly, is $1,540. That would hardly be enough to provide for an increase at the rate of $50 apiece for the officers of the department. During the year Mr. Hardy died. His salary, at the time of his death, was $2,600. The place was filled by promoting one of the first-class clerks who, at present, draws only $1,850.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister has provided for two more hands.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One, I think.

Mr. SPROULE. No, there were forty-nine last year and there are fifty-one this year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One is to make provision for the minister's private secretary. The other is the case of a young man who was filling the place of a messenger. He qualified himself by passing the civil service examination and becoming competent as a typewriter and otherwise, and has been promoted to be a junior class clerk.

Civil Government—Department of Public Works, $46,530.

Mr. BENNETT. Have any of the clerks in this department received the statutory increase ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). Yes; the statutory increase has been given to three first-class clerks, two second-class clerks, and one junior class clerk—$50 each. Two messengers have been granted an increase of $30 each. This makes eight statutory increases altogether.

Mr. BENNETT. Are there only eight clerks in the department who are entitled to the statutory increase ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. How many clerks are there in the department altogether ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My department is divided in such a way that I cannot state off-hand the exact number. There are branches for which separate amounts will appear later on in the estimates. For instance, the chief architect's and chief engineer's branches are separately voted. But, if my hon. friend desires it, I will give the exact number at another time.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the hon. minister has been giving the annual increases how comes it that there is a decrease in the total amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The secretary of the department, Mr. Roy, was superannuated. At that time his salary was $2,100 a year. He has been replaced by another gentleman who receives only $1,850. The gentleman who now fills the office was formerly in receipt of $1,250, but he has been replaced by another who receives $1,100.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why was Mr. Roy superannuated ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He was superannuated last year. He had been ill for a long time and could not do his

work. Another decrease was due to the death of Miss Hyman, who was at the maximum of her class and received a salary of $1,000. Her place has been filled by another who receives $650. Mr. Desbrisay died. His place has been filled by one receiving $600 a year, whereas Mr. Desbrisay received $900 a year.

Mr. SPROULE. Why does the hon. minister find it necessary to provide for his accountant 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because he receives more than the statutory increase.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that when Mr. Dionne, the chief accountant, died, he was replaced by Mr. Kingston, who was the assistant accountant under him, and we are obliged to give Mr. Kingston a little more, and to put these words in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. With the consent of the House I wish to move to reduce that item we have just passed by $300. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) drew my attention to it. As I explained, a messenger was promoted, and a fair provision will be made for messengers in the supplementaries. I move that in item seventeen, the sum of $64,430 be reduced by $300.

Item as amended, agreed to.

Post Office Department, $218,760.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). The only changes are some increases amounting in all to $3,570, and some decreases amounting to $3,560. The increases consist of thirty-three at $50 each, and of twenty-four at $30 each, and two junior clerks. The decreases are made up of a miscellaneous number of items arising from promotions and deaths.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Does that amount cover the outside service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Only the inside service.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed for some time that the letter carriers have been making applications for an increase of their salary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are in the outside service.

Mr. SPROULE. It might not be inappropriate to mention it, merely to know if the minister is giving their claim due consideration. I suppose it would be premature to expect him to tell us now, but there ought to be an item in these estimates somewhere for that purpose.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The item for the letter carriers belongs to the outside service, and the subject will be properly discussed when we come to the outside service. Perhaps my hon. friend will leave it till then.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Has the hon. gentleman allowed statutory increases in all cases in his department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Wherever they have been recommended.

The office of the High Commissioner for Canada in England, $8,850.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In that case one of the officers hitherto in the High Commissioner's office has been transferred to the office in London in connection with emigration, under the direction of the Department of the Interior. The work has been divided in that respect, and that officer has been transferred, effecting a saving of $1,800. On the other side, there are three statutory increases of $50, making a reduction of $1,650.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding from the minister that he has divided the High Commissioner's office, or separated from it the branch controlling emigration?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would rather that question were answered by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton). But practically that is correct. The emigration office has been separated from the High Commissioner's office to a certain extent, and this gentleman has been transferred from the High Commissioner's office, and will have his salary provided for in the votes of the Department of the Interior. So it is a saving so far as the High Commissioner's office is concerned, but the salary will appear in another branch of the public service.

Mr. SPROULE. To ascertain whether there will be any saving or otherwise it would be necessary to add the cost of the new office to this one for the coming year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In this case there is no saving, because the work has to be done and that gentleman's salary will appear in another branch of the service.

Mr. SPROULE. Why were the two offices separated, and under whose recommendation? I understood there was a little friction in the past.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will ask my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior to answer that question.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The idea of making the change was that an office should be procured in another part of the city where particular attention would be given to emigration matters, and where a proper display of the products of Canada could be

made. On the advice of the High Commissioner, one of the officers in his office who had had special cognizance of emigration work was detached from his office, and this is supposed to be a new office established in another part of the city. The gentleman sent over in connection with these matters has not yet returned, and I have not yet received his report, but I will make a full explanation when immigration estimates come up.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the minister would tell us who is at the head of the Emigration Department now in England, and whether he is subject to the High Commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He will be subject to the High Commissioner by statute. The statute constituting the office of the High Commissioner provides that he is in charge of the emigration work in Great Britain, and no change is proposed to be made in that respect.

Department of Labour.—The whole or any portion may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $13,450.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like the hon. gentleman to say what that means.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am glad my hon. friend has called attention to it. If he will turn to page 18 of the estimates he will find the particulars. Deputy head and editor of 'Labour Gazette,' $3,200; assistant editor of 'Labour Gazette,' $1,500; two fair-wage officers, $3,000; three stenographers and clerks, $2,950; three clerks, $2,800. The hon. gentleman will observe by reference to this list, for the first time votes the salary of a deputy head to the present occupant of the position. The Act of 1900 created the department and the Civil Service Act calls for a certain minimum salary being paid to the deputy head of such a department. The lowest salary provided by the statute for a deputy head is $3,200. This deputy begins, therefore, at that salary. The next item is $1,500 for the assistant editor of the 'Labour Gazette.' The assistant editor was Mr. Harper, who filled the position with great credit to himself and with advantage to the country, and, as you know, lost his life a short time ago in a very chivalrous act on the Ottawa River. He has been succeeded in the office by Mr. Coates, a man of promise a distinguished graduate of the university, who has made a study of political science to some extent, who is a man of capacity and I look for good results from him. The other officers are those who have always been in this department and there is no proposed change in their salaries.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if this is the only department in which the removal expenses of any new appointee are paid. Take for instance the case of Mr. Frank Plant, of London; his expenses were paid from London to Ottawa. Last year it appeared in the Auditor General's report in respect to Mr. D. J. O'Donohue, whose removal expenses were paid from Toronto to Ottawa. They were paid by order in council and the Auditor General objected to it. I find that the expenses of Mr. Frank Plant were paid from London to Ottawa. Can the department pay by order in council or how were the expenses paid—under the Civil Service Act ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know the technical authority for such a payment, whether by order of the statute and effect given to it by order in council, but I am sure, on reflection, my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will take no exception to this particular transaction. The official in question is a most worthy man. His initial salary was comparatively trifling, he was very highly recommended by many of a class in whom my hon. friend takes a very great interest and he has fully justified the recommendation made in support of his appointment. As to whether an order in council was passed or not authorizing the payment, I do not know. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) was the acting minister in my place, last year, when the payment was made, and if my hon. friend desires information, if he would be good enough to allow me to bring it down on another item I will be glad to furnish him with all information on the subject.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year I thought the proceeding was not a usual one. I did not think that any department made a practice of doing that sort of thing. I did not bring the matter up for the purpose of raising an objection to the person whose expenses were paid at the time particularly, but it was against the principle that I was objecting. My reason for asking the question now is to find out whether other departments of government pay the removal expenses of their new appointees because I have this to say that there is a large number of men in this country who would be glad to receive the salaries that are paid to these gentlemen and pay their own removal expenses. I think the principle is a bad one and I object to the principle, not to the parties who have received these expenses.

Mr. SPROULE. I see this note below :—

This amount or any portion of it may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

These are civil servants. Where do you get the authority then ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) explains that these officers are not civil servants, not having passed the Civil Service examination. The fact is that up to the present moment the Civil Service

Act has not provided a class of officers such as is named in this schedule and therefore though they are here treated as if they were regular civil servants, in fact they are not civil servants, and this makes it quite clear that they are not obliged to comply with the act in order to draw the payment voted by parliament.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Why not specify those that come under the Civil Service Act and those that are excepted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I say that none of them have passed the examination. None of the officers in this department outside of the deputy minister is an officer provided for under the Civil Service Act. If you look at the Civil Service Act you will find that it gives a schedule of the various departments and that this department is not named by the Act.

Mr. BROCK. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the sum of $4,700 is the total expense of the 'Labour Gazette'.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What page ?

Mr. BROCK. In the estimates, page 18, in connection with the department of labour, there are two sums, deputy head and editor of 'Labour Gazette", $3,200, and assistant editor of 'Labour Gazette", $1,500. This paper is published weekly I believe?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Published monthly.

Mr. BROCK. The cost of the editorial management, I suppose in connection with that of the deputy head of the department, is $4,700. Is that the total expense of publishing this gazette ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. BROCK. Where will we find the balance of this expense?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The balance appears in the Auditor General's report.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) will find in the latter portion of the estimates that there is an item for publishing the 'Labour Gazette' which includes that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will find in the Auditor General's report full particulars of the expenditure for the last fiscal year and perhaps he will prefer to discuss it after having looked at these items. There will be an opportunity.

Mr. BROCK. I am not going to discuss the item, but it struck me that the editorial charges for a journal published monthly when compared with the editorial charges on monthly and weekly papers are ex-extremely high. This 'Labour Gazette' has caused a good deal of difficulty. It is a very difficult paper to get at. Statements are made in it at times that are absolutely incorrect, and when an attempt is made to correct them, the communications are quietly ignored. I think it should be more directly under the control of the minister himself, and if so I believe the country would have a good deal more confidence in it. The appropriation taken here is a very large sum for services in connection with the publishing of a monthly paper. I have no doubt that it is caused to some extent by the editor being ranked as a deputy head, which I suppose means chief editor of the 'Labour Gazette' for collecting information and so forth. This paper should be carefully looked after because it is tending to make the department very unpopular. I hear complaints ; I have had occasion to make complaints myself, but we could get no acknowledgment. When it is stated that such a mill is working full time and when the 'Labour Gazette' is informed that the mill is not working full time or half time, no correction is ever made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) has given no particulars I am not able to controvert what he has said. If he will tell me of any misstatements that appeared in the 'Gazette,' his complaint will be very carefully considered. This is the first time I have ever heard of any such charge, and I think the hon. gentleman will search in vain for a case in which a complaint to the department has not received courteous acknowledgment and every consideration that the case called for. We will have this item under discussion again, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) informs me of any complaints in advance, I will have them thoroughly inquired into. I can assure him that there is nothing about which the head of the department and the deputy head are more anxious than that only statements of facts, matters that are absolutely true—not merely true technically but substantially true and fair—should appear in the 'Gazette.' No opinions are published ; and it is supposed to be simply a record of facts for the information of employers and employees alike.

Mr. BROCK. This criticism is confined entirely to the very large expenditure connected with the issue of a monthly paper.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not all for that. The Department of Labour has many other duties to perform besides editing and issuing the 'Gazette.' The Conciliation Act of 1890 charges the department with trade disputes, and the Deputy Minister of Labour has rendered invaluable services to the country in adjusting many of those trade disputes. If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to read the first annual report of the depart-

ment he will find that out for himself, and when he has read it his views will be entitled to more weight.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. How many pages in the report.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is very brief, but it is a very interesting and a most valuable document.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It does not seem to compare with the great question of labour, if I judge by the size of the book.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We must not judge of anything by its size.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That is exactly where you are mistaken.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year this matter was pretty freely discussed and the Labour Department was strongly advised to be careful of interfering with anything of a party character in this 'Labour Gazette.' I do not know that much fault can be found with the 'Gazette' from a party standpoint but I think the object of the publication of that 'Gazette' is not fully met. Those engaged in the large manufacturing concerns of this country have some interest in labour problems, and I notice that at a recent meeting of the Manufacturer's Association in Montreal, strong objections were made to the manner in which the 'Labour Gazette' was edited. They complained that the manufacturers were excluded from any discussion in that paper. I believe that a similar organ in the United States publishes letters from both sides interested in the labour problem. The manufacturers of Canada complained that our 'Labour Gazette' did not set forth their side of the question, and that they were not permitted to publish their views in it in case of disputes between employers and employees. There ought to be harmony between the employers and the employees, between labour and capital, and there is no way that this can be brought about so readily as through free discussion by both sides to the controversy. I think this suggestion ought to be considered by those in charge of the 'Labour Gazette,' and if its adoption should result in increasing the cost of circulation the wider interest taken in the paper might to some extent repay the extra cost.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) has alluded to the resolution passed by the Manufacturer's Association. I should have expected to find him on the other side of such a question as this. It is quite true that very important body did pass such a resolution. but I think that the resolution does not fairly express the deliberate opinion of thoughtful members of that association. It was a general resolution, without particulars, and I am perfectly satisfied that whoever were instrumental in causing that resolution to be passed would have reason to change their views if they more fully understood the question. It is quite true that the Canadian 'Labour Gazette' does not follow the 'Labour Bulletin' published at Washington. The Canadian 'Labour Gazette' follows in style and object the precedent furnished by the 'Labour Gazette' of Great Britain which contains a record of facts and not of opinions. When parliament was considering the Bill authorizing the establishment of the 'Labour Gazette' I said that it was not to be an organ for publishing opinions, but that the intention was to give statistical information which statistics, if they be true, and as I believe them to be true, are as valuable to one class as to an other. The 'Labour Gazette' is not a class publication at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) would have us copy the model set at Washington. That is not the model that this government is following. The 'Washington Bulletin' is an organ of opinions, and I leave it to hon. gentlemen to say whether the publication of the opinions of extreme men is as useful to employers and employees in industrial matters as is the publication of statistical information which is valuable to both sides. The 'Labour Gazette' does not purport to give any opinions. We believe that it is better to give the facts and allow the working classes, employers and employees alike, to form their own opinions. We tell them the state of affairs in different industries.

We have correspondents at centres in Canada, whose duty it is to report to us the state of the labour market, and it is to the advantage of the employer and the employee equally to have that information. We have each month a leading article dealing with some great industry—one month the iron industry, its condition and resources, another month the lumber industry, another the fishing industry, and so on. These articles are compiled after the greatest labour and with the greatest care, and not simply by reference to employees, but after having obtained the most accurate information possible from all classes. The department has a form of inquiry which it sends out when the officers are studying a subject. These forms are sent both to employers and employees, and the most thorough and honest effort is made to acquire accurate information for dissemination throughout the country. This is a task in itself involving an amount of research which no ordinary newspaper undertakes; and the information thus obtained is of permanent value. It is infinitely more valuable than the information of a person who perhaps takes an extreme view of a question on one side or the other; and so far as I know, what has been furnished has been absolutely correct. The more the object and the

method of this 'Gazette' and this department are known, the more they will commend themselves to the public as being in every respect in the best interest of Canada. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) alludes to the salary of the Deputy Minister of Labour, and unintentionally falls into the error of assuming that he has no duties to perform except editing the 'Labour Gazette.' I can inform him differently, and I am sure that on reference to the report, little as it is, he will see that the department is performing a valuable service not only to employees, but also to the large class in whom the hon. gentleman is especially interested, the employers. I shall expect the hon. gentleman to give me that detailed information.

Mr. BROCK. If this gentleman has something else to do besides editing the 'Gazette,' he has a good many to help him, because I find that $13,450 is added to the expense of that office, for the employment of fair-wage officers, stenographers, clerks, &c. I suppose he attends to his particular department just as any editor does; these people largely do the work for him, while he merely compiles it. I think the pay for journalistic work, as it is paid in this country, especially work on a monthly journal, is very high.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not think the hon. gentleman intended to accuse me of approving of the resolution passed by the Manufacturers' Association. I simply mentioned that incidentally; but I go as far as to say that I think their side of the case should be permitted to be explained at times in the 'Labour Gazette.'

Mr. CASGRAIN. Allusion has been made to the cost of the 'Labour Gazette,' and I find that it does cost a great deal of money. If hon. members will look at it, they will find that it is a monthly publication of fifty pages. The editor-in-chief receives $3,500, and the assistant editor receives $1,500. I will allow for the fact just mentioned by the Minister of Labour that the editor-in-chief has some other duties to perform than simply editing this paper; but, as my hon. friend from Centre Toronto has said, I do not see what the other gentlemen employed in that office have to do. They cannot have much to do, if we are to judge from the report. Then, there are correspondents all over the country who are paid $100 each—not as is generally done in the case of other newspapers, which pay their correspondents as they send in items, but paying them a lump sum of $100 a year, whether they do any work or not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not correct.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It is so stated in the Auditor General's Report. I find on page N—2 a list of correspondents at $100 per annum; so that if a correspondent works a great deal or only a little he gets this sum.

So far as I know journalistic affairs, that is not the way correspondents are paid. I also find that $200 is paid to a legal correspondent, Mr. Lyon. If this is the Mr. Lyon whom I know in Montreal, I must say he is a most competent young gentleman, and if given the opportunity of reporting decisions concerning labour in this paper, he will earn the $200. A great many other items bring the cost of this paper up to about $18,000 per year, allowing to the Deputy Minister of Labour something for certain other duties. That brings the cost of this small monthly volume to about $1,500. My hon. friend says that this is not a publication in which the editor-in-chief has any opinions to express. He has only the work of compiling; and I say that $3,500 to the chief compiler and $1,500 to the deputy compiler are very large sums to pay. I venture to say that there is not in this country a publication of the same importance which costs as much as this 'Labour Gazette.' No doubt it is a valuable publication; I do not want to depreciate the value of the services my hon. friend has attempted to give by means of it; but I find that it has only 800 subscribers. I would like to know whether these are all bona fide subscribers, who pay their subscription of 20 cents per year. This publication is of course distributed gratuitously to the members and senators, and I would like to know to what other persons it is issued gratuitously. If the publication is as valuable to the labouring classes as my hon. friend thinks it is, it seems to me that its circulation is very limited. At all events the cost is exorbitant—$18,000 a year for this publication—paying editors, sub-editors and correspondents. It is a drain upon the country, which is not compensated for by the services rendered by this department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend is generally fair and not apt to disregard the facts even by inadvertence. I would ask him is it fair to treat this expenditure as wholly on behalf of the 'Labour Gazette?' If he will study the items, he will find at least one of $3,000 which has nothing whatever to do with this publication.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I did not include that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend added up all the figures, and he cited something against the 'Gazette' from the Auditor General's report which is not to be found in that report. He said that the correspondents were paid $100 a year, whether they did any work or not, and gave the Auditor General's report as his authority. But there is nothing in that report to warrant any such statement. All through the votes of parliament, you will find votes of so much a year to certain individuals, but you will also find rules governing their service, and if these men do

not earn their salaries, it is the duty of the department to see that they are not paid. Each correspondent is obliged to make a monthly report. If he fails to make his report any month, he does not receive the proportion of salary assignable to that report. His $100 is divided into twelve parts, and on the receipt of his report each month, he receives his monthly pay, but not otherwise.

My hon. friend seems to have been on the hunt for argument against this bureau. He suggests that the department does nothing else but compile. Well, my hon. friend has not the faintest idea of what is involved in compiling, or he would not talk so flippantly. If he desires to be informed, let him visit the department and he will there see the amount of detail gathered from all parts of this Dominion, and what has to be utilized in the various statements made and conclusions arrived at. He will find that there is not a single statement made or conclusion reached which does not involve considerable research. If he examines the schedules that come in, giving the statistical details regarding some great industry, I am sure he would have a much higher opinion of the labour involved and the skill required by the officers in the discharge of their duties than he evidently has at present.

The 'Gazette' itself is not a medium for publishing the views of any section or class. I may tell my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), that there never was any intention of allowing one side or another to ventilate their opinions through its columns, and a study of the 'Gazette' will bear out what I say.

My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) quotes the Auditor General's report as showing a circulation of 800 subscribers and find that a very small circulation. But my hon. friend, as a member of parliament must know full well that every public document has a large free list, and the 'Labour Gazette' is no exception. It is sent to the secretary or some other officer of every trade union in Canada, and outside of Canada, it is sent, by way of exchange, to the various governments throughout the world. It is also sent to the libraries in Canada and is forwarded as a useful medium for information wherever any official desire is expressed for it. It is not gratuitously distributed among individuals, and the hon. gentleman must also remember that the 'Gazette' only came into existence in September, 1900: so that the Auditor General's report deals only with a fraction of its first year, namely, up to the 30th June, following.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is the circulation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I believe it is many thousands, partly free and partly paid for, and it is doing good work. I will get the information and bring it down, and if there is any other information which the hon. gentleman desires, I shall be glad to give it to him, because I wish to dislodge from his mind these erroneous opinions which have caused him to assume an attitude of hostility towards a movement that has already been of great service and is calculated to be of still greater service to the country. I do not suppose he desires to be regarded as implacably arrayed against this movement.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have a Department of Agriculture to deal with the interests of agriculturists, we have a Department of Trade and Commerce, which takes cognizance of all questions relating to the commercial class; and in giving special attention to another great class, the industrial classes. I think we are entitled to the support of our hon. friends opposite, and I know we have the support of the great majority of the people outside this House. The subject is too important to be made a party question, and I hope that hon. members will not allow themselves to consider it from a party standpoint. I am quite anxious to have fair criticism, but I do not think that such sweeping criticism as the saying the 'Labour Gazette' costs too much, and that it is nothing but a compilation, without taking into account the many important duties performed, is one that we should be expected to meet.

Let me point out another duty which the 'Labour Gazette' has to perform, and in which it is of great service to the country as well as to the labouring classes. Parliament in 1900 passed a resolution declaring that in all government contracts the government should see that fair-going wages were paid to the working men. That in itself is a task involving a great deal of labour. The Department of Labour is of great assistance to the other departments in complying with that resolution. The fair-wage officers are obliged, in the discharge of their duties, to travel from ocean to ocean in the search of information for the guidance of the various ministers. The duty of the Deputy Minister is not merely to see that the 'Gazette' is published and that others do their work—although that is of no small importance—but he has many duties outside of the publication of the 'Gazette.' My hon. friend from Centre Toronto is a large employer of labour. Well, I am bound to say that he does very little of the actual labour himself, but he has a manager and men to carry out his will, and is responsible for the success of the institution of which he is the head. And I am sure I can congratulate the men on having him as that employer.

We have to pay for brains and the Deputy Minister of Labour is a very able man. Let me tell my hon. friend the difficulty we have had in retaining the services of that gentleman. I do not wish that gentleman to be the subject of criticism in this House unless he deserves it. It is the privilege of hon. gentlemen opposite to criticise him. It is their privilege to detract from his merits. But it is our duty to see to it that he is fairly understood, and that the sacrifice he is making in serving Canada and in retaining the position he is now filling so well as Deputy Minister of Labour is known. Mr. Mackenzie King is one of the most gifted men, I venture to say, who could be found for the position. Moreover, there is not a man in Canada to-day who has studied more deeply the great problems of labour. After having devoted his university under-graduate career to the study of this subject, he took up a post-graduate course, first in the University of Chicago. He was invited to Harvard and there was given a fellowship, and the authorities of Harvard University thought so highly of him, that they desired him to associate himself with their professional staff. They sent him abroad at their expense for two years to study the great problems of labour, on the understanding that he was to return and take a position in that great university. I was not aware of that offer having been made to him when we were organizing this department; and, knowing of his standing, my colleagues authorized me to make overtures to him. I did so, by inviting him to come here in connection with this Department of Labour. He declined the offer, on account of his engagement with Harvard. But, when he returned on laying the case before Havard University they very generously relieved him of that understanding, for he preferred to serve his own country if possible. After a while a vacancy occurred in Harvard University through the professor of political science there being appointed to a university in Great Britain. The University of Harvard again made overtures to Mr. King and offered him a chair, one of the most attractive offers that could be presented to a young man of talent and ambition such as the Deputy Minister of Labour. He is making large pecuniary sacrifices in remaining in this department in Canada. That is Mr. King's record. He will prove in time, and has already proved, the wisdom of the choice the government made in placing him in his present position.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am sorry to see the hon. Postmaster General who showed so much good humour at the beginning, exhibit a different feeling now. As I said, I think the country will be grateful to my hon. friend for his good intentions; but I think we may differ as to the results he has achieved. The hon. gentleman can hardly deny that this is a subject open to the criticism of parliament, and one about which we may as fairly question him as upon any other. He must not get angry whenever we touch this enfant chéri of his; for, if he decides to do that, I am afraid he will be angry very often. I should be very sorry indeed if I have laid myself open to the implication of unfairness to the hon. gentleman. I did not take the amounts I mentioned from the item before us, but from page N—2 of the Auditor General's Report. These items relate to the editing of the paper, the paying of correspondents, the printing and distributing of the paper—in a word, all those items which have to do with make-up and circulatiou of the 'Labour Gazette. And I find—and the hon. gentleman if he looks at the figures will see that I am right—that the paper costs $18,000. Now, as to the editor-in-chief, what I said was about the editing of this paper; and, after the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I think I was justified in coming to the conclusion that the editing cost too much. For the hon. gentleman said that Mr. King did not express opinions in the paper, was not engaged in writing articles upon these great questions of labour which agitate the country, but was concerned more directly with the compilation of statistics received from different parts of this country and other countries. I expressed the opinion—I may be wrong and the hon. gentleman may be right—that $3,200 for this gentleman and $1,500 for an assistant editor and $1,817.47 for correspondents, is too much to pay for such a paper as we have before us. I do not say that it would be too much for what would be a good 'Labour Gazette,' for the kind of paper in which the labouring classes of this country could get the proper information to which they are entitled, but I am speaking of the 'Labour Gazette' as I find it before me. Hon. gentlemen who have some knowledge of publishing a paper know that, for instance, a paper of eight pages issued daily, costs only about $1,000 a week. But here is a paper, which is only issued once a month, and it costs $1,500 for one number. I leave it to this committee to say whether that is not too great a price to pay for the paper which is placed in our hands. Is that unfair criticism? I take the figures from the reports that the government supplies, and I take the 'Labour Gazette' as I find it. This being so and my remarks having been what they were, I think it was uncalled for on the part of my hon. friend to say that my criticism was unfair.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) that he is charging against the 'Labour Gazette' expenses of the Labour Department generally.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Not at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has charged against the paper the whole salaries of the Deputy Minister and his assistant. I have explained to him that the department has many other duties to perform than the publishing of the 'Labour Gazette.' It has to do with arbitration, with administration of the Conciliation Act, with the fair-wages policy, the Canadian labour policy—all these in addition to preparing the 'Labour Gazette.' The hon. gentleman—and I am sure that he will be the first upon reflection to see it—has made an unfair representation of the case when he charges all this expenditure to the 'Labour Gazette.' I would again say that I did not suggest that the Deputy Minister devoted his time merely to compiling. I merely indicated the course of procedure in the preparation of the 'Labour Gazette.' There is compiling to be done, but I did not say that the Deputy Minister did it. The Deputy Minister is engaged in the management of the department, a large department, and one with which I wish the hon. gentleman and his friends would familiarize themselves. If they did so they would be more friendly to it.

Mr. PUTTEE. The policy of inaugurating this department and the work that the department is doing are not to be considered as above criticism. But I fear that the hon. gentlemen who are criticising it have not paid sufficient attention either to the 'Labour Gazette' or to the Labour Department to make their criticism of much value. I have no idea at all that the whole business of the department is editing and the turning out of the 'Labour Gazette.' In fact my idea was that the Labour Department would have a great deal more work to do than it has done. It is a matter of remark at the present time that the report of the deputy minister contains hardly a word in reference to the railway men of this country, who form one section of labour, at all events, which has been altogether overlooked. In respect to the circulation of the 'Gazette,' which is said to be only 600, if the hon. gentlemen will examine the report which is in their hands, they will find that the paid subscription on the 30th of June last was 4,354. Now, considering that this is a government publication, and that most people expect to get such papers free, it seems to me that is a remarkably good circulation to have worked up in that time. In fact, if any gentleman has been engaged in the business of working up a circulation, he will rather envy the 'Labour Gazette.'

I think probably one of the few compliments that have been paid to the 'Gazette' during the past year is the resolution passed by the Manufacturers' Association, because no sooner had that been passed than the question was put from the chair asking those present what position they took in regard to the 'Gazette'; and from their own reports most of those present stated that they immediately threw all communications into the waste paper basket. Now we have our hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) saying they had complaints to make, that their representations are not properly attended to in the department. If the department treats their communications in the same way as they treat it's, why of course there is simply a deadlock. I believe that any fair-minded person that has read the 'Labour Gazette' during the past year will say that there is no cause for complaint on behalf of the manufacturers, at least, that their side is not properly put forth. The 'Gazette' is colourless, it is too colourless, that has been the complaint on behalf of the labour men. But that it errs in shutting out the manufacturers' interests seems to me not to be the case. Probably there is a good deal to be said for the minister's argument that the idea of the 'Gazette' is to make it purely a matter of figures, colourless altogether, and to express no opinions. There are other gazettes who deviate somewhat from that line, and I think, with good results. If the 'Gazette' goes a little farther in that respect I believe it will be more acceptable to those for whom it is published. In reference to the criticism that has been made in regard to the circulation, and to complaints being made, I hope the minister, when we come to the items where this can properly be discussed, will bring down all the complaints that are made, and tell us what has been done and what is expected to be done in the future with the 'Gazette,' and by the Labour Department generally. We feel that the department cannot stop where it is now, that it has either to get fossilized, or else take up a more advanced position.

Mr. INGRAM. I am glad the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), who wishes to be considered a leader of labour has confirmed the idea I expressed. I have certainly found labour men who take a prominent part in labour questions making complaints for the reason that the 'Gazette,' so far as they were concerned, was too colourless. They profess to be leaders of labour, but were unable to express the opinions of the enlightened labour element of this country, and for that reason they were precluded from having such letters as these published in the 'Labour Gazette.' Supposing the department did publish these letters, it would naturally follow that there would be a discussion on the subject by persons taking different views. These labour men believe that a discussion such as that might be in the interest of the labour men throughout the country. That is the reason I expressed the opinion that I did at first.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to get some further information about the authority which justifies this item as I see it here—

'The whole or any portion may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' The answer the minister gave me I understood was that the employees were not included in the schedule contained in the Civil Service Act. I took the trouble to look up that Act, and it reads as follows :

The civil service for the purpose of this Act includes and consists of all classes of employees elsewhere than in the North-west Territories, in or under the several departments of the Executive Government of Canada, in the office of the Auditor General, and included in schedule 'a' and 'b' to this Act, appointed by the Governor in Council.

Schedule 'a' would cover this, I presume. In the first place schedule 'a' is composed of deputy heads of departments, officers who have special professional or technical qualifications, chief clerks, first class clerks and second class clerks. Now this is called the Department of Labour, therefore it is under a department and is controlled by a deputy head, and is under an executive head who is a Minister of the Crown. Therefore it comes under the Act in that respect, it is a Department of Labour. Now, according to the estimates put before us here, you have a deputy head and you have clerks. The only difference that I see between this schedule and the other is that this one says 'Chief clerks, first-class clerks and second-class clerks.' It does appear to me that you cannot evade the responsibility of the Act by saying 'clerks' and leaving out 'chief clerks, first-class clerks or second-class clerks.' they are clerks all the same. As I said, it is under a deputy head, under the executive branch of the government, under a Minister of the Crown. The appointments are made by order in council, and the parties employed come under that schedule. As I interpret it, therefore I think it must fairly come under the Civil Service Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is for the purpose of examination, they do not pass an examination.

Mr. SPROULE. But they should. I think that is where the mistake is made, or else they must be appointed because of technical knowledge, which is not the claim made here. I think there ought to be a stronger reason given than any we have had for asking us to pass this vote.

Mr. BENNETT. After the description given by the Postmaster General of the abilities of the gentleman who conducts this department, and knowing as he did before that gentleman entered the employ of the government of his transcendent abilities, the House will be surprised to know that this heavy taskmaster, the Postmaster General, insisted upon this gentleman working at the rate of $1,750 a year when he first entered the service. He seems to have done him the greatest unfairness in view of the gentleman's ability of which the minister speaks. Afterwards the salary was increased to $2,250, and now it is raised to $3,200. Last year when this question of the Labour Department was before the House, there was a very long discussion on the subject in view of the fact that the expense had risen by such a large amount. Now I am going to say a few words of local interest in reference to this so-called 'Labour Gazette.' In the east riding of Simcoe, particularly, I can tell the minister that the efforts of the 'Labour Gazette' are not at all appreciated. There was a strike in the carriage factory in the town of Orillia, and instead of that matter being probed to the bottom, instead of its being thoroughly exposed, I am told, though I did not see the reports at the time, that they were far from being truthful, in reference to the strike in that establishment, and the real reason assigned for it was that the owner of the carriage factory, Mr. Tudhope, is the Liberal candidate in that riding for the local assembly. Now if the same treatment is accorded labour men in other parts of the Dominion by this labour journal, then I say its efforts are not appreciated. So far as the labour efforts of the government go they are worth nothing in that part of the country, for this reason, that though an enforcement of the Alien Labour Act would have been highly beneficial, it is allowed to remain a dead letter, American tugs manned with American employees are permitted to ply in and out of the harbours there, while Canadian tugs are not permitted to ply in American waters. By reason of the owners of these tugs being friends of this government they are permitted to ply in Canadian waters contrary to all the coasting Acts of the province or the Dominion. When this item was before the House last year I then took occasion to point to the ridiculous articles that were sent in by correspondents, and as the hon. minister was not here then let him listen for a moment to some of the articles that appeared in this 'Labour Gazette.' Here is one that came from Vancouver.

The bar-tenders report work well. The average wages earned are from $40 to $65 a month, with board.

Then, from that Sodom of Canada, at the present time, London, comes the following :

The local bar-tenders are taking steps to organize the bar-tenders of St. Thomas. They report the organization in a prosperous condition.

If the people of this country want to pay their hard earned money for rot of that kind, they should be well pleased with the efforts of the minister. I thought that Mr. King, the gentleman in charge of the department, sitting as he did sit on the floor of this House last year, and hearing these reports and the complaints to the minister would at least have exercised some restraint and placed some restrictions upon the re-

ports that are published. For example I take the issue of the 'Gazette' for the month of February which shows that in order to earn the $100 that these correspondents are receiving in a year they stick into this publication the most nonsensical and absurd statements possible. In every case I am bound to say that these correspondents are just as in the case of Mr. Phillips Thompson, of Toronto, party hacks of the government. For instance here is a report that the livery business is good on account of sleighing. Is that not a wonderful item of news to be communicated at the cost of this country? How could the livery business be otherwise with good sleighing? Mr. King goes on further:

> Many men are employed at union wages getting out ice for the breweries.

In the name of all that is good what other time would they get out ice except during the winter months? Mr. Phillips Thompson says:

> In addition to the demand caused by the meeting of the legislature, the provincial campaign will give an impetus to the trade.

Of printing. I do not know whether he had ballots in view or not.

An hon. MEMBER. Extra ones.

Mr. BENNETT. Extra ones, of course. It was reserved for this hard worked correspondent at Hamilton to give items that are really of great importance. He says:

> There are hundreds of bar-tenders and waiters employed in the city at hotels and restaurants. Wages are very good. The former are members of the Bar-tenders International League and are affiliated with the Trades and Labour Council.

So that, apparently, he is having a great deal of solicitude again for the bar-tenders. I find another item that is not at all savouring of gallantry on the part of the editor of the 'Gazette,' for coming from the city of London; there is this item:

> The bar-tenders are asking all union men to refuse patronizing any hotel in the city where bar-maids are employed.

Let the people know what they are paying their money for. Let them know that they are paying first and foremost the gentleman who fills this office $3,200 a year. Had it been announced when he came into the position first that his salary was to be $3,200 a year, I am bound to say that some of the hon. gentleman's friends would have objected to it. I have heard something of the salaries paid to editorial writers in this country, and I will be bound to say that there are very few editors in the large cities of this country receiving $3,200 a year. In the smaller cities where a man of necessity must bring to the conduct of a newspaper a large amount of ability they do not receive any such salaries. Take the case of these correspondents and we see that all these party friends and hacks are employed at $8 a month to send in these items that can interest a very few people to say the least. The government had better spend a little of the money in the enforcement of the Alien Labour Act in this country, and in particular on the shores of the Georgian Bay at the present time. There is not a point on the Georgian Bay where navigators and vesselmen are not protesting and protesting strongly against the government permitting American tugs to come in and contravene the laws and securing employment while the same right is denied to men going from this side to the other.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we ought to have some more information, as a discussion on this particular question will not be permitted on the item in connection with the expenditure of the bureau, as to why these officers do not come under the Civil Service Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Civil Service Act requires that persons appointed shall pass the Civil Service examination. Therefore, unless we put this exception in, they would not receive their pay.

Mr. SPROULE. I can understand you saying that on each item. When we come to a name in the estimates we say that we vote this sum 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act', but in this case you say that any portion of this expenditure may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act and you make a lump sum of it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They have not passed the examination.

Mr. SPROULE. That would not keep them out.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Auditor General would not pay the money.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 21, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough) moved:

> That the Public Accounts of Canada for the year ending June 30, 1901, and the report of the Auditor General, volumes 1 and 2, for the same year, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply.

Department of the Secretary of State—Clerical and other assistance, $2,150.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The increase of $180 is entirely due to the statutory increase of $30 each to the lower officers.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is the increase general or has the deputy recommended more increases than you have granted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Speaking generally all those recommended by the deputy ministers in all the departments for an increase are receiving the statutory increase. These increases are being received pretty generally and are only withheld for special reasons.

Department of Printing and Stationery.—Clerical and other assistance, $2,000, printing and stationery, $1,300, sundries, $1,700.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the hon. minister give some explanation regarding the policy of the government in connection with this department. I believe that a large sum is now being paid to outside offices for government printing. If that be the case the government should outline a policy. The government should declare whether they have confidence in the Printing Bureau as established, or whether that Bureau is not competent to do the work. In the latter case, is it the intention of the government to extend the bureau, or do they propose adopting year by year the policy, which they condemned in former days, of subsidizing political supporters through job printing ? The expenditure on job printing outside the Bureau is this year much larger ; and the charge is made that the government are securing political support by means of job printing contracts given to newspapers for work which should be done by the Printing Department. In former days such contracts were called subsidizing the reptile press. Can this government be doing that which they formerly denounced ? I am not making any charge, but I am simply asking the hon. minister to say whether the Printing Department has lost the confidence of the government, or if not why should the government pay out so much public money to the reptile press, which is the term by which these gentlemen were wont to describe the newspapers supporting the late government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot undertake to outline any general policy, but I can tell my hon. friend that at present the Printing Bureau cannot do all the work required to be done.

Mr. MACLEAN. Do you purpose enlarging it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not like to make any rash statement as to what we may do in the future. I am aware that there is a strong opinion in some quarters that the Bureau should be enlarged and also that there is a considerable question as to whether the Bureau is the most economical place in which to do the printing. I would not care to define any policy just now, but my hon. friend can have a general discussion on the question at a later stage if he thinks one necessary. In any case, if we enlarge the Bureau, my hon. friend will have to vote more money, and he is objecting to the expenditure now.

Mr. MACLEAN. We are paying the hon. gentleman to advise us on these subjects and the government ought to have a definite policy. They have been in office six years and do not seem to have any settled policy with regard to public business except to give as much public money as they can to their supporters in the press, or to what they used to call the reptile press. We must conclude that the policy of the government is not to extend the Printing Bureau and not to investigate whether the Printing Bureau is the best means of giving us value for our money, but simply to go on spending as much as $50,000 on job printing given to one newspaper alone. What a contrast between the speech of the hon. Finance Minister today and those which these gentlemen opposite were wont to make in days gone by. It is only another case of broken pledges, and of the worst possible policy being adopted.

Mr. SPROULE. Since we have had of late years such a departure from the custom which heretofore prevailed of having the printing done in the Bureau, the government ought to be prepared to tell us how much printing is done outside so that we may understand whether it is advisable or otherwise to enlarge the Printing Bureau so that it may do our printing work entirely. If our work costs us more than it ought or more than we can get it done for outside, the sooner we know it the better. Until the last few years the work was done by the Bureau and done more expeditiously than at present, and there was a less baneful influence exercised over the press of the country. But this constant departure, during the last few years, and increasing in ratio every year, from the principles laid down by these hon. gentlemen when in opposition, cannot but attract our serious attention. The government should tell us what percentage of the work they have done outside, what the cost has been, and whether they have made up their minds to depart from the usual custom of having the printing done in the Printing Bureau.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as the future is concerned, that is a matter I do not wish to speak about too decisively. But as to the other point raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that is a reasonable one. I shall deal with it. If the information brought down in the Auditor

General's Report does not cover the point, I shall be glad to have a statement made showing the proportion of printing done in the Bureau, and the proportion done outside.

Mr. MACLEAN. And the minister should also give us a statement showing which system is in the public interest and which the government intend to follow. Government is government, and should be run on some principle. The principle in this case is, either that we have a Printing Bureau which we intend to maintain at a high plane of efficiency and to have the government printing done there, or else that this is an impossibility and the intention is to distribute the work among the job offices of the country. When the minister gives us the report he has referred to—he has promised it and we will hold him to his promise—he must come here with a policy and he must let us know if he intends to maintain and equip the Bureau as it ought to be or whether he intends to wind it up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The promise I made was that I would furnish a statement showing what proportion of the work has been done outside of the Bureau. I will keep that promise.

Mr. MACLEAN. But I want further information. I want some policy announced. This is an important question and one upon which we have a right to criticise the conduct of the hon. gentlemen opposite who, in this House and all over the country cried aloud about the iniquity of the Conservative administration with regard to government printing. But if they themselves have no policy in regard to the matter, but simply intend to use the government printing to the best advantage from their own party point of view, we should be informed that such is the case.

Mr. SPROULE. As the hon. gentleman has consented to give us the information I think, perhaps, it should be made a little fuller and a little more intelligible than in the form he has suggested. I think we should have the various items of printing, showing where the printing was done and what it cost. This would enable us to make a comparison of that which has been done in the Printing Bureau with that which has been done outside. It may be true that all this is in the Auditor General's Report, and that by going through that very large volume we can gain the information, but we would rather have it in more convenient shape.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister has promised more than that. He hinted that the work outside had been done cheaper than in the Bureau. What we want particularly is a comparison of the cost in the Bureau and the cost outside. The hon. gentleman could easily furnish that. He must have had some authority for—I can not say the statement, but the inference that he leaves us to draw from the statement—that the printing in the Bureau would cost more than the work that we are getting done outside.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What I said was that it is contended that printing was not done more economically in the Bureau and in some cases not so economically. On that point I expressed no opinion. I have no doubt but that the authorities of the Bureau will say that it is done cheaper, and that outside printers will say the contrary.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, but what does the Minister of Finance say? He is here to tell the country about these things. He and his colleagues have asked the country to trust them with the management of public affairs on the plea that they would conduct those affairs in the public interest. He should tell us whether it is in the public interest to get the printing done in the Bureau or to give it out on political lines.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At present, both seem——

Mr. MACLEAN. The government have political interests pressing upon them, and therefore they think it best to give the work out. The contention is that it is necessary for a Liberal government to maintain its position in the country by the distribution of printing patronage. I am not going to let the hon. minister away from the issue. I will give him another day or a week if he wants it; but I want him to tell the House and the country which system is in the public interest, and which he intends to follow.

Civil Government Contingencies—Department of Interior—Clerical and other assistance including $820 for J. D. Bollard and $515 for T. W. Hodgins, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, ... $3,932 50
Printing and stationery $8,500 00
Sundries 7,000 00

$19,432 50

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why are these grants to J. D. Bollard and T. W. Hodgins given, 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act?'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton) is not in his place to-day, and I cannot explain the reasons in each case. Generally, however, the purpose is to pay larger increases than are usual under the statute. Perhaps it would be better to let the item stand.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I may as well speak on this as on any other item of a similar nature. The hon. Minister of Finance was not in the House, as I was, when his party was in opposition. But if he

had been here he would know that whenever a case came up of any public officer receiving a grant 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' we would have it discussed for hours and days in this House. But, notwithstanding the professions thus mouthed by every one of these gentlemen during opposition, there is not a single department whose estimates come before us that we do not find a violation of those principles. With this continuous recurrence of exceptions, we might as well do away with the Civil Service Act altogether and appoint these parties and give them their promotion by statutory enactment, for that is what is being done in these cases. A case does sometimes occur, the circumstances of which are extraordinary, making it necessary that this course should be taken. But it is impossible that these extraordinary cases can occur by the dozen and in every department as we will be led to suppose they do from these estimates. Better let the item stand until the minister is here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the general question, I desire to say that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is mistaken in assuming that these cases are so numerous as he says. As a rule, no doubt, the provisions of the Civil Service Act work well. But there will be cases, as the House has told us, where the statutory increase may not be sufficient to recognize the services of a particularly good man. The number of increases to the whole service is small. The hon. gentleman says that there are one or two in every department; but that is not correct. But, even if there were, that would be a small proportion to the whole civil service——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You will find it in every department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, not in every department. But, even if there were in every department one or two men of whom exception was made in this way, that would be an exceedingly small proportion of the whole civil service, and would hardly justify the inference that you might as well abolish the whole Civil Service Act in this respect. There are, perhaps, not more then a dozen cases in the whole estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it occurs more frequently than the hon. minister is ready to admit. We find it in items 27, 29, 32, 35, 36 and 38. These are but a few picked out hastily.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But this happens to be the class of items in which they are most apt to appear—these that we are dealing with to-day, and the ones we dealt with yesterday.

Mr. SPROULE. But we find this pretty prevalent in these items.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

Civil Government Contingencies—Office of the Auditor General.

Clerical and other assistance..	$ 3,700 00
Printing and stationery	1,250 00
Sundries	700 00
	$5,650 00

Mr. SPROULE. How does it come that there is a saving here of $1,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When we get a decrease, I generally accept it without asking any questions.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board, $7,590.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are some small increases. We have estimated the items rather closely.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the minister will let that stand for a moment, because we want to discuss the overrulings of the Treasury Board, and I do not see any other item as convenient as this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection. Perhaps I had better give the information on the point, and then the hon. gentleman can retain the item for the purpose of discussing the overrulings. There are two statutory increases to messengers who are paid out of contingencies now. The messengers now appointed are included in the contingent vote—$60 represents that. The rest represents a general increase in the cost of printing, stationery and small sums.

Item allowed to stand.

Department of Marine and Fisheries, $10,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. This might be a proper place to ask the government for some explanation in regard to the negotiations that were conducted between them and Mr. Marconi in regard to wireless telegraphy. Various statements have been made as to the arrangements between the government and that inventor for the use of his invention, and the department has placed certain conveniences at the service of the inventor. The government might let us know what the arrangement is, and what they hope to effect in the interest of the public by such arrangement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it would be better that I should bring down the papers and let them speak for themselves. I could give the hon. gentleman the explanation now, but I expect to place the papers on the Table on Monday next, and that will be the most useful way of answering my hon. friend's question.

Mr. SPROULE. There were some subjects of controversy between the Dominion and provinces with regard to the fisheries. We had some information about it last year, but it was not very conclusive, and the evolutions of time were to set it all straight.

Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries any additional information to give us on the subject ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps under another item we will have some information to give. I am not so very sure that the evolution that he speaks of has taken place, and a final settlement been made with regard to the different contentions between the provinces and the Dominion. I am free to admit from the opportunity that I have had of looking into the matter, that there will be very little reduction in the expense of looking after the fisheries so far as the Dominion is concerned, unless there is a very important change made in the relationship between the provinces and the Dominion. If my hon. friend will leave this matter until we come to discuss the items under the head of fisheries, I will be able to give him full information on that point.

Department of Agriculture—Clerical and other assistance, including payment up to $800 each per annum to two assistant patent examiners, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $10,000 ; printing and stationery, $3,750 ; sundries, $3,250 ; total, $17,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice here a little divergence from the usual custom ; you say 'clerical and other assistance, including payment up to $800.' Heretofore you made the statement of the amount needed for some particular civil servant, of which you gave the name, and then added, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary, but in this case you simply ask us to vote the amount, without giving the name for whom it is needed. Consequently, you can use it for whom you like, and also any amount up to the maximum of the sum named.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The explanation is that I have been obliged for some time back constantly to add to the patent examining staff. The system I have adopted is to take the men and pay them out of clerical assistance, on trial. I have made it a rule to take university graduates who have their degree in some scientific course. I think these men are most suitable for this work, and I may say that the results since I have adopted this course have been eminently satisfactory. I find it impossible to keep young men for any length of time at the maximum of the rate which temporary clerks are allowed, and therefore I have asked for two years back—this is the same as last year and the year before—for power to raise those salaries to the extent of $800 before putting them on the permanent list. When they go on the permanent list of course they come under the other part of the civil government vote. But here while they are being paid this $800 they are still on trial.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I understand these civil servants are not required to pass the civil service examination.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, being university graduates they are eligible without such examination.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the minister accord that treatment to graduates of the Military College at Kingston ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They come under the same category.

Mr. MACLEAN. I very much approve of this policy, and I would like to see it extended throughout the civil service of this country. We are educating young men at that Military College, we give them a first class education, and then we let them go out of the country the moment they are graduated, instead of drafting them into the civil service and distributing them all over the country in order to get the benefit of their services. If that policy is extended throughout all the departments, as I believe it should be, the government will receive the commendation of the country. I congratulate the minister on his action in moving along these lines, and I recommend his colleagues to follow in the same way. The Auditor General's Department have long utilized university graduates as experts, and I believe with great success. The University of Toronto has recently created a department of political economy and civil economy, which has proved most useful, and those young men who have graduated from that department have been taken hold of. The board of trade and the Manufacturer's Association in Toronto have taken these young men and given them employment, and they have proved to be a splendid class of employees, or officials I might call them. I hope this policy will be extended. If this country is educating young men in the Military College, and if we find that these young men have been forced to leave the country to get employment, I hope the ministers of the various departments will see their way clear to find them employment so as to keep them at home, and in that way they will do a great deal to build up the militia of the country.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before that carries I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to it. The whole of the clerks on whom this expenditure of $10,000 is to be made under these items are exempted from the provisions of the Civil Service Act. It is not as the hon. Minister of Agriculture says at all, for the purpose that he may employ a couple of graduates of a college or something of that kind. All the payments up to $800 and above that may be made under the provision that we are now passing notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is not that in the explanation given ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Agriculture asks to have this provision inserted for the purpose of enabling him to make payments to a couple of clerks who are exceptional and who have passed university examinations. Instead of that he could do just the same as they do in the Department of Railways and Canals, where all persons who have technical knowledge, such as engineers, are exempted from the provisions of the Civil Service Act. In this case, the hon. minister exempts from the provisions of the Civil Service Act the whole of the expenditure of $10,000 which he proposes to make.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is not the case.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, that is in the wording.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The wording 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' applies only after the word 'including.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But it says 'including payment up to $800 each per annum.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That applies to only two.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Only two ? Oh, then, I am mistaken.

The Department of Inland Revenue—	
Clerical and other assistance..	$2,300
Printing and stationery..	3,000
Sundries..	2,000
	$7,300

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $200. Would the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) explain the cause of it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no increase. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will see that there is one item increased and the other reduced so that the net result is the same. It is not an increase; only a readjustment.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is good phrase.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Referring again to the vote of the Department of Agriculture, I stated that the exemption from the provisions of the Civil Service Act applied to the whole of the vote. When I read it over I thought that was correct, and upon further examination, I find that I was correct in saying that it applies to the whole of the clerical assistance required. The item reads :

Clerical and other assistance, including payment up to $800 each per annum for two assistant patent examiners, 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.'

You see there is a comma before 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I move to strike out the comma.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That applies to the whole staff.

Mr. MACLEAN. The government are saving themselves with a comma.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We do not take advantage of commas.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If you strike out the comma, perhaps it will be correct.

Department of Customs—	
Clerical and other assistance, including $1,750 to be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.. .. ..$5,625	
Printing and stationery,..	2,000
Sundries..	2,730
	$10,355

Mr. SPROULE. I think the same principle is involved here, and it is a very pernicious one.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This applies to the whole of them; there is no doubt in this case.

Mr. SPROULE. No name is given of anyone, and there is nothing beyond the vote of the money. The money can be expended without reference to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and it can be given to any person the minister chooses. I remember somewhat distinctly some of the discussions which took place upon this question years ago, the object of inserting this provision was this : Every young man or young woman in the civil service was supposed to be getting a fair salary, and if for any cause it was found necessary to employ them in any capacity other than that which had been their ordinary work, and a vote of money passed this House for that purpose, the name was given so that you might look up and see who the party was, the amount of salary he was getting and whether he was getting more than he was entitled to; or, if he was charged with doing one class of work and with doing less than he should do in his ordinary avocation, so as to enable him to get the additional salary, you could readily look up the record and see who the civil servant was, how much his salary was at the time, and how much it would be if the addition was made. Then, the name was given in each case. Now, we are departing entirely from that rule. You give no name, we vote the amount and you can employ any person you choose. I think this is leading to the abuse that we had to correct in 1891 after the long inquiry which we made into the civil service, and it cannot be stopped a moment too early. I think we should have some explanation from the minister.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will remem-

ber—I have been out of the House for a few moments—there was a general discussion upon this question. Speaking about this particular item, I think that three years ago, in taking the general estimates, I had an estimate in for a first-class clerk at $1,750. It passed in committee, but before the estimates were adopted finally the clerk died. I then stated that I would wait until the main estimates were being concurred in and move to reduce them by the sum of $1,750, and that I would take in the supplementaries a vote for an amount without reference to the civil service examination. What I did was, that after the death of that officer I was proposing to get two officers, paying both of them only the amount that had been paid to the gentleman who died. This has gone on from that time to this, not with any desire to hide the names of the persons receiving the money or anything of that kind. Then, I was unable to get the officers to start at $400. I could not get the officers that were required, but I was able to get two officers who had not passed the civil service examination, and as they were good and competent men I gave them $700 each one year, and next year I increased it to $750.

Mr. SPROULE. Who are the officers? They are not named here.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. One was Mr. Norris, who is now in the outside service, and I forget the name of the other gentleman at this moment. But, this is the way it came about, and perhaps now a second-class clerk, starting at $600, would be better for another year when this provision would be dropped and these officers brought under the civil service list.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be better. I think it is a very bad principle, and since attention has been drawn to it, I do not think it would be out of place to change it and adopt the regular system.

Department of Public Works—

Printing and stationery	$4,500
Sundries	5,500
	$10,000

Mr. SPROULE. This is for printing and stationery?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Newspapers, postage, telegrams, printing, and so on. There is not a cent for employees.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to ask the minister if all this was given to 'La Patrie.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 'La Patrie' does not require any public patronage.

Contingencies—High Commissioner's Office, London, $18,350.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item contains a special vote to which I invite the attention of the committee. There is a small increase in the general expenses consequent on the increase of the income tax which has always been paid by this government. There is an increase of $100 for stationery, and for rents, alterations, &c., there is an increase of $1,800.14, explained by the fact that the premises have been enlarged, during the past year. The offices in London were found to be somewhat cramped and additional accommodation was obtained last year in the same building. There is a sum of $5,000 proposed to be granted in lieu of house and furniture. It will be remembered that when the office of High Commissioner for Canada was established, a house was bought in London for the High Commissioner and both house and furniture were supplied at the public expense. That system continued for some years. The house was a somewhat expensive one, but the property somewhat deteriorated in that vicinity and the house was never occupied by Lord Strathcona. We came to the conclusion that there was no use in keeping it idle, and so the house was sold. The government no longer owns the house and no longer undertakes to furnish a house in London, and so this appropriation is in lieu of the house and furniture which have hitherto been supplied at the public expense. The High Commissioner, for the time being, has either to buy a house, or he can rent a house and furniture during the term of his incumbency. This is in lieu of the house and furniture which has hitherto been supplied at the public expense.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will this be cheaper or dearer than the former system?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Speaking from memory the house cost us upwards of $40,000. It was furnished at the public expense and the furniture had to be maintained. Whether or not this is an exact equivalent I am not prepared to say. It may be more liberal. There is no doubt that the whole tendency of the expenses of the High Commissioner in London must be to increase. It is a very expensive place. It is a position which I believe the average public man would hardly desire. It can only be occupied, I am afraid, by a man of private means, and we must expect to make a decently liberal allowance to whoever occupies that office.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose Lord Strathcona lives in his own residence in London?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Of course he does not draw this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He will draw it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought this was a provision to carry out the common rumour

that there is to be a successor appointed to Lord Strathcona.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there is no foundation for that rumour whatever.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am very glad to hear that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as we know Lord Strathcona has improved in health and strength and the desire of all is that he may be long spared to continue in the office, the duties of which he has discharged with such great ability and credit to Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Contingencies—Post Office Department, $60,885.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Every year the number of savings bank accounts increase, and there is an allowance of 1¾ cents for calculation of the interest on each saving's bank account. The number of accounts has increased by 6,000 last year, and this is the ordinary vote to meet that.

Mr. SPROULE. I have seen the rumour of late in the public press that the Postmaster General is getting a large share of his printing done in Toronto, and has transferred it from the Government Printing Bureau for some reason or other unknown to the general public. Can the minister give us some information on the subject. Where is he getting his printing done now, and is there a saving in the cost ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend is in error in saying that the printing has been transferred to the city of Toronto. It does happen that one single item of printing for this department was done outside the Bureau, but it was not done in the city of Toronto. However, this is immaterial to the question. It was done in the city of Montreal.

Mr. MACLEAN. By whom ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The 'Herald' of course.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was not the 'Herald.' Tenders were invited, or rather inquiries were made to see what was a fair price. It was done by the printing firm of Perrault, I think that is the name. This was one item known as the Money Order Book, and it was sent there because we could not get it done with equal dispatch and cheapness in the Printing Bureau at the time. They complain at the Bureau at times, that their equipment is inadequate and that the accommodation is not as large as it should be. I believe there is something in that, and we may some time or other be called on to enlarge that Bureau. I think the minister is getting more equipment in.

Contingencies—Office of Controller of Northwest Mounted Police, $900.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that in almost all these items there appears the proviso 'clerical and other assistance notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' It does not say who is to be employed, but we put the money at the disposal of the minister to use it as he sees fit. It is a pernicious principle and it is more prevalent this year than ever before. The Civil Service Act is old enough to have a fair trial, and if there is anything in it, we should live up to it as closely as possible. It is true there are exceptions to every rule and the House is liberal in providing for these exceptions, but this sort of thing now appears to be the general rule rather than the exception.

The PRIME MINISTER. As far as the Department of Mounted Police is concerned, I believe there is this redeeming feature for the violation of the rule, namely: That the department is in exactly the same position as it was in July 1896, when we took office.

Mr. SPROULE. The Prime Minister does not quite apprehend the point I make. Not that there was any change in the department of the Mounted Police, but that almost every item in these estimates contains a sum of money that is required 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary.' That is, we set aside an amount of money which the head of the department may spend contrary to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, in employing any person he chooses. Formerly when this was done the name of the individual was given, and we could ascertain how much he was getting in the aggregate for the work he was doing. But to-day the names are not mentioned. We only vote the money, and leave it to the judgment of the minister or someone under him in the department to employ any one he likes, perhaps some one in another department who gets a good salary, and who, if he did his duty, would have his time fully occupied there. The result is that we do not know anything about it unless we can find out by looking into the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps I should say that in a number of cases these words are necessary to enable us to employ messengers who have not passed the civil service examination; and I do not know that it is necessary that messengers should pass it. Perhaps the most useful messenger you could have would be a man of about forty years of age, who could not pass the civil service examination; and in order to employ him it is necessary to insert these words. You might get a boy who

could pass the examination, but who, after being a messenger for a year or two, might want to be made a clerk. He probably would not make as good a messenger as the man I have described.

Mr. SPROULE. If this refers to messengers, it should be so stated; but it is impossible to suppose that all these cases, or even a large number, are those of messengers.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We have an Act of parliament, and if it is not a proper one we should amend it. I know that, as the hon. gentleman states, sometimes the very best messenger you could get is one who cannot pass the civil service examination, perhaps an old soldier, trained to the service; but in that case his name should be mentioned, if he is employed. There must have been a controversy with the Auditor General whether the voting of a particular sum for a certain purpose without mentioning the man's name could exempt the individual from the provisions of the Act. I would suppose that voting the money would not exempt the individual.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think this is the same form that has been used for years. There is no change.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the point has never been thought of.

Contingencies—Department of Labour, $1,650.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the Minister of Labour say whether it is his intention this session to increase the pay of that large class of labourers, the letter carriers ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would like to satisfy my hon. friend at the earliest moment, but I am afraid this is hardly the opportune occasion. If he will kindly renew his question at a later date, I can assure him he will have the opportunity.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I notice that the minister at the head of the Department of Labour does not take advantage of the phrase 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' so that none of this money can be applied to any one who does not come under the provisions of that Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We take our chances of that.

Mr. SPROULE. I may remind my hon. friend of the vote taken yesterday, a note at the bottom of which said that none of these come under the Civil Service Act. It is said that they are all exempt.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was with reference to civil government.

Mr. SPROULE. It applied to the clerks in the department—all below the deputy head.

Mr. MACLEAN. And as we have the Minister of Justice now in the House, and he is a young and energetic man, he can give us the benefit of his advice and straighten out this tangle, so that we shall not have one minister after another getting up and saying that they are taking their chances. We hope the Minister of Justice gives sound advice, and we shall expect it at the next sitting in regard to these important questions.

Care and cleaning of departmental buildings, $28,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the usual vote.

Mr. SPROULE. As the Minister of Public Works is not present, I presume this is not the proper place to bring up the question of the rooms in this building. Although we were told last year that there was going to be an important addition made which would afford us more rooms and better ones, we find, when we come back, that there is not much change, apart from adding a committee room and a suite of rooms for some employees of the House. Owing to the absence of the Minister of Public Works, who has to bear the brunt of the abuse in these cases, I think we shall have to take up the matter at some other time.

Administration of Justice—miscellaneous expenditure, including North-west Territories, $37,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We are told by the papers that there is some probability of a change in regard to the salaries of the judges, notably the county court judges. I understood the Minister of Justice to say the other day that the government had not arrived at a policy in reference to the judges of the superior courts and the Supreme Court. When this item is being voted it is the time for the Minister of Justice to state what the policy of the government is in reference to the salary of the judges throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think the question of an increase in the salaries of the judges has been considered at all. The question that came up the other day was with reference to the retirement of a certain number of county court judges who had reached a period of life when they were not in a position properly to perform the duties appertaining to their office, and the suggestion was that these judges, after they had reached a certain term on the bench, say twenty or twenty-five years, and had attained the age of seventy or seventy-five, should be allowed to retire on full pay. That was the suggestion. We have not got beyond the stage of looking on it as a suggestion. I myself would not be in a position to go further than to say that I do not think a man who has served his country for twenty or twenty-five years and reached an advanced age, should be forced to retire without receiving some consideration for the services he has rendered.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does this apply only to the county court judges ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Up to the present time it is only with reference to the county court judges that the matter has been considered. I may say that a constitutional difficulty exists with regard to the High Court judges. It is extremely doubtful, in view of the terms of the British North America Act, whether a high court judge can be interfered with in any way. The most we could expect to do would be to make some provision that after he has attained a certain age and done service during a certain period he might be allowed to retire on full pay.

Mr. MACLEAN. Has not the time come for some radical departure by this parliament in the treatment of our judges. Year by year representations have been made to the previous government, as well as to this one, on this subject without any effect. I hope the new Minister of Justice will give the question his most careful consideration, and put the government shortly in a position to grapple with it. I have no hesitation in saying that our judges are not sufficiently paid and that we have too many.

Mr. COWAN. Not High Court judges.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, but altogether. The number ought to be reduced and the salaries increased, and there ought perhaps to be more liberal treatment given them with regard to expenses. At present we cannot get a lawyer of the best class to take a judgeship in Ontario simply because the salary is not high enough. I have actually heard it stated that a certain judge was in a position to go on the Appeal Bench in the province of Ontario because he had private means of his own and could afford to dispense with the $1,000 allowance for expenses given the other judges. That condition of affairs should not be allowed to continue. I believe in paying our judges well so as to get the highest class of men for the position. I believe that our judges should be selected among men of 40 or 45 years of age, because then you get men who are in their prime, but in order to get the best men we must pay a better salary. I hope that the day is at hand when the whole question will be courageously grappled with by the government and a progressive policy brought down. I trust that the new Minister of Justice will take this matter up and give it his best consideration next year if not this year.

Mr. WADE. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has brought this matter up, especially the matter of the salaries paid judges. In Ontario there are four judges who are paid $6,000 per year each and eleven who are paid $5,000. In the province of Quebec three are paid $6,000 a year and twenty-two $5,000 a year, while in Nova Scotia only one judge is paid $5,000 a year and the other six are only paid $4,000. I submit that the character of litigation which comes before the judges of Nova Scotia is more varied perhaps than that which comes before the judges of any other province. Certainly it covers every possible kind of business—mining, manufacturing, lumbering, ship building, agriculture, banking and commerce and insurance. If the judges in Ontario and Quebec are not adequately paid at $5,000 or $6,000 a year—and I agree with my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) in that regard—surely he will admit that the judges in Nova Scotia are much more poorly paid and that their salaries should be increased. Shortly before this discussion arose I was going through the figures, and I find that it would take some $29,000 to level up the salaries of the judges in the other provinces to those in Ontario and Quebec, and I would urge on the hon. Minister of Justice this phase of the question. Something might be urged against any increase to the judges in some of the provinces on the ground that the character of the litigation which comes before them is not as varied as it is in Nova Scotia or Ontario, but no such contention can be made with regard to the judges in the province of Nova Scotia.

As regards the number of superior judges being too great, I do not think that such an objection can hold with regard to Nova Scotia. We have only seven Supreme Court judges there. There might be some objection of the kind raised with regard to the county court judges, but certainly not in the case of the Supreme Court judges. I had intended to bring this mater up at a later stage in the discussion of the estimates, but as we are at the vote now, I take this opportunity of giving expression to my views and will refer to the subject again.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. When I first came in to this House, and on the very first occasion when I addressed the Chair, I did so in favour of increasing the salaries of the judges. That was over thirteen years ago, and I am still of the same opinion, but I regret that although I have exerted myself in bringing up the subject before the House every session, nothing so far has been done. Speaking of my own province, we have in Manitoba but four Superior Court judges. They preside over the Court of King's Bench in criminal as well as in civil cases, and they also form a Court of Appeal or Review, so that these judges in Manitoba have to do all the duties which in the other provinces are assigned to special judges. In Ontario as well as Quebec there are several courts, and the judges of each court are confined to the work of that court alone, but in Manitoba our four judges have to do the work both of the Court of First Jurisdiction and the Court of Appeal. This is not the case in the province of Quebec or Ontario or the province of Nova Scotia, of

which the hon. gentleman who last addressed the Chair has spoken, and yet our judges are on the same footing as the judges in Nova Scotia with regard to salary. The Chief Justice gets only $5,000 a year and the puisne judges only $4,000 per year each, which is entirely inadequate and out of proportion, considering the excessive cost of living in the western province and the amount of work they have to perform. Their labours extend over the whole of the province of Manitoba where we have three large districts. The result is that in order to keep up with the work, these judges are sometimes subjected to such a strain that their health is undermined through over work. It is unfair to expect men of their ability—and our judges in Manitoba are men of high ability—to do the work they do at such a low salary.

To pay salary of judge of Divorce and Matrimonial Court, N.B., $500.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. May I ask the Minister of Justice if we are soon to expect an appointment in the place of Judge Prendergast who has been removed to the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Almost immediately.

Mr. MACLEAN. Here is an item for the salary of a judge of the Divorce and Matrimonial Court in New Brunswick. I used that only to bring out the fact that eleven cases are being tried this year in the Senate, in a very expensive way and a very unfair way.

The PRIME MINISTER. Why unfair ?

Mr. MACLEAN. It is unfair to the poor people, and really amounts to class legislation. If we pay salaries for a divorce court in New Brunswick, there is a large section of this community who think there ought to be, in some way, a divorce court for the Dominion.

Mr. LARIVIERE. Let them go to New Brunswick.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, they do not have to go to New Brunswick. The time is coming when this question must be approached. It is very well to try to sidetrack it in this way but we do not thereby remove the trouble. People are leaving Canada for the United States in order to get relief. They may go to New Brunswick also. And yet, notwithstanding all, the Senate, the worst possible court to try cases of this kind, has eleven cases before it this session. I know there is a great deal of objection to the proposal of a Divorce Court, but it is one of those difficult questions which ought to be approached and dealt with by the government.

Administration of Justice—Supreme Court of Canada—The reporter, $2,050.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I notice there is an increase in the general vote for this court. It has been increasing year by year. It was a respectably small sum at one time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The general staff have been allowed the statutory increase of $50 a year, except the messengers, who have been each allowed $30.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How many messengers are there ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Two.

Mr. SPROULE. These officers, I see by the estimates of last year, received the statutory increase last year also. Exception seems to have been made of this court, among the civil servants. Nearly all were denied the increase last year, but, on the other hand nearly all the officers of this court received the increase both last year and this year. I do not object to the increase, if it is given to the others. But, to refuse it to so many of the others and give it to all these officers suggests that the injustice is being done to the many, or that more than justice is being done to these.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When the permanent head of the department reports that a civil servant is entitled to the increase, for my part I have endeavoured to conform to that recommendation.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that that is the contention this year. But that has been strongly opposed in other years, and it has been contended that, notwithstanding the recommendation of the deputy head, it was left to the wisdom or justice of the minister to grant the increase or not as he pleased. And, last year, the judgment of the ministers was that, in most cases, the increase should not be given. To grant the increase generally in one branch and to withhold it generally in others could hardly be defended on grounds of justice.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before we pass the estimates of the Supreme Court, I would like to have a little discussion with the Minister of Justice concerning the statement he has made that he doubts whether we have power, under the British North America Act, to fix the time at which a judge may be superannuated. Surely, that power must rest somewhere. We have all the power that the British parliament has, there being no reservation under the British North America Act. If a British parliament is all powerful with regard to the judges of Great Britain, we surely have power to say at what age our judges shall retire. When men arrive at a certain age, frailty overtakes them, as a rule—there may be individual exceptions. Surely, when we are paying the salaries, we have the power to say at what age a man shall cease to perform the duties as a judge for which the salary is paid. What the people of this country complain about is not that the salaries of the judges are too large but that there are so many judges and such a multi-

tude of appeals. In no country in the world, except the United States, and partially, Great Britain, can a litigant, when he goes into court to obtain civil justice be delayed so long as in Canada. I am sorry the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is not in his place today. When he was in opposition he advocated this principle. He drew the attention of the Minister of Justice of that time again and again to the number of appeals and to the delay of justice in Canada. As the hon. gentleman used to ask then, why cannot we adopt the simpler system that they have in Switzerland, or the form of procedure that they have in the German empire, or that of France, or the new procedure of Great Britain? Why should a poor litigant be delayed in this manner when he seeks a simple answer to a request for justice from the courts of the land? Have fewer judges. Pay them well. There is a favoured corporation which exists in this country and to the members of which more prizes, more good offices are open than to all the rest of the people in the community put together. It is a close corporation. Of course it is open to every young man who accepts it as a profession. But how few are in a position to do so. It is virtually a close corporation. And, while the people of this country are proud of the integrity of the judges, proud of their incorruptibility as well as, generally, their intelligence in the administration of justice, they feel that there should be a simpler course of procedure, fewer courts and fewer judges. I congratulate the Minister of Justice on the accessions the Supreme Court of Canada has recently made. I am glad to see that the government have appointed two distinguished members of the House, and I believe they will bring to that court the intelligence and ability which ought to characterize the members of the Supreme Court of the country. I am glad to say that, though they have been opponents of mine in this House. I believe they will bring to that court at any rate that incorruptibility which is as necessary almost as intelligence. I say this though, the appointments are following precedents which the Postmaster General has condemned, of taking members from this House, though I may differ with him upon that subject. But I am glad to see that two gentlemen for whom I have so high a respect as the late Minister of Justice and the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries have been—might I say hoisted, or sent upwards, to the honourable position which they now hold as judges of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. A good many years ago when I was a younger member of this House, a Bill was introduced to do away with the Supreme Court. Perhaps I did not know as much about courts then as I do now. But I hold the opinion which has just been expressed by my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that it was thought then that the courts were rather used for the benefit of the rich man than of the poor man, because when a case was entered you never knew when it would be finished, and unless a man had a very long purse he might expect to be outdone by his opponent. I might cite one or two cases that went on year after year in that way. But the argument made against the Supreme Court was something like this, it was contended that it was very expensive for litigants to go to the highest court in the empire, that is to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and therefore there was a strong necessity for a Supreme Court in Canada where most of those cases could be taken and finally decided. That was the reason the court was established; but it was afterwards found that that object was not fulfilled by the Supreme Court, and a Bill was introduced to do away with it. On that occasion I remember distinctly that the late Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald opposed the Bill strongly, and held that while there were many things about the Supreme Court that he thought were not just what they ought to be, he still held it was on its trial, and that we ought to let it continue, It was held that there were two lines especially in which that Supreme Court would be advantageous, namely, that it would secure finality in many cases coming from the provinces, and that it would be able to settle constitutional questions that might be submitted to it. I have watched with a good deal of interest the conduct of these cases since then, but I have not found as time went on that there has been much improvement. There is an increasing number of cases being taken to the Privy Council in England. That high court seems to be the aim of every litigant who is able to carry his case there. Instead of securing finality, it appears to me that the Supreme Court is only another stepping stone that the litigant has to pass before he gets his case finally settled and one that adds to the expense. It seems to me that there ought to be some stringent rule laid down to govern the selection of cases that are allowed to be taken from the Supreme Court to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I think a large percentage of the cases in which application is made to carry them to the Privy Council, should not be allowed, and that we should have some rule laid down by which a majority of those cases would end in the Supreme Court here.

Mr. HACKETT. I want to say just one word with reference to a statement made by the Minister of Justice that there is a constitutional difficulty standing in the way of superannuating the judges of the Supreme and higher courts of Canada. In this country when a man goes to law, he expects to get justice in the courts, and

every thing depends upon the honesty and integrity of the courts of justice. Now I want to say here that in my opinion the judges, not only of the Supreme Court and of the other higher courts of Canada, but also of the lower courts, are men against whom not one word can be said in respect of their honesty and integrity. But I chiefly rise for the purpose of expressing my gratification on the accession the Supreme Court of Canada has recently made in the persons of Sir Louis Davies and the Hon. David Mills. They have long been political antagonists of mine. I want to say of Sir Louis Davies that I have known him for thirty years, ever since he was a young man, and I have always found that he was a gentleman of high convictions of honesty and truth which he was ready to carry into any position which he filled in this House or elsewhere. I rise to say this of that gentleman, and also to say that our people in Prince Edward Island look upon his elevation to the Supreme Court as a compliment to their province. We are a small portion of this great Dominion, but I am glad to recognize that the government of Canada has shown that though we are small in numbers we have produced men of great ability. We are proud that they have taken a gentleman from our province and raised him to the honourable position of a judge of the Supreme Court.

Mr. McCREARY. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to one or two facts in relation to the west. I do not know whether he has yet received from the bar of Manitoba a resolution recently passed to the following effect:

Moved by Mr. Aikins, K. C., seconded by Mr. Phippen :

That as there is now a large and increasing population in Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia, and in view of the rapidly growing importance of these provinces, it is in the opinion of the bar of Manitoba, due to that portion of Canada lying west of Ontario that there should be appointed from such territory at least one judge to the Supreme Court of Canada, and the bar of Manitoba respectfully urges that the government of the Dominion of Canada make such amendment to the Supreme Court Act as will enable such additional judge to be appointed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I intended to bring this up at a later date, but as the matter is now up for discussion. I may properly mention it to-day. Most lawyers in this House will agree with me when I say that the legislation of Manitoba, the Territories, and British Columbia, is very dissimilar to that of Ontario, and especially to that of the Maritime Provinces and Quebec; and some of the litigants who go to the Supreme Court have complained bitterly, not that the judges of the Supreme Court were not men of ability, but that they were not in touch with the laws of the western portion of Canada, and consequently they considered their cases had not been dealt with as well as they might have been had there been on the Bench a judge who had some knowledge of the laws of the western provinces. Now, the lawyers from Manitoba are to a great extent acquainted with the laws of the Territories as well as those of British Columbia, in fact one half the bar of British Columbia is composed of gentlemen who have been members of the bar of Manitoba, of gentlemen who have graduated in Manitoba. I think the late Chief Justice of British Columbia graduated in Manitoba, and if I mistake not the present Chief Justice did also. The lawyers in Winnipeg are pretty well acquainted with the laws of all of western Canada, even to the coast; and I submit that the Minister of Justice might now consider whether some amendment should not be made in that Act by which members from Manitoba or the west might be appointed to the Supreme Court Bench. I think he will agree with me when I say that we have just as able men in the west as we have in the east. In fact we see now that one of the most important acts of legislation passed in Manitoba has recently been adopted by the great and intelligent province of Ontario, I refer to the Prohibition Act, which is to be a copy of the Manitoba Act.

Before I sit down I will take this occasion of saying that I endorse the statement made by my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) with regard to salaries. I notice in looking over the salaries that $6,000 and $8,000 are paid to several judges in Ontario. As I have said, we have just as able judges in Manitoba and the Territories as any in the east; besides we all know that the expense of living up there is 25 or 50 per cent higher than it is in the east, higher than it is in Ottawa or Quebec. I know that if you engage a hack to take you from the station to your hotel in Manitoba, it costs you a dollar, when such a service would cost 25 cents here. My experience has been that it costs from 25 to 50 per cent more to live in Manitoba and the North-west Territories than it does here. Our judges in Manitoba and the west are as able as the judges are here, and why should they not be paid the same salaries or even 25 per cent more ? I submit that an injustice is being done in our western provinces. It may be argued that we are not numerically a large province. That is not a good argument. We ought to have the best men that Canada can procure in a new country which is rapidly filling up with people and they would be amply paid. Next year we expect to have between 50,000 to 100,000 people coming from the American nation across the boundary, and a great deal will depend on how our courts are established and maintained as to the impression which will be made on the minds of those people who settle in that country. Ameri-

cans as a general rule have a very great respect for our courts and our judges, and it will be well to maintain the courts in a manner which will merit such respect. It behooves the hon. Minister of Justice and parliament to take proper steps to see that the best men are appointed to the Bench and that they are paid the highest salaries that it is practicable to give them. I also notice that you have five or six judges in other provinces to one in Manitoba. We have only four judges of the Superior Court when we should have seven or eight, and they will still have too much work to do. I know that Judge Dubuc, one of the judges of the Manitoba Superior Court, is practically laid up from overwork, over study and overtravel. I know also this, and I state it as a fact, that if we were to ask for a judge to be put on the Superior Court Bench, of the six or eight senior members of the bar of Manitoba not one would accept the $5,000 salary that is offered and go on the Bench. I have spoken to five or six of these gentlemen. I know that their practice is worth much more than $5,000 a year. I would ask the hon. Minister of Justice to carefully consider these matters.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As to the question of the appointing of the judges, I may state, after the discussion that has taken place here to-day, that up to the present time it is apparent that fairly good judges have been appointed, because it seems to me that each side is vieing with the other in praising the judges we have now. In respect to appointments from Manitoba to the Supreme Court Bench, I may say that what is desired and what is necessary in this country is that we should have as far as possible the best men in the country on the Supreme Court Bench, and in order to accomplish that purpose we should endeavour to eliminate the question of boundaries and take the best men, wherever we can get them, always of course having proper regard for the position of the province of Quebec. Dealing with that point, I should say in answer to the opinion expressed by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that appeals to the Supreme Court are final in so far as it is possible for this parliament to make them so. I may say to my hon. friend that when a case has once gone to the Supreme Court it is concluded by the judgment of that Court, and that in order to go to the Privy Council it is necessary to make application to the Privy Council for special leave to go there. In respect to an application to the Privy Council in order to enable an appeal to be taken we have absolutely no jurisdiction. We have absolutely no control over it. It is one of the inherent rights of every British subject to go to the sovereign and ask him for justice. The sovereign is the source of all justice, and every subject can always go to the sovereign and ask to be heard. That is the reason of appeals to the Privy Council. We can limit this right, we cannot take it away; it is impossible for us to do more than to say that in so far as this country is concerned the judgment of the Supreme Court is final, but every British subject may then go to the King, when he has a grievance, and ask him to remedy it. If the King considers that the question ought to be inquired into he says that the appeal should be granted and fixes the terms upon which the appeal may be granted. Then, an appeal is made to the King in council and that is why it was called an appeal to the Privy Council.

Dealing with the question of the superannuation of judges, I would like to say to my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that at the present time a judge who is appointed to the High Court may, after he has served fifteen years on the Bench, retire and receive his retiring allowance, or, in the interval a judge becomes incapacitated on account of illness or some other cause, he may retire and receive his retiring allowance. But, a judge once appointed, is appointed for all time and there can be no interference with his appointment except with his consent or by impeachment. That is the rule, that is the sacred rule, and it is a necessary rule if we are to preserve the independence of our courts. My hon. friend beside me suggests that of course we may proceed by impeachment. If it were otherwise what would happen would be this; a judge would be appointed and after he was appointed if he became obnoxious to the powers that happened to control the legislation, at any time in his career, legislation might be introduced and his services dispensed with. What would become of the independence of the judiciary under these conditions? It would be impossible to have those judges of whom all have spoken so highly to-day. They would then be dependent upon the whim or caprice of parliament and that would be the ruination of the judicial system of this country. What I should like to do would be to provide that when a judge has served his country for a certain period of time, and when he has reached a certain age, by common consent, or by mutual agreement, as between him and the crown, he may retire on his full pay. The pay is now so small that it is impossible for a judge to make any provision for his declining years, and the result is that we see judges going beyond their period of labour, having passed the allotted three score years and ten of life, and still struggling on and dying in harness practically because they have been obliged to continue work at a time when they should be relieved from that obligation, because the position is such that it is impossible for them to retire, as their financial condition prevents them from doing so with advantage to themselves and their families. The hon. member for North Lanark said that we

have too many judges in this country. I am not going to dispute that point, but my hon. friend must remember that we are not responsible entirely for the judicial system of this country. It is an anomalous system that we have; the creation and control of courts is within the jurisdiction of the local legislatures. All that we have to do is to appoint the judges that the local legislatures declare are necessary for the proper administration of justice.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is only for the county courts.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is applicable to all the high courts. If you will look at the British North America Act you will see that the constitution of the courts is under the control of the local legislatures. As a matter of course, the appointment of the judges remains with us, but the necessity for judges is a matter that is under the control of the local legislatures. Therefore, we are not entirely responsible for the number of judges in the land. On the contrary, I say in the words of Sir John Macdonald—than whom there was no more competent man to discuss such a question—when the point was raised by the Hon. Edward Blake; I say in the words of Sir John Macdonald, that it would be a serious responsibility for this parliament to assume. If the local legislature has decided that it is necessary to appoint a judge in the interest of litigants, it would be a serious responsibility for this parliament to assume the right to refuse to do that which the local legislature asks us to do. After all, we have to bear in mind that we represent here practically the same electorate that the members of the local legislatures represent, and that if that electorate speaking through the local legislature, declares that a court ought to be constituted in a certain division, or that a judge ought to be appointed, it would be a serious matter for us to refuse to acquiesce in the desire of the local legislature.

As to the multitude of appeals, there again, I speak feelingly. Perhaps I should limit my observations to my own province, and I can say that in my province there is a multitude of appeals which I think are entirely unnecessary. But there again my hon. friend must address himself to the local legislature. We have no remedy; we cannot give any redress; we cannot interfere at all. That is a matter of procedure which is governed exclusively by the local legislature.

Mr. SPROULE. If we had never established the Supreme Court they could not appeal to it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is another question. The question of the appeal to the Supreme Court is a matter for which this parliament must assume the responsibility, but, speaking deferentially of course, and after some experience of the Supreme Court, I say it would be rather a disappointment to me at all events if the Supreme Court of Canada were abolished. The Supreme Court has rendered good service, and if you bear in mind that the commercial law of this country, and generally that part of the legislation under the control of this parliament, is uniform throughout Canada, it will be seen to be important that this parliament should have a court to construe its own laws. It is important I say that this parliament should have control over the court that is called upon to construe the laws we enact here, so that we may have some sort of uniformity in our jurisprudence in respect to laws which are uniform throughout the country. There is a class of laws peculiar to each province, but there is on the other hand legislation applicable to the whole country, and with respect to that it is proper we should have a court that would construe that legislation so that our jurisprudence will have uniformity. In that respect the Supreme Court is a valuable body. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has spoken of the judicial system they have in England. I speak with deference on that, because the system is not very familiar to me, but it strikes me that in Ontario and Nova Scotia the Judicature Act is practically adopted, and in those two provinces they have substantially the same Judicature Act they have in England.

I am reminded by the Prime Minister of something which I should say in respect to appeals to the Supreme Court. There is one question we must consider, and that is a question which is entirely under our control. That is, as to whether or not, with respect to the appeals to the Supreme Court, we should say that these appeals should be limited to that particular class of legislation I spoke of a moment ago; namely, the cases arising under the federal laws. There is a question as to whether that ought not to be done. That is a question which I think ought to be very seriously considered by all of us. I do not think that we ought to be hasty in our legislation in that regard. I know that so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, although they are called upon to administer a system of laws which is perhaps not very familiar to all of the judges, still there are cases in which we are glad to have appeals to the Supreme Court, notwithstanding that their system of law is not the same as exists elsewhere. With respect to the general question it would be worth our while to consider it. I think it is a very valuable suggestion, and one that ought to be looked into, as to whether we ought not to limit the appeals to the Supreme Court to cases which arise under the federal laws.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Justice tells us that it perhaps would not

be just to retire a judge at a certain time of life, and that at all events it is not the constitutional practice followed in England. I know the system that prevails there, and it was a question with me as to whether we had the power to do it. I contend we have the power if there is no constitutional principle against it. As to the appeal from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council, I am glad to hear the present Minister of Justice announce doctrines which are entirely different from those held by his leaders when they were in opposition. When the Hon. Edward Blake introduced the Supreme Court Act he said that the power of limiting the right of appeal was under the British North America Act and that when a question went to the Supreme Court we could by an Act of this parliament prevent it going to the Privy Council.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mr. Blake never made such a statement.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg your pardon. I listened to it and I heard the reply of Sir John Macdonald and his suggestion which was incorporated in the Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mr. Blake knew too much to make such a statement as that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I remember that Sir John Macdonald stated that a little bird whispered in his ear that an Act which deprived Her Majesty of a certain prerogative would be disallowed. The Minister of Justice tells us that it is the inherent right of every subject to appeal to the foot of the Throne. I rather think, that is a prerogative of the Crown itself. The prerogative of the Crown is to hear the appeal, and it rather appertains to the Sovereign and not to the subject. That is the way it should be put.

Mr. BELCOURT. What is the difference ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We have no right here to interfere with the prerogative of the Crown. When preparing the Australian constitution it was insisted that there should be embodied in it a provision similar to that in our original Supreme Court Act, and they held that the decision of the Australian courts should be final. The contention was made that in the Australian Act, when the King and parliament of England consented to it, the fact of their consent did away with the prerogative as far as it referred to Australia. If the parliament of Canada had a short Imperial Act passed, and if the King assented to it, no appeal would go from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council, because the consent of the King would take away this prerogative. I rose in order to state to the Minister of Justice what my recollection was of the matter under discussion.

Then, as to the question of our jurisdiciton over procedure, the power virtually rests with the government by its refusing to appoint a judge or refusing to pay him, or by delaying his appointment for a long time in order to allow of a consultation between the Dominion authorities and the provincial authorities as to the necessity of it. But when the provincial authorities establish a court and we appoint a judge to it, we virtually become a party to the establishing of that court and the mode of procedure adopted by it. Equal power lies with us in consequence of having the power of appointing a judge and paying him. I will admit the statement of the Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald as to the convenience of leaving the matter to the different provincial legislatures ; and I will admit that Sir John Thompson, with some qualms of conscience, instead of fighting legislatures which were perhaps hostile to him, or forcing them to come to an agreement, did the same thing as a matter of convenience ; but I contend that in the having the appointment and payment of judges, we have equal power with the provincial governments over the procedure of the courts.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am obliged to my hon. friend for his correction of my statement as to an appeal to the Privy Council from the Supreme Court. He must bear with me, because unfortunately my knowledge has to be obtained from books, not having had a long parliamentary experience, and my knowledge of the Supreme Court is taken from the statute, which I will read to my hon. friend.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the date?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. 38 Victoria, the statute which created the court :

> The judgment of the Supreme Court shall, in all cases, be final and conclusive, and no appeal shall be brought from any judgment or order of the Supreme Court to any Court of Appeal established by the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, by which appeals or petitions to Her Majesty in Council may be ordered to be heard, saving any right which Her Majesty may be graciously pleased to exercise by virtue of her Royal Prerogative.

That is the original statute, which was introduced by Mr. Fournier, and of course it is in contradiction to the hon. gentleman's words.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will get the debate on the question.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As to the appointment of judges, if my hon. friend will read the British North America Act again, he will see that the appointment of judges is determined by that Act, and we have no right to interfere with it.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Minister of Justice could give us a statement of the percentage

of cases which have reached the Supreme Court and have been appealed to the Privy Council, I think it would be useful. Then, there is the question whether we could not prevent or limit the appeals in some way; but if that could not be done, I think the question might naturally be considered whether it would not be wise to do away with the court. The aim of the court in the first instance was to save appeals to the Privy Council; but it has not resulted in that after a fair trial, and therefore I think it might properly be a matter for consideration whether it is worth while to retain the court. If the number of appeals could be reduced by confining them to a certain class of commercial cases, the court might be made more useful.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is in our power to limit the appeals in the way my hon. friend has suggested. That is matter to be considered.

The Exchequer Court of Canada, $11,135.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When this court was established, we thought we were only going to appoint a judge; but we have a whole staff of clerks and messengers, a registrar and so on. If I remember rightly, the Exchequer Court was appointed for the purpose of inquiring particularly into claims against the Crown arising out of contracts or out of cases in which fiats were issued by the Governor in Council. I understand that in some recent cases, in which disputes have arisen relating to contracts in some of the departments, notably the Department of Railways and Canals, instead of going to the Exchequer Court, they have been going to arbitration, the minister choosing one arbitrator, the contractor another, and the two arbitrators choosing a third. I do not know how they got around the statute.

Mr. BELCOURT. The contract provides for it. It makes the chief engineer the sole arbitrator.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not since the appointment of this court.

Mr. BELCOURT. Under the contract.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. There is no provision for arbitration. It is necessary, before a payment is made to a contractor, that a certificate should be granted by the chief engineer, who is made the sole judge as to whether the contract is carried out or not.

Mr. BELCOURT. All disputes under the contract.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The appointment of the Exchequer Court judge was for this reason, that a contractor might have an equitable claim and the chief engineer might refuse to grant him what was evident justice in the case. Then they might apply to the Exchequer Court and have a trial of the case. If I remember rightly, the Exchequer Court was created for the trial of these cases in order to relieve the department of any charge of being smirched or of making arrangements by which contractors might get an unfair advantage of the government. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) says now: Oh, the party has no right to go to the Exchequer Court at all.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman said that under the clause of the contract, which provides that the sole arbitrator shall be the chief engineer of Railways and Canals, the party could not go to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to repeat what I said? I pointed out that one of the last clauses in all the contracts between the department and the contractors provides that the chief engineer shall be the sole arbitrator of all matters in dispute between them arising under the contract. Under that clause the arbitrators are asked to report to the chief engineer, and the chief engineer finally gives his certificate.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand the hon. member for Ottawa now, and the interpretation he puts on the clause is a most extraordinary one. For the purpose of protecting the department, the chief engineer is made the judge of the efficiency of the work and is appointed sole arbitrator. The hon. member for Ottawa appears to contend that because the chief engineer is the sole arbitrator, he may consult three other arbitrators, he may make them the custodians of his conscience, and allow them to decide what the contractor is entitled to, and then certify to their report as required by the contract. I say that the clause in the contract has no such meaning. It was inserted to relieve the ministers of the different departments of the judicial jurisdiction, but it certainly was never intended that the chief engineer could relieve his conscience by referring the decision of disputes to other arbitrators. Nor was it intended to take such matters out of the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court. I would ask the Minister of Justice whether, in the case of claims of contractors against the Department of Railways or the Department of Public Works, it is the intention of the government to go outside the Exchequer Court and refer them to arbitrators, and then have the arbitrament of these arbitrators certified to by the engineer of the department?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. By the Exchequer Court Act, as I recollect it, claims against the Crown are referred to that court for consideration. These claims are referred to it, on a petition of right, which is granted on the fiat of the Governor General. In addition to that, the minister himself may refer a matter to the Exchequer Court

directly without any petition of right at all. References of that sort are frequently made. These are the proceedings which may be taken under the Exchequer Court Act, and such proceedings would fall to some extent under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. But what my hon. friend brings to the notice of the House is the reference to arbitrators of differences between the crown and a contractor. With these the Department of Justice has nothing to do at all, and in order to answer my hon. friend it would be necessary to understand the terms of the contract between the parties. If the contract provides that disputes or difficulties may be referred to arbitration, the minister is within his right in granting the reference. But if there is no such provision, then the minister who made the reference must answer for his conduct. I know nothing about it.

My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has drawn attention to the number of officials connected with the Exchequer Court. Let me tell him that since the change of government in 1896—since my connection with the Department of Justice—we have not added one official to that court. We have taken the court as we found it and have maintained it in the condition in which it was previous to 1896.

To pay L. A. Audette portion of present salary over and above his statutory salary, representing annual increases from Jan. 1, 1891, to July 1, 1896, amounting to $275, together with $50 for 1901-2, and $50 for 1902-3, making a total of $375.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the salary of Mr. Audette before ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The statutory salary of the registrar is $2,000, but it appears that when he entered upon his duties it was stipulated that his salary should increase, by annual increments of $50 each, to $2,400. This $325 is to provide for this annual increase which has now run his salary up to $2,325. He will have $75 more to get in order to reach the amount at which his salary was fixed by the original agreement. This is an unsatisfactory way of dealing with this gentleman's salary. If it is intended to fix it at $2,400, we should not have to come down each year, as has been the practice hitherto, and ask for this annual increase. My intention is to introduce an Act amending the Exchequer Court Act and fixing Mr. Audette's salary at a certain sum so as to get rid of this annual vote.

Mr. PRINGLE. I find that there is a provision in the Act fixing the salary of the registrar at $2,600. I do not know whether it has been repealed or not. Or it may be a provision with regard to the Supreme Court. I may be in error as to that.

Mr. BELCOURT. That refers to the Supreme Court.

Mr. PRINGLE. It follows almost immediately after the Exchequer Court, and provides that the Exchequer Court shall have and possess concurrent jurisdiction. It then goes on to the distribution of business.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the Supreme Court.

Mr. PRINGLE. I was not quite sure, having just taken the Act in my hand.

Mr. SPROULE. There seems to be a very unusual principle in this. If I understand it is practically going back ten years to vote an increase in a man's salary.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, it had been added on each year. The only addition this year is $50. The additions started in 1891, but we are not responsible for them before we took office.

Mr. SPROULE. But we are voting $375.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We vote the amount each year, with an increase of $50.

Mr. HENDERSON. This item does not seem very clear. Mention here is made of increases from 1891 to 1896, and then for this year and next year. Did he get increases for 1897, 1898 and 1899 ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think for one or two years after 1896 he did not get the increases; but the increase has gone on as I have explained, and each year the amount of the previous year is voted with the additional amount of $50. The original salary is $2,000. My hon. friend will see, by reference to the Exchequer Court Act, sec. 9, the salary is fixed at $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. And this vote for editor and publisher is for the same party as the vote for registrar ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As editor of the Exchequer Court work—yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Altogether what does the salary amount to ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. $2,650.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I wish to settle that question of the introduction of the Bill by Hon. Mr. Fournier. I thought I was right in my recollection of it. The Bill that was passed was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Fournier. That gentleman stated at the time that the clause in reference to the appeal and the exercise of the prerogative was left off. He said that, had he consulted his own feelings, he would have inserted a clause which would prevent an appeal to the Privy Council—evidently he thought he had the right to do so. My memory extends further then the thought. I can remember when Sir John Macdonald accused the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite of stealing his Bill. He said that

his Bill which had been introduced in this House had been pigeon-holed and afterwards was stolen. The measure was introduced four times before the Bill proposed by Mr. Fournier was passed. The first intention evidently was as was the whole tenor of the discussion led by Mr. Blake, who introduced the Bill, to cut out the appeal from the Supreme Court to the Imperial authorities.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As far as possible.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Sir John Macdonald pointed out the difficulty, that this was an attempt to limit the prerogative. I remember the dispute perfectly well. And, when this clause appeared in this Bill, I remember, Sir John Macdonald said that a little bird had whispered to him that the Bill would be disallowed. When Mr. Fournier introduced his Bill, he still stuck to his idea that, while, in some cases they might act wisely in an appeal to the Privy Council yet, in the majority of cases, the reasons were against that appeal, and he thought there ought to be inserted in the Bill a clause to prevent the appeal to Great Britain. Finally the Bill passed, as stated by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick). But I was not wrong in saying that the intention of the Bill as introduced was to cut out the appeal to Great Britain.

Mr. PRINGLE. In referring, as I did a moment ago, to the salary of the registrar being fixed at $2,600. I was quite right in this respect—that clause 70, of the Act states that the registrar of the Supreme Court appointed under the Act should also be the registrar of the Exchequer Court. But I understand that that has been amended by the Exchequer Court Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are two officials now.

Administration of Justice—Yukon Territory. Additional salary of judge, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will ask that the items under this head be allowed to stand. It is probable that there will be a complete re-organization of the salaries of the officials of the Yukon. Pending final conclusion as to that, I would like to have it stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Dominion Police, $30,000.

Mr. PRINGLE. Do I understand from the Minister of Justice that there is likely to be a re-organization with regard to the county courts of the different provinces ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The minister was speaking of the Yukon officials.

Mr. PRINGLE. But we are passing over the estimates for county court judges.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We are not discussing these. We have just passed the Supreme Court, and these that we have come to are statutory items.

Legislation—House of Commons—salaries, $70,550.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the minister give us some information about the new appointment he has made of Black Rod, whether he has changed the salary, and what necessity there was for continuing the office? There were great objections made years ago from the opposition to that office. They thought it was one of the useless offices. But it appears their views have changed in that respect as in many others. Will the right hon. gentleman explain?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know whether the views of my hon. friend have changed. If they are the same as he formerly held he must be in favour of continuing the office of Black Rod. Whether we have acted rightly or wrongly, we have continued the office. The new appointment, Mr. St. John, I think is a very acceptable officer, at all events his appointment seems to have been received with great favour. The former incumbent received a salary of $1,300, and was entitled in addition to his lodging, fuel, light, and the services of messengers. All these perquisites have been abolished. Mr. St. John has no room except one for his office, and he receives a salary of $1,800.

Mr. SPROULE. I feel much as Mr. Blake did when he was asking for a judgment of the Privy Council. He said he was not so much concerned to know what their judgment was as to know the reason for their judgment. I was not so much concerned to know that the right hon. Premier had followed the course of his predecessors, as I was to know why he had changed his mind, and why he had reached the conclusion that what he thought was wrong at one time is right now.

The PRIME MINISTER. I suppose the reason is advancing years. I am afraid I am getting more Conservative.

Mr. SPROULE. I see there is a reduction of $300; how did you accomplish that?

Mr. SPEAKER. Since the estimates have been prepared one of the chief clerks has applied for superannuation, which has been granted, and which will take place in a short time. It is therefore proposed to reduce the item by $1,200, and I move that this item of $70,550 be reduced to $69,350. On page 32 of the estimates the committee will find a detailed statement of the salary of each clerk.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the necessity for appointing a new first-class clerk, or making provision for one who is going to be appointed?

Mr. SPEAKER. Nobody has yet been appointed, because the gentleman who has been superannuated is still on the staff, but it is intended to replace him by another clerk. The work which he is now doing is absolutely necessary, namely, the translation of French documents into English.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose this new appointment is not for the purpose of making special provision for some one, or for the purpose of rewarding some clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I have just explained, the clerk who is to be superannuated is doing work that is absolutely necessary, consequently we need to appoint another clerk to replace him. There is no political patronage exercised in the House of Commons.

Item as amended, agreed to.

Expenses of committees, sessional and extra clerks, etc., $25,650.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the minister tell us how many sessional messengers there are now ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think there are 48. But they do not come under this item, they will come under the item of expenses in connection with sergeant-at-arms. I may say there has been a reduction in the number of messengers since I have been Speaker.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will Mr. Speaker give us some idea of what the duties of those sessional clerks are, and what privileges members have in asking them for services ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The sessional clerks are appointed to do the work of the House generally, not for the service of members.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not see how forty-eight men can be kept employed in doing work for the House. I have no idea what the character of that work is. Forty-eight men ought to do a very large amount of work. I was under the impression and I think other members have been, that these sessional clerks were available at times if we wanted to obtain a copy of some document that was brought down for the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is right, the hon. gentleman may call upon the sessional clerks for copying all documents of the House. But I thought the hon. gentleman asked me whether they could do the private work of members.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not intend that at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. The work that is to be done by the clerks is the general copying of documents and if hon. members want to have documents, for instance, returns, copied, they may use the sessional writers for that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. SPROULE. If I am correct in my information the number is the same now as it has been for several years past.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, there is no change in the number. There are twenty-eight.

Mr. SPROULE. What I wanted to know was whether there had been a decrease or an increase. I often heard, especially from Mr. McMullen, who has been translated to the other House, and from the hon. Postmaster General in former years, reference to the fact that the sessional clerks were so numerous that they were stumbling over each other. If the same number is employed still, and I do not think there is much more work to do, I am afraid that argument, like many others that were addressed to the House and the country in the past, was not of much value.

Mr. SPEAKER. The number of sessional clerks has not been increased since I have filled the office of Speaker. I am informed that it has been increased since 1896. I may add, concerning the sessional writers, that the persons who are in the post office are sessional clerks.

Mr. HENDERSON. Could the hon. the Speaker give us an idea of the number of sessional clerks, messengers and pages employed at the present time ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, the sessional clerks are twenty-eight in number.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought forty-eight.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, those are the messengers. There are seventeen pages, six servants and eighteen charwomen.

Mr. WILSON. How many messengers ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Forty-eight.

Mr. HENDERSON. I merely adverted to this because I had the curiosity a short time ago to look up the number employed in the legislature in Ontario and I found there were 154 in 1898, and I wondered whether they were more extravagant than we are here.

Salaries and officers of the library, $17,130.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $320. Have you any more appointments, or is this a statutory increase ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is one proposed change in the library and I am not sure that we have carried out here what we intended. There is no change except that one of the officers, Mr. Todd, is to be given the rank of a chief clerk instead of a first-class clerk.

Mr. SPROULE. That would give him much more salary ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would give him no increase of salary, but

it would give him rank with the right to advance in future years.

Books for the general library, including binding, etc., $12,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Who selects these books?

The PRIME MINISTER. The librarians, Messrs. Griffin and Descelles.

Printing, binding and distributing the laws, $7,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is being done with the revision and consolidation of the statutes that we voted some money for last year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Nothing has yet been done.

Mr. SPROULE. Has there been any appointment made for the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed that one Mr. Cameron had been appointed some time ago.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No appointment has been made, but the matter will be considered in a very short time.

Legislation—general printing, printing paper and binding, $110,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I see there is a reduction in this of $15,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to let that stand as I have not the information.

Contingent expenses in connection with voters' list, $8,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This is in connection with the voters' lists from year to year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I see you have an increase of $2,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I will get the information if the hon. gentleman will let the item stand. I have no information. If there is no objection this can be passed.

The PRIME MINISTER. We are now at the end of this branch of the estimates, and as we have done a good day's work we might perhaps adjourn. We will consult the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well.

Some resolutions reported.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture.—Hon. Sydney Fisher.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 24, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT, 1900.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5), to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. He said: The election law was consolidated and amended by the Dominion Elections Act, passed in 1900. In that Act, there are stringent provisions against bribery of electors and there is one provision against the bribery of a candidate. Section 108, clause (i) provides :—

Every person who, to induce a person to allow himself to be nominated as a candidate or to refrain from becoming a candidate, or to withdraw if he has become a candidate, gives or procures any office, place or employment, or agrees to give or procure, or offers or promises to procure, or endeavours to procure any office, place or employment for such person or any other person, is guilty of an indictable offence under the Act.

There is no provision in the Act as it stands to prevent any person offering money to induce a person to become a candidate or to withdraw after being nominated as a candidate; and the Bill I have drawn is merely for the purpose of adding to this clause another subsection so that the same penalty shall attend the offering of money to bribe a candidate as is now provided in the case of offering an office to a candidate.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAYS.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act with respect to drainage. He said: It is not necessary to make any remarks in connection with this Bill. It is similar to the Bill introduced last year, which was passed by a sub-committee, but not acted upon by the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

BATTLE OF THE WINDMILL—PENSIONS.

Mr. REID (Grenville)—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

Have any pensions been paid to persons who took part in the battle of the windmill, near Prescott? If so, for what reason? If any persons were paid, are any of these who received such pensions still living, and are they still receiving same?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am informed by the

Deputy Minister of Militia that it will be impossible to answer this question verbally. The hon. gentleman had better move for the papers.

STAFF COURSE AT KINGSTON.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

What officers are now taking the staff course at Kingston?
What are their occupations in private life?
Who among them are in the permanent force?
Who in government service?
What are the text books used in the course?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1 and 2. Major R. Costigan, merchant ; Major E. A. C. Hosmer, farmer ; Major J. A. McDougall, farmer ; Major F. X. A. Carriere, insurance inspector ; Major W. H. Floyd, boots, shoes and clothing ; Major L. J. O. Ducharme, civil service ; Capt. T. W. Lawlor, lumber surveyor.

3. None.

4. Major L. J. O. Ducharme. Lt. Col. Hodgins, R. O., (joins 15th March).

5. Hereto attached is the syllabus showing the text books.

6. No pay is allowed. A per diem allowance of $2.50 is paid to each officer in lieu of subsistence.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

How are the officers for the staff course at Kingston selected?
What rates of pay were named in the circulars calling for officers?
How were the officers attending selected?
When were these each selected?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Officers for the staff course were selected from those nominated by the D.O.C.'s, except Lt. Col. Hodgins, R.O., who is permitted to attend to complete the staff course interrupted in 1900.

2. The instructions to D.O.C.'s were sent by telegram and the rates of pay were referred to in these words : 'Allowances same as 1900.'

3. By the general officer commanding.

4. 30th January.

REPORTS TO IMPERIAL AUTHORITIES BY G. O. C. OR SUBORDINATES.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Has the Canadian government a copy of the report or memorandum furnished to the Imperial authorities in 1885 by each, General Middleton and Lord Melgund, on the conduct and qualities of the Canadian volunteers serving in the North-west rebellion of 1885?

2. Is it permitted by the Canadian government to the General Officer Commanding or any subordinate officer, to make reports to the Imperial authorities without the consent of the government of Canada, or the minister of the department concerned ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. There is no copy of any such report in this department nor is there any record of any such having been rendered.

2. There is no authority for such procedure nor any orders relative thereto.

COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE CADET CORPS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Has the government received any petition or petitions from collegiate institute cadet corps, asking for facilities in rifle shooting and for swords for use by officers?

2. Has the government in store any swords suitable for use by officers of cadet corps, and if so, is it the intention to issue the same for this purpose?

3. Does the government intend to place collegiate institutes on the same footing in regard to rifle shooting as it has placed Upper Canada College, that is to say, by issuing Morris tube outfits and granting free ammunition?

4. Has the government received a petition from the Toronto Collegiate Institute Board, asking for Lee-Metford rifles, and for encouragement to cadets to practice at the Long Branch ranges ? If so, what does the government intend to do in the matter ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. Morris tubes are no longer required. Free ammunition is issued to rifle associations only. None has ever been issued to educational establishments. They are only organized for drill.

4. Yes. By the application received it appears that the corps consist each of fifty young gentlemen between the age of fifteen and twenty years, and consequently all above sixteen years of age can form themselves into a rifle club and thus obtain the advantages they desire under provisions of G. O. 150 of 1901, paragraph 6.

As regards lads under sixteen years, the major general does not consider that they should be entrusted with ammunition and permitted to perform range practices.

WELSH IMMIGRATION FROM PATAGONIA.

Mr. WILSON asked :

Has the Dominion government appointed a commissioner to proceed to Patagonia to negotiate with the 4,000 Welshman now residing there, with a view to their settling in Canada?

If so, has the commissioner reported, and will the government lay his report on the Table of the House?

What was the cost of these negotiations, and is it the intention of the government to give the Welsh colony in Patagonia any assistance to induce them to settle in Canada?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The government appointed a delegation to proceed to Patagonia

with a view to ascertaining and reporting to what extent the members of the Welsh colony there were likely to remove to Canada.

2. The delegation has not yet reported to the head office. The deputy minister, being now in England, has, no doubt, conferred verbally with the delegation.

3. The accounts are not yet in a position to enable an answer to be made to this question. The matter of further assistance is now under consideration.

RETIREMENT OF MAJOR TASSIE.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

What are the facts connected with the retirement of Major Tassie from the Royal Grenadiers of Toronto?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The facts are as follows) :

1. On the 6th of February, 1899, Major Tassie addressed a letter to his commanding officer in which he stated that, 'if at the expiration of two years' from the date of his promotion to the rank of major, the officer commanding the Royal Grenadiers considered it expedient, the district officer commanding was authorized to forward 'this my resignation' of any position he might hold in the battalion, and that for so doing that letter shall be sufficient authority. On this condition, Lieut.-Col. Bruce recommended Captain Tassie for promotion. He was promoted to be major.

2. Major Tassie submitted the plea that he made it under the assurance of a brother officer that it would be inoperative.

3. The major general commanding, in his reports to the Minister of Militia and Defence, maintained that, in his opinion, Major Tassie's resignation is absolutely valid and binding. The recommendation of the major general commanding was accepted and Major Tassie was retired on the 31st of August, 1901.

YUKON—CONCESSION TO THE TREDGOLD SYNDICATE.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) asked :

1. What is the date of the concession to A. & C. Tredgold, or to the Hydraulic Mining Syndicate, associated with A. & C. Tredgold, and proposing to operate in the Yukon?

2. What are the terms of such concession?

3. What area of the Klondike is by this concession given over to such syndicate, and closed to the general public?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. Order in Council June 12th, 1901; subsequently amended by Order in Council 29th June, 1901, and by Order in Council 7th December, 1901.

2. The terms are set forth in the Orders in Council above cited, copies of which will be laid on the Table.

3. Claims on Bonanza, Bear and Hunker Creeks and their tributaries, which have been staked out by miners and thereafter abandoned and allowed to lapse.

EMPLOYMENT OF JAPANESE IN YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. PUTTEE asked :

1. Were Japanese employed as special officers by mounted police officers in the Yukon Territory in December last ?

2. If so what was the emergency necessitating such action ?

3. Have instructions been issued forbidding such appointments in future ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government have no information that Japanese were employed as special officers by mounted police officers in December last, or at any time; and the government does not credit the rumour to that effect.

BOUNDARY LINE THROUGH DETROIT RIVER.

Mr. COWAN—by Mr. Parmelee—asked :

1. Has the boundary line between the United States and Canada, through the Detroit River, been determined ?

(a.) If yes, when and by what convention ?

(b.) Was the line shown by maps ?

(c.) Has any work been done on the Canadian side of the line in the Detroit River by the American government ?

(d.) If any work has been done by the American government, how much, and at what cost ?

(e.) Has consent been asked by the American government to do work in Canadian territory ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

(a.) Yes, by commissioners appointed under the sixth article of the Treaty of Ghent.

(b.) The line was shown on the maps filed by the commissioners with their report.

(c.) Yes.

(d.) The government has no information as to the amount and cost of the work done in Canadian waters by the United States government.

(e.) Yes ; permission was asked by the United States government to proceed with projected improvements in the Detroit River without regard to the exact location of the international boundary line, and permission was granted.

WELSH IMMIGRATION FROM PATAGONIA.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been called to the following cablegram to the Toronto 'Evening Telegram,' which has been republished in other Canadian papers :—

'Toronto, February 18.-"Evening Telegram's" special cable :—London, February 18.—A deputation of Welshmen to-day waited on Right Hon. Jos. Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, to ask that the government provide a transport for the purpose of removing to Canada a number of their countrymen and their families, who had migrated to Patagonia, and who de-

sired a change of settlement. Mr. Chamberlain explained that when the reception of the deputation was first mentioned he understood that the Welsh in Patagonia wished to emigrate to South Africa. Had such been the case, arrangements could easily have been made, but he was powerless to render them assistance to emigrate to Canada. He suggested that the deputation should call on Lord Salisbury, or that a subscription be started in the United Kingdom to raise the necessary five or ten thousand pounds ; or that the Canadian government might increase their liberal offer of a pound per head. The deputation, which was greatly disappointed at the Colonial Secretary's reply, was headed by a representative Welshman, resident in London. The Canadian High Commissioner's office was not represented. It is reported in some quarters that the Elder-Dempster Company will offer a steamship to transport the Welsh settlers to Canada.'

2. Has the government made any inquiries, or, if not, does it intend to make any from the Canadian High Commissioner in London, respecting the foregoing alleged statement of Right Hon. Jos. Chamberlain, as to his inability to assist the families above named to emigrate to Canada, as to his willingness to assist them to emigrate to South Africa ?

3. If the government has made any inquiry from the Canadian High Commissioner, as above, has any answer been received, and, if so, of what nature ?

4. Has the Canadian government made any offer, and, if so, of what nature, and to what extent, to assist the emigrants above, to come to Canada ?

5. Has any steamship company offered to convey the said emigrants free to Canada, and, if so, has the offer been accepted ?

6. What has the government done for the purpose of attracting or bringing the said emigrants to Canada ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. No ; except through press reports.

2. No.

3. No report has yet been received of this interview.

4. No.

5. No.

6. The government sent two delegates to Patagonia to investigate and report to what extent members of the Welsh colony were likely to move to Canada, to place before this colony the natural advantages offered by Canada as a place of settlement and the regulations existing with regard to free grants of land, and to advise the colony that the government is willing to make a reservation of land on their behalf. The government is now in cable communication with its Welsh agent respecting the desirability of giving further assistance.

THE CANADIAN SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTABULARY.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Leonard—(Translation) asked :

1. Did the government, or any member thereof, give a public assurance that in the selection of the officers for the Canadian South African Constabulary, which sailed last year, preference would be given (a) to those Canadian officers who have served in South Africa, and to other officers of the Canadian militia ?

2. What persons, officers, or others, applied for commissions in the said constabulary ? What is the military record of each, either in Canada, South Africa, or elsewhere ?

3. (a.) What officers were selected and appointed ? (b.) What is the military record of each ?

4. Who of those selected as officers, had never before been officers ?

5. Were there enough applications from officers of the Canadian militia to officer the constabulary ? If so, why were they passed over, and men without qualification, if there were any such, selected ?

6. How many commissioned officers of the Canadian militia were enlisted in the first and second contingents, in the Royal Canadian Regiment, the Canadian Mounted Infantry, the Royal Canadian Dragoons, and the Canadian Artillery, as (a) non-commissioned officers, and (b) as men ?

7. How many non-commissioned officers and men of the permanent corps were enlisted in the corps named in question ? How many of these were non-commissioned officers in South Africa ? (c.) Why were the commissioned officers enlisted in the corps as privates, not given the non-commissions ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In answer to my honourable friend, I must inform him that in order to secure the documents relating to this question, it is necessary that he should make a motion.

IMMIGRANTS IN 1892.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

What was the number of immigrants who came to Canada during the year 1892, classified under headings British and Foreign, including the United States ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The total number of immigrants who came to Canada during 1892, was 27,898, classified as follows : British, 16,357 ; foreign, 6,054 ; total, 22,411. In addition to these there arrived at the port of Montreal, not defined as to nationalities, 5,487. Grand total, 27,898.

ARTICLES PUT ON FREE LIST OR REDUCED IN DUTY SINCE 1897.

Mr. CLARE—by Mr. Henderson—asked :

1. What articles have been put on the free list by Order in Council since the adoption of the Customs tariff of 1897 ?

2. What articles have been reduced in duty by Order in Council since the above date ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

1. The articles transferred to the free list by Order in Council since 29th June, 1897, are as follows :

'Cotton seed oil, when imported by manufacturers of liquid annatto, to be used in their factories exclusively in the manufacture of liquid annatto.'

'Metallic tubes for use in the manufacture of vaccine points, made in Canada.'

'The chemical compounds known as "Safety Bate" and "Tanning Preserver" when imported by tanners for use exclusively in "the tanning of leather in their own tanneries".'

'Cotton yarn, polished or glazed, when imported by manufacturers of shoe laces for the manufacture of such goods in their own factories.'

'Syrup or molasses of cane or beet testing under 35 degrees by the polariscope, for use in the manufacture of compressed food for live stock, when imported by the manufacturers of such food, to be used for such manufacture only in their own factories.'

'Key pins, damper springs, jack springs, rail springs, regulating screws, spoons, bridle wares, damper wires, back check wires, dowel wires, German centre pins, brass pins, rail hooks, brass brackets, plates, damper rod nuts, damper sockets and screws, shell, brass sapstan screws, brass flange plates and screws, hammer wires, fly felt, butt felt, damper felt, hammer rail cloth, back check felt, catch felt, thin damper felt, whip cloth, bushing cloth, hammer felt, back hammer felt, bridle leather and buck-skin, when imported by manufacturers of piano keys, actions, hammers, base dampers and organ keys, to be used exclusively for the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.'

'Botany yarn, single, in numbers 30 and finer, on mule cops, dry spun on what is known as the French or Belgium system, not doubled or twisted in white only, when imported by manufacturers of cashmere socks and stockings, to be used exclusively for the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.'

'Glass caps, shells, containers and capillary tubes, rubber bulbs, boxes and corks, for use in the manufacture of vaccine points; and only when imported by manufacturers of vaccine points.'

'Materials which enter into the construction and form part of cream separators when imported by manufacturers of cream separators to be used in their own factories for the manufacture of cream separators, until otherwise ordered.'

'Silver tubing, when imported by manufacturers of silverware to be used in their own factories in the manufacture of silverware.'

'Hemp Bleaching Compound, when imported by manufacturers of rope, to be used in their own factories for the manufacture of rope, until otherwise ordered.'

'Steel castings in the rough for the manufacture of scissors and hand shears, when imported by manufacturers of scissors and hand shears, to be used in making such articles in their own factories.'

'Steel for the manufacture of cutlery when imported by manufacturers of cutlery to be used in their own factories in the manufacture of such articles.'

'Yarn of jute, flax or hemp, for the manufacture of jute, linen or union towels, to be used in their own factories in the manufacture of such articles.'

2. By Order in Council of February 11th, 1902, the customs duty on news printing paper in sheets and rolls, including all printing paper valued at not more than two and one-quarter (2¼) cents per pound, was reduced from twenty-five per cent ad valorem to fifteen per cent ad valorem.

IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN ONTARIO PORTS, 1901.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. How many bushels of grain, or other seeds, were shipped through the ports of Depot Harbour, Midland, Collingwood, Meaford, Owen Sound and Sarnia, respectively, during the year 1901?
2. How many barrels of flour?
3. How many bags oatmeal?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). As that question is worded, I suppose the hon. gentleman's intention is to get the quantity of grain, not only that has been sent through those ports and exported, but also the trade between one port and another. We are already in communication with those ports to get the information for the hon. gentleman, and if he will allow his question to stand for a few days, I will be able to answer it.

QUEBEC—ISLAND OF ORLEANS MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Leonard—asked :

1. How many times each week, in winter and in summer, has the mail been carried from Quebec to the Island of Orleans ?
2. What is the cost of said mail service during the winter and the summer, respectively ?
3. What are the average receipts from such service, considering the different parishes separately?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. William Mulock) :

1. Daily in summer, tri-weekly in winter.
2. The service costs $645 per annum.
3. The receipts from each parish are as follows :—St. Jean, $150.50 ; St. Francois, $8 ; St. Pierre, $76.48 ; St. Laurent, $64 ; St. Famille, $44.62.

MR. ALFRED MARANDA.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Leonard—asked :

1. Has Alfred Maranda, of St. Pierre, Ile d'Orleans, been replaced as contractor for the carrying of His Majesty's mails ?
2. If so, by whom, and for what reason ?
3. Were tenders called before the granting of such mail-service contract ?
4. If so, how many tenders were received by the department, and what is the amount of each of such tenders ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. William Mulock). Tenders were called for before entering into the contract with

Maranda in 1897. Five tenders were received, namely:—From A. Maranda at $645, from N. Ferland at $700, from O. Vézina at $750, from F. Campeau at $800, from F. Labbé at $900. The contract was awarded to Maranda, the lowest tenderer. This contract expired on the 31st of December, 1900, and was continued on a temporary arrangement during pleasure pending certain changes under consideration. It has since been placed in the hands of Pierre Plante pending the receipt of tenders for a new contract.

ROSEAU INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked:

1. Has the government considered the request of the rural municipality of Franklin, Manitoba, signified by a resolution of its council, dated 10th April, 1900, and asking that the Roseau Indian Reserve be opened for settlement; said consideration having been promised by the then Acting Minister of the Interior at the sitting of this House on the 10th May, 1900?

2. When will the few Indians now remaining on that reserve be removed to some more convenient place for themselves, and their land opened for settlement?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The question of the surrender of the Roseau River Reserve was submitted to the Indians to whom it belongs on the 26th February, 1901, by Mr. Inspector Marlatt, and a report was received from him that the Indians declined to sell any part of the reserve. In view of this decision it is impossible at present to take the action desired by the municipality of Franklin. I may state to the hon. gentleman, that, as he is no doubt aware, the Indian Act requires that before an Indian reserve, or any portion of it, can be sold there must be a surrender of it by the Indians, in order to authorize the government to take action.

DEMAND FOR LABOUR IN MANITOBA.

Mr. WILSON asked:

1. Was there a cablegram sent to the High Commissioner by the Dominion government relating to good crops in Manitoba, and consequently a demand for hired help with good wages?

2. If so, what was the date of said cablegram?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton):

1. Yes.

2. July 29th, 1901.

IMPROVEMENT OF ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked:

How much has been voted up to the end of the present fiscal year for the contemplated improvements of St. Andrew's Rapids, Manitoba?

How much has been spent so far out of these votes, and what for, in each year?

Is the work done so far meeting the expectation of the Minister of Public Works, as to extent and quality?

Was there any unnecessary delay, and what was the cause of it?

When is it expected the locks will be completed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. LaRivière) will make a motion for a return the papers will be brought down immediately. The question cannot be properly answered.

RECIPROCITY IN TRADE.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved

That this House is of the opinion that Canadian import duties should be arranged upon the principle of reciprocity in trade conditions so far as may be consistent with Canadian interests; that a rebate of not less than 40 per cent of the amount of duties imposed, should be made upon dutiable imports from nations or countries admitting Canadian natural products into their markets free of duty; and that the scale of Canadian duties should be sufficiently high to avoid inflicting injury upon Canadian interests in cases where a rebate of 40 per cent or more shall be made under the conditions aforesaid.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the motion that I am about to submit through you to the House for its consideration affirms what I believe to be a correct principle in regard to the management of our fiscal affairs in this country. The motion first affirms that reciprocity in trade conditions will be proper except in case where such conditions may not be favourable to Canada. The motion next proposes that countries admitting the natural products of Canada into their markets free of duty shall be accorded a rebate or differential duty of 40 per cent or more in the customs duties levied in Canada. The motion next proposes that the scale of duties shall be sufficiently high to avoid injury to Canadian interests in cases where the minimum duty is imposed, as has been done under the present arrangement of a differential duty in favour of Great Britain to the distress and detriment of our woollen interests. The export trade of Canada is largely with the mother country. About 63 per cent of the export trade of Canada is with Great Britain. The import trade of Canada is to a very small extent with the mother country; less than one-quarter of our imports coming from that source. It is, I affirm, a proper course to pursue to have regard to the interests of the mother country which affords us our chief market, in the adjustment and arrangement of our tariff duties.

We have, in the past, been making unsatisfactory progress in this country. An increase of 10½ per cent in the last decade, an increase of less than 12 per cent in the previous decade and an increase of less than 47 per cent during the last three decades is an unsatisfactory rate of increase in population. Canada has a limited increase of population not for the reason that we

are incapable of supporting an enormous population, but for some reason Canada has been forging ahead at a rate in the highest degree unsatisfactory to those who desire to see this country become a great nation. We had, in 1871, a population of 3,649,782, allowing an estimate of 50,000 for the population of British Columbia and Manitoba. We had last year, by the last census, 5,338,883. We had an increase in 30 years of 1,689,111 souls, an increase, as I have said, of 10½ per cent in the last decade, and of 47 per cent for the entire period covered by the space of time between 1871 and 1901. Now, the United States, when similarly situated with us, with a growing country, with a small population with great natural resources, with an infinite stretch of virgin land and with practically every inducement to offer to settlers, had, in 1790, a population of 3,929,214 and in 1820 a population of 9,600,781, or an increase of 5,671,569 in 30 years against an increase of 1,689,111 in our own case, or an increase of 141 per cent in 30 years as against an increase of 47 per cent in our own case; yet, during that period of 30 years the United States received but 250,000 immigrants from the old world.

Now, there is something wrong. No doubt we have, living in the United States to-day, 3,000,000 people who are either Canadians by birth or descendants of Canadian ancesters in the first and second generation. We are losing the flower of our population, we have been losing it for the last 30 years, and if by any possible means we can arrest that drain of our population, if by any means we can adopt a policy that will lead to a more rapid expansion of our resources, a more rapid increase of our population, a more rapid increase in the direction of creating in Canada a nation, it is worth our while to study the question and ascertain if there are any possible means by which this result can be reached. We have enormous resources. Without question, in my opinion, Canada can sustain a population of 100,000,000 souls. Some disadvantages and drawbacks, as we deem them, appertaining to our country, are really calculated to make our population a people of virility, of great courage and self assertion. We have the resources of the maritime provinces, the resources of Quebec and of Ontario, the enormous region of the North-west Territories, with an arable area extending over 500,000 square miles, the resources of British Columbia; we have fisheries, and timber and minerals and agricultural resources in great abundance, in unlimited supply; we have all the resources that are necessary to create in Canada a great nation. Now, Sir, our trade with all the countries of the world, except Great Britain, is in an unsatisfactory condition, in my opinion. We had a total trade last year of $191,000,000 with the United States. Our total imports were, from the United States, $119,306,000, and our total exports to the United States were $72,382,000. The balance of trade against us was $46,924,000 and the import percentage of our total trade with the United States was 63 per cent.

United States.

Total imports from	$119,306,000
Total exports to	72,382,000
Total trade	$191,688,000
Balance against Canada	46,924,000

Import percentage of total trade, 63 per cent.

But this statement presents an unduly favourable aspect of the case. While our Trade and Navigation Returns show an export trade to the United States last year of $72,382,000, it is well to take into account that $28,331,000 of that amount was gold and silver coin, nuggets, gold dust, silver concentrates, the product of our mine in the Klondike, and that this $28,331,000 was actually a payment upon our balance of trade with the United States.

Revised.

Total imports, less coin and bullion, $3,335,000	$115,971,000
Total exports, less $28,331,000, coin, bullion, gold nuggets, silver, &c.	44,051,000
Balance against Canada, $71,890,000.	160,022,000

Import percentage of total trade, 72 per cent.

When you eliminate from our exports to the United States the gold and the silver that are included in the returns of exports, you bring the amount down to $44,000,000, which includes the re-exports of articles not the produce of Canada. That leaves the balance of trade against us actually $71,890,000 and it leaves the percentage of imports of our total trade 72 per cent, instead of 63 per cent. So that we imported from the United States $72 of the amount of our total trade, and we exported to that country $28 of the amount of our total trade out of every $100. This is the condition of our trade with the United States, a most unsatisfactory condition; a condition which I shall enlarge upon later on.

Then with regard to Germany: Our total trade with Germany last year was $9,162,000. The balance of trade against us in our trade with Germany last year was $4,879,000. The import percentage with our total trade with Germany last year was 76 per cent.

Germany.

Imports from	$7,021,400
Exports to	2,141,532
Total trade	$9,162,932
Balance against Canada	4,879,021

Import percentage of total trade, 76 per cent.

Our total trade with France last year was $6,979,000. The balance of trade against Canada with that country was $3,806,000. The import percentage of our total trade with France was 77 per cent.

France.

Imports from	$5,398,021
Exports to	1,581,331
Total trade	$6,979,352
Balance against Canada	3,806,690

Import percentage of total trade, 77 per cent.

With Holland, our trade total was $984,000. In that comparatively small trade the balance of trade against us was $610,084 and the import percentage of our total trade with Holland was 81 per cent.

Holland.

Imports from	$797,462
Exports to	187,378
Total trade	$984,840
Balance against Canada	$610,084

Import percentage of total trade, 81 per cent.

With Spain, our total trade was $897,000. The balance of trade against us in this comparatively small transaction was $557,000, and the import percentage of our total trade with Spain was 82 per cent.

Spain.

Imports from	$742,537
Exports to	185,354
Total trade	$897,993
Balance against Canada	557,183

Import percentage of total trade, 82 per cent.

Now, this is the condition of our trade with all these countries; with the United States, with Germany, with France, with Holland, with Spain; and we have a satisfactory trade balance; we have a satisfactory condition of trade relations with one nation only, and that is with Great Britain. Our imports from Great Britain last year were $43,164,000, and our exports to Great Britain were $105,018,000. The balance of trade in our favour in this case was $61,853,000, and the import per cent of our total trade with Great Britain was but 29 per cent; the export percentage being 71.

Great Britain.

Imports from	$ 43,164,297
Exports to	105,018,164
Total trade	$148,182,461
Balance in our favour	61,853,367

Import percentage of total trade, 29 per cent.

Now, we took this $62,000,000, which we got from Great Britain, and we paid tribute to the United States. We paid tribute to the United States, from whom we purchased $3 worth of goods for every $1 which we sold them. We paid tribute to them under the arrangements of their tariff, which have existed for the last 35 years, and which they have arranged with the purpose of buying little and selling all that is possible. The time has come, in my opinion, when this arrangement should be set aside, either by satisfactory and proper concessions from them, or by action upon our part that wall render these attempts nugatory. Great Britain, as I have said, is our chief market. Great Britain will no doubt continue to be our chief market, and as I said at the outset, it is proper that we should give due attention to the cultivating of that market in Great Britain; that market which to-day takes 82 per cent of our total farm products; that market which to-day takes 63 per cent of our exports.

The United States, of course, is a nation contiguous to us. Our boundaries are common from ocean to ocean. Nature has decreed that unless its purposes are thwarted by unfriendly legislation, the relations between these two countries shall be of the most intimate character; and that the trade between these two countries shall be enormous in its proportion. That trade already is enormous; enormous, notwithstanding the obstacles that have been thrown in the way of free intercourse between these two countries. These two countries are one geographically, the very barriers that separate them invite intercommunication. Their railroad lines cross and re-cross and knit them together. The maritime provinces have their natural trade associations with the States on the Atlantic seaboard. Ontario and Quebec can reach the ocean, in winter, at least, more conveniently across American territory than by any other route. Our great North-west is geographically a portion of the Mississippi valley, and its trade will naturally tend to that section. On the Pacific slope, nothing is more natural than that trade relations should exist between British Columbia and the States of Washington, Oregon and California. This contiguity of territory, this intermingling of interests will lead and should lead to enormous trade transactions. But, Sir, these transactions should be and must be upon a different basis from that which exists to-day. Now, this natural tendency to intimate trade relations and rapid increase in the volume of trade between the two countries, if obstacles are not interposed, was strikingly illustrated by the experience of Canada and the United States under the Reciprocity Treaty which existed from 1854 to 1866. That treaty provided for free trade in natural products only. During the first year of that treaty, the exports of Canada to the United States were less than $10,000,000. Twelve years later, in the year 1866, the exports of Canada to the United States (including the usual allowance for inland short returns) was $44,000,000, an increase of 440 per cent in the export trade between Canada and the United States in twelve years under the fostering influence of freedom in the interchanging of natural products. During that same period the Canadas largely increased their import trade with the people of the United States. In 1866, with an export trade of $44,000,000 from the United States, the imports from the United States were $28,000,000, and im-

ports from Great Britain in the same year were $40,000,000, while the exports to England during the same year were, in round numbers, $17,000,000.

Exports.

1866—Great Britain	$ 16,826,000
1890—Great Britain	48,353,000
1901—Great Britain	105,328,000
1866—United States	44,143,000
1890—United States	40,452,000
1891—United States	72,382,000
On deducting coin, bullion, precious metals and goods not produce of Canada	41,626,000

Imports for consumption.

1866—Great Britain	$40,062,000
1890—Great Britain	43,390,000
1901—Great Britain	43,018,000

United States—Imports.

1866	$ 28,572,000
1901	119,306,000

Increase, $90,734,000, or 318 per cent.

Summary Movements, 1866 to 1901.
Great Britain—Imports.

1866	$40,062,000
1901	43,164,000

Increase, $3,102,000, or 7 7-10 per cent.

This gives evidence of the tendency that would be exerted on the trade between these two countries by the removal of restrictions. The year 1866 came and with it came the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty. It was a treaty that was working to the mutual advantage of both countries, and it was abrogated largely no doubt because of the influence of other motives than those appertaining to the loss or gain that might accrue from the operation of it. Unfortunately, we were unwise enough to allow expression to be given in the Canadian Assembly to a feeling of felicitation at the federal defeat at Chancellorville, and although there were as large a proportion perhaps of the population of the North who were copperheads and rebel sympathizers as of the population of Canada, and although the only difference was that in Canada they had a right to express their opinions while in the North they had not, the United States government took umbrage at this display of sympathy with the South; and although we had given evidence of our devotion to the North by sending forty thousand men to fight in the Union armies, and although as large a proportion of our population sympathized with the cause of the Union as of the population of the Northern States, and although we had maintained neutrality and discharged our duties as neutrals wisely and well, yet the single circumstance to which I have alluded probably had a great influence in causing the repeal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854.

We were aware that that treaty was an advantageous one. We were aware that the circumstances under which we exported to the United States so much more extensively than we imported were exceptional circumstances, due to the existence of a war in that country. The importation of American fabrics was rapidly decreasing, and but a few years would have elapsed before the imports and exports between the two countries would have become equalized. Efforts were made on the part of Canada to bring about a modification of the treaty, to do anything within the bounds of reason to make the treaty acceptable to both countries; but all these efforts were spurned. The United States government, in point of fact, refused to consider any applications or arguments with reference to the renewal of that treaty, and entered upon a period of repression, which has been continued for thirty-five years. The United States was then the chief market for our products. The belief in the United States and the belief in Canada was that that market was essential to us. Possibly American statesmen may have thought that putting on the screws and shutting us out from their market would force us into annexation. If this was not the case, pains ought to be taken to disabuse the Canadian mind of that impression. For thirty-five years we have had a war of tariffs, fought chiefly on one side, and the result has been rather disappointing to both the United States and ourselves—agreeably disappointing to ourselves, perhaps not as agreeably disappointing to them. Our exports to Great Britain have increased from 1866 to 1901 as follows:

Great Britain Exports.

1866	$ 16,826,000
1901	105,328,000

Increase, $88,502,000, or 527 per cent.

Our exports to the United States in the same years were as follows:

United States Exports.

1866	$44,143,000
1901	72,382,000

Increase, $28,239,000, or 64 per cent.

But, as I said a moment ago, deducting corn and bullion and the products of the mines of the Yukon and the export of goods not the produce of Canada, our net exports to the United States last year were $41,626,000, or $2,517,000 less than they were in 1866. That condition of trade was brought about by the repressive tariff legislation of the United States.

A summary of these trade movements shows that our imports from Great Britain increased from 1866 to 1901 7·7 per cent, and our imports from the United States increased in the same interval 318 per cent; and this result was brought about, not by the application on the part of Canada of the American principle, which we ought to have applied, but by a liberal low-tariff arrangement which offered no impediment to the importation of their wares into this country, while we were almost absolutely excluded from their markets.

In the same period our exports to Great Britain increased 527 per cent, while our exports to the United States, eliminating the precious metals and the exportation of goods not the produce of Canada, have fallen $2,500,000.

Now, I will proceed to consider some of the reasons that have led to this anomalous and unsatisfactory condition of trade I will look first at our tariff rates. Last year our rate of duty upon the total imports from the United States was 12·5 per cent, and our rate of duty upon dutiable imports from the United States was 24·83 per cent. In the same year our duty upon the total imports from Great Britain was 18·2 per cent, and our duty upon dutiable imports from Great Britain was 24·87 per cent, or 4-100ths higher than our duty on dutiable imports from the United States.

Mr. CLARKE. Notwithstanding the preference.

Mr. CHARLTON. Notwithstanding the preference. Our duty upon the total imports from all countries, the United States included, was 16·6 per cent. and our duty upon dutiable imports from all countries was 27·45 per cent. Here you have the fact that the duties upon United States imports were lower, both upon dutiable imports and upon total imports, than the duties upon imports from Great Britain or upon imports from the whole world; and you can contrast those duties as I now propose to do, with the duties imposed by the United States. While we admitted their total imports at a duty a fraction above 12 per cent, their duty upon our total imports last year amounted to 28 per cent. And while we imposed a duty of less than 25 per cent upon dutiable imports, their duties were 50 per cent last year, or almost exactly as high again as in our own.

And when we come to the percentage of imports, 63 per cent of our total imports came from the United States, 22½ per cent from Great Britain, and 14½ per cent from the rest of the world. It is scarcely necessary for me to say that these duties are unequal, that they are not in our interest, and that the duties we impose should bear some proportion to the duties which the United States imposes upon us. This goes without saying. The American policy has been applied not only to us, but to all the world. The object of the United States has been to sell all that it possibly could of the products of its soil, its mills, and its workshops, and to buy just as little as it could from other countries, and thus have as large a balance of trade in its own favour as possible. The result has been that the balance of trade in favour of the United States last year amounts to $600,000,000 against the whole world, and $71,000,000 against Canada. That is a good thing for the United States. Let them cling to their policy as long as the rest of the world will permit them to do so, but it is not a good thing for us.

I need hardly claim that I am not open to the charge of being biased by racial animosity, or national animosity, or prejudice of any character against the United States. The time has been when I have been sometimes misunderstood, and oftener I imagine misrepresented in relation to the attitude that I have taken on our relations with that country. I have always been in favour of the most friendly relations between all Anglo-Saxon communities. I have realized for many years that any policy which is calculated to draw these commonwealths closer together in the bonds of amity and union is a good policy, and have acted upon that principle, and the Liberal party has acted upon that principle in the past.

It is beyond question that the United States, is a great nation, a mighty nation—perhaps the greatest to-day in the world. I have no intention to belittle their might, and prowess, or to say anything even against their tariff policy, which is no doubt a good thing for them, and one which they should adhere to so long as the rest of the world allows them to do so, but I do not think it is a good thing for us to submit without effort to secure change of existing conditions. But while I recognize that the United States is destined to play a great part in the direction of the world events in the future, while I recognize that it has an immense population, intelligent, energetic and aggressive, while we must admit that the construction of the Isthmian Canal will give it the command of the Pacific and that it is bound to become a great naval and military power, while it is evident that by the possession of the Philippine Islands, it will gain control of the Asiatic trade, and while I acknowledge freely that it is a mighty nation, I still say that as Canadians, we must uphold the interest of our own country and enact such a policy for the development of Canada as the circumstances of the case require. I did believe once that if our friends opposite had shown a proper disposition, and had gone to Washington in a proper spirit, they might have got something advantageous to Canada. I still think it is a pity that they did not make any attempt in this direction under the administration of Grover Cleveland instead of waiting until Mr. Harrison was president. However, I must confess that my expectations are hardly as bright to-day as they were at one time, and while I did believe that we had only to approach them in a proper spirit, when we were governed by an administration known to be friendly to them, in order to get something in return, I must confess that my experience upon the Joint High Commission was not such as to fully justify the entertaining of that belief.

Mr. LARIVIERE. Open confession is good for the soul.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is not a confession, it is simply a statement of the facts.

Mr. McCREARY. That is what confession should be.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a very easy matter to prove to an American audience that the importance of the trade of Canada to the United States is so great that this country is entitled to better treatment. Canada is the third largest customer in the world of the United States. She is only outranked in that respect by Great Britain and Germany. She is the best customer of the United States for manufactured goods—for the products of the mills, the looms and the factories. The importance of the Canadian trade is illustrated by a comparison of that trade with the trade of the other portions of the American continent. Take Latin America, comprising Mexico, Central America, South America, the West Indies, all but Cuba and Porto Rico, and the total imports of all this vast region, with a population of nearly sixty millions, from the United States in 1900, was $96,140,000, while the imports of Canada in the same year amounted to $116,972,000. Or the five and a half million population of Canada bought $20,832,000 worth, of United States goods more than the sixty million inhabitants of Latin America, the Philippine Islands, although they cost the United States an initial outlay of $20,000,000—being the cost of their purchase from Spain—and a further sum of $300,000,000 in the maintaining of forty ships of war and 100,000 soldiers—the Philippine Islands with a population of nearly 10,000,000, imported from the United States last year only $4,027,000 worth of goods or twenty-seven times less than Canada.

These are facts it is well for the people of Canada to understand and for the people of the United States to understand. They are facts of which the people of the United States were in ignorance, and I have urged for years past that we were making a mistake in not attempting to make the public men of the United States understand the conditions that exist and which should have weight with them in arranging with us their trade relations. I have been doing a little work in that line. I was invited a little less than a year ago to address the Free Trade League of New England in Boston. I took for my subject free trade with Canada, and my speech at Boston was well received. Fifty thousand copies were published by the Boston Chamber of Commerce. A copy was placed in the hands of every member of Congress and of the State Legislatures, and of every board of trade and chamber of commerce in the United States. I next spoke to the Detroit Bankers' Association at Detroit, and the Chamber of Commerce in New York. Then to the Manufacturers National Reciprocity Convention at Washington. Then to the Merchants' Exchange at Buffalo, and at other places.

I have seen the statement made that this was a very injudicious thing to do. I noticed an editorial in the newspaper of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) advising my right hon. friend the leader of the government to bring me home, not to allow me to be running up and down among these Yankees giving away the Canadian case. And I have been assured by some highly esteemed friends in this House that they hardly approved of the kind of propaganda that I engaged in in the United States. So far as getting my leader to bring me home is concerned, I hardly think that he would have acceded to such a request had it been made to him. While I did not go at his expressed command, I did consult him as to the best course to take in many matters, and received an expression of his opinion; and I have reason to believe that he thinks the work I did in the United States not an entirely useless work. I happen to know—and I learned this, of course, through having access to means of information that put me in possession of the facts—and I state it not as a matter of egotism, but as a plain matter of fact, that the speeches I made in the United States, the articles of mine that appeared in the 'Forum,' the 'North American Review,' and other periodicals and the other means I have adopted to influence American sentiment, have produced an impression. And I believe that it is within the range of possibilities, and not only that, but that it is highly probable that, by pursuing this course, by bringing the American people to understand the actual condition of affairs between the two countries, a trade arrangement may be secured which will be satisfactory to Canada—and no arrangement will be satisfactory to Canada that does not give us reciprocity of natural products without granting any return or any concession beyond what has already been granted.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) mean reciprocity in natural products only ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly. I mean that we are buying $65,000,000 worth of manufactured goods. I mean that we are buying of the United States three times as much as we sell to them. I mean that we are buying of the United States two and a half times as much farm products as we sell to them; and that we are entitled to-day to reciprocity in natural products, absolutely and unrestricted, without granting one solitary iota of a concession, further than that we have granted, without putting an article on the free list that is not already there, and without diminishing our duties by a single fraction. That is what I have been preaching in the United States; that is what I have

been assuring the American people was our just due. I have been telling them that they could not give us less than this, and that, if they did not give it, probably we would do something for ourselves.

There have been changes in the condition of affairs since 1866, Mr. Speaker, that it would be well to bear in mind, changes that the ordinary American, who regards this question through impressions he had received from day to day does not understand. For instance, in 1866, the United States was our chief market in agricultural products, while we imported almost all our manufactured goods from Great Britain. Now this condition of things is reversed—actually and absolutely reversed. To-day, England is our chief market for agricultural products, while the United States is our chief supply for manufactures. More than that, in 1866 we bought no agricultural products or food products from the Uuited States, but now, as I say, we now buy of them two and a half times as much as we sell to them. These facts constitute a reversal of the conditions of 1866 that is well to understand and take into account when we deliberate as to the proper course to pursue in the attempts we shall make and the limit to which we shall go in making arrangements.

Now, I wish to say a few words about, perhaps, the most important matter in connection with this question, I refer to the magnitude of the trade in manufactured goods imported from the United States into Canada. I must confess, that when I first commenced to investigate this case, I was amazed at the revelations that were made to me. I suppose, that, as a matter of course, we bought more manufactures from Great Britain than we bought from the United States—never dreamed that the contrary was the fact. But I found that in 1898 our purchase of manufactures, free and dutiable, from the United States, were much greater than our purchases from Great Britain. These are the figures :—

Import of Manufactures into Canada.

From Great Britain—	
1898, free	$ 5,181,126
1898, dutiable	21,551,460
Total	$26,732,586
From the United States—	
1898, free	$12,271,448
1898, dutiable	31,563,321
Total	$43,834,769

In 1899 our imports of manufactures free and dutiable from Great Britain and the United States respectively were as follows:—

From Great Britain—	
1899, free	$ 5,144,804
1899, dutiable	26,501,435
Total	$31,848,239
From the United States—	
1899, free	$14,299,330
1899, dutiable	37,247,307
Total	$51,546,637

The figures for the following year afford a still more striking comparison between our imports of manufactured goods from Great Britain and our imports in the same line from the United States. These are the figures :—

From Great Britain—	
1900, free	$ 7,610,477
1900, dutiable	30,375,084
Total	$37,985,561
From the United States—	
1900, free	$18,021,365
1900, dutiable	44,837,580
Total	$62,858,945

The figures for 1901, I have had in my hands for only a few days. They are as follows :—

From Great Britain—	
1901, free	$ 6,906,185
1901, dutiable	30,364,488
Total	$37,270,673
From the United States—	
1901, free	$21,941,184
1901, dutiable	43,618,061
Total	$65,559,245

These figures show that our imports of manufactured goods from Great Britain last year were $714,000 less than those of the previous year, while our purchases from the United States were $2,700,000 more than those of the previous year. What does that mean ? There was a preference of 33⅓ per cent in favour of Great Britain, yet we find a considerable falling off in the imports of manufactured goods from that country ; while the United States which enters our market against that preference, made a great increase in the quality of manufactured goods sold to us. The figures show that we purchase from the United States manufactured goods to the extent of $28,289,000 in excess of what we purchase from Great Britain, and to the extent of at least $15,000,000 in excess of what we purchase from all the rest of the world, Great Britain included. There were 381 articles on the list of importations, and, of that number, we purchased from the United States in excess of Great Britain—and very largely in excess in most cases—in the case of 269 articles ; and we purchased from Great Britain in excess of our purchases from the United States in the case of 112 articles. Why, Sir, the United States has command of the market of Canada for manufactures. Now, if we cannot sell to these people of whom we buy manufactured goods to the amount of over $65,000,000 to these people of whom our farmers

buy fully $35,000,000 of that $65,000,000 worth ; to these people who allow our farmers on the other hand to squeeze in a paltry $8,000,000 worth of farm produce through their tariff fence, while over $20,000,000 of farm products exclusive of raw cotton comes into our markets from that country. I say that if we cannot secure some arrangement by which we can exchange the products of our own labour for the immense quantity of goods we buy from them, we had better make arrangements to manufacture the goods ourselves. It will cost us something at the start ; but, for my part I am perfectly willing to pay my share of that additional cost.

One more presentation to show how favourable is the position of the United States in this market. I have some figures here that will show the free imports into Canada last year :—

Free Imports, 1901.

		p.c.
From the United States, ex. coin and bullion	$53,549,000	74·66
From Great Britain, ex. coin and bullion	11,118,000	15·50
From all other countries.....	7,063,000	9·84

These figures show that almost seventy-five per cent of our total importation of free goods come from the United States. And what do they give us in return ? Why, they allowed us to send to them the products of our Klondike mines, our gold dust, our nuggets and our rich gold-bearing quartz. They allowed us also to send them free of duty saw-logs, pulp wood and hop poles, and if there is anything else, I have not had time to look it up. We have practically no free list in return for this free list of 53,000,000 odd dollars. And what did we give them on that free list ? Of this $65,000,000 of manufactures I spoke of a moment ago, $21,941,000 are on the free list. Of these free goods there were $3,464,000 of forest products. While they are putting $2 a thousand on our lumber, we are letting theirs come in here free. Of anthracite coal, $7,871,000 worth was free. Of farm products free of duty, consisting of corn, flax seed, wool, hides, hemp, broom corn, tobacco leaf, etc., $14,775,000 were free, or a total of $48,051,000, besides raw cotton, and if you add that to the list, you make it $52,782,000. This is our free list : $22,000,000 of manufactures, and $14,750,000 of farm products from a country that allows us to sell them—I will show how much shortly.

Here are two specimen facts that I want to place before you in connection with this large subject. Last year our importation of corn from the United States free of duty was $6,484,000. Last year our total export of agricultural products of all kinds from Canada to the United States was $2,907,000. It lacks $700,000 of being one-half of what we permitted them to send to us in the shape of free corn.

Now here are some figures in relation to our trade in farm products. Our imports from the United States last year were, of animals and their products, dutiable and free, $7,549,758 ; of agricultural products, dutiable and free, $17,919,000, or a total of $25,469,000 of agricultural products imported from the United States last year ; or if you eliminate raw cotton from the list, which is as much an agricultural product as wool, it still leaves $20,737,000. And in return what did they allow us to send them ? Of agricultural products we sent to the United States last year, the produce of Canada, $2,907,924 ; of animals and their products, $5,331,651, a total of $8,239,581 of the products of the farm which we were permitted to sell to the United States last year. We bought from them almost exactly $25,000,000 of the products of the farm, about $15,000,000 of which was up on the free list.

Now in 1866 our exports of farm products to the United States were $25,000,000, and the trade has fallen to one-third of what it was in 1866. In 1866 our exports of farm products to Great Britain were $3,544,000 ; in 1901 they were $78,527,000. That trade increased 2,115 per cent between 1866 and 1901, an increase of 21 fold in the exportation of farm products from Canada to Great Britain, against a decrease of two-thirds in the trade of the United States in the same article. Last year we sent to Great Britain 82 per cent of our total export of farm products, while we sent to the United States 9 per cent. We sent to Great Britain 82 per cent, and to all the rest of the world, the United States included, 18 per cent. Last year we bought articles of the United States raised on the farm in excess of our sales to that country—I do not want to weary you, but I think it would be profitable to read a list of the articles which we purchased in excess of our sales to the United States.

Corn, oats, rye, wheat, cornmeal, oatmeal, rye and wheat flour, malt, seeds, apples, small fruits, potatoes, vegetables, tobacco leaf, broom corn, hemp, flax seed, horses, hogs, poultry, eggs, butter, lard, bacon, hams, beef salted in barrels, pork in barrels, other meats, grease, hides and skins, wool, and many other articles.

In all these articles, comprising the great bulk of our exportation to the United States, we bought of that country in excess of our sales to them.

Now if the conditions of our trade relations between Canada and the United States are not grotesquely and unfairly unequal, then I confess I am no judge. If these conditions are such as we are called upon to submit to, if we are to go on maintaining trade relations with the United States of the character that have existed for the last thirty-five years, we will certainly show a lack of spirit, and we will also show a lack of comprehension in my opinion of that which our interests require.

I now come, Sir, to the consideration of the question of reciprocity in natural products. I say right here that the very easiest, simplest and most favourable arrangement that we are called upon to make with the United States is to have reciprocal free trade in natural products, without references to any other conditions of tariff or trade. We are not called upon to increase our free list, we are not called upon to reduce our duties; but we have a right to ask, and should be content with nothing less than reciprocal free trade in natural products. I have spoken of the balance of trade, the actual balance of trade of nearly $72,000,000 in favour of the United States, after eliminating from our exports the precious metals that were an actual payment on the balance of trade. I have pointed out that there is a heavy balance of trade between our exports of farm products and our imports of farm products. We buy of the United States, including cotton, three times as much as we sold to them. We buy of them, eliminating cotton from the list, two and a half times as much as we sell to them. Now, if we were to enter upon an arrangement by which there was free passage to and fro for all these natural products, the first thing we would have to overcome would be this balance of trade in favour of the United States in farm products; and if the duty were removed, while there would be a great impetus given to importations into the United States from Canada, there would also be an increased amount of purchases in Canada from the United States. In almost all these articles except Indian corn, we impose duties which are calculated to interfere with the trade and to lessen importation. Now, if these duties were removed, we would export more largely to the United States, and of course we would import more largely from the United States; and I do not believe that the balance of trade, in adjusting balances with reference to the products of the farm, would be a very large sum when we came to let the policy have full scope. For instance here is British Columbia and the Klondike region. Their natural sources of supply for food are Oregon and Washington. Take off the duties and the great bulk of the food that goes into that province and into the Klondike region will come from these two American states. Take off the duties and the maritime provinces will send their coal and lumber to the seaports on the Atlantic coast and will take from these ports nearly the entire amount of food that is consumed by the 900,000 inhabitants, of those provinces. Take off the duties and the mining and lumbering operations of Ontario and Quebec will use largely increased amounts of American corn and meats and other products.

While we would largely increase our exportations to the United States we would also increase our imports not only of farm products, but also of manufactures. The increased trade thus created would be mutually advantageous, and even under this proposed arrangement of free trade in natural products we would round up every year with a balance of $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 against us in our trade with the United States.

There is another question that it is proper to discuss in connection with this matter, a very important question so far as it concerns influence upon American sentiment in relation to this question, and that question is: Would free trade in natural products lower prices in the United States? Well, with regard to the articles for which both countries have a common market, wheat, cheese and all articles of which both countries produce a surplus and sell that surplus in Great Britain, or elsewhere, it could have no influence whatever upon prices in the United States. If all those articles were taken into the United States the merchants of that country would simply act as our factors in the business of exportation and if they went into the consumption of the United States they would merely displace that amount of the products of United States that would go abroad. It would, however, have a good influence in Canada, it would increase competition in our markets and introduce new classes of buyers. But as far as prices in the United States are concerned the placing of natural products on the free list would have no appreciable influence upon the prices of such articles as that country, has a surplus of to export.

Then, let us take into consideration the question as to whether free trade would have any influence in the direction of depressing the prices of articles the United States imported from Canada for consumption into that country. I hold in this relation also that it would not. I hold that the volume of importation in any line would be so insignificant compared with the great volume of production in the United States that the comparatively insignificant quantity that went into that country from Canada would have no influence upon prices. I will illustrate this by a few quotations from the United States census of 1890. I have not the returns for 1900 which would be much more favourable to the view that I am endeavouring to present. In 1890 the production of eggs in the United States amounted to 819,722,000 dozen in volume of a value of about $120,000,000. The largest exportation of eggs from this country, when they were free, was about two and a quarter million dollars worth and last year we sent to the United States $7,185 as against a domestic production of $120,000,000. That little dribblet of eggs could have no influence upon the price of the vast production in the United States. In regard to horses, in 1890, there were in round numbers 15,000,000 horses in the United States. We sent them last year 3,289, or one horse for every 4,550

that they had in the country. Suppose we sent them three times as many horses, the exportation of horses would still be one horse for about every 1,500 in the country. Would that one horse in 1,500 influence the price of horses in the United States? Of cattle last year we exported 46,320 head, while in 1890 there were 51,363,575 head of cattle in the United States. We sent them one steer for every 1,100 they had in the country. In regard to sheep and lambs, there were about 41,000,000 in the United States in 1890. In 1900 we sent them 309,087, or 1 lamb, or sheep, for every 130 in the country. Of potatoes, in 1890, they had 217,546,000 bushels. We sent last year 255,000 bushels, or one bushel of potatoes for every 920 raised in the United States. Of hay they had in the United States in 1890, 66,831,000 tons, and we exported last year 155,000 ton, or we sent them 1 ton to every 430 raised in the United States. In 1890, the United States raised about 79,000,000 bushels of barley, and we sent them last year 85,927, or 1 bushel to every 910. Suppose we increased our export to 7,000,000 bushels, the highest figures of our former importations, the importation of 7,000,000 bushels would have no influence upon the price. Of oats the United States in 1890 raised 809,250,000 bushels and we sent them in 1900 1 bushel for every 42,500 they raised.

Mr. Speaker, when this thing is considered in the light of common sense, when we take the figures of production in the United States and the figures of exportation from Canada, it becomes clearly apparent that the fear that free importation of Canadian products, and particularly of farm products, will have an influence upon American prices is sheer absurdity. Last year we sent to the United States $7,266,000 worth of sawn lumber. This included what came from St. John, the product of the state of Maine logs, and it included what went through in bond for export. It included vast amounts of lumber bought by the Standard Oil Company for boxes on which they received a rebate of 90 per cent. The product of the United States in sawn lumber in 1890 was $446,000,000 worth—last year it was $100,000,000 more—but take 1890 as the basis of calculation, $446,000,000 worth of lumber was produced, while our export to the United States was $7,266,000, or the entire importation of lumber into the United States was 1,000 feet to every 63,000 feet produced in that country.

Let me present this information in tabulated form.

Sale of Farm Products for Consumption.

Eggs in the United States, Census, 1890	819,722,000 doz.
Value	$120,000,000
Largest import from Canada	2,100,000
Last year import from Canada	7,185

	Head.
Horses in the United States, 1890	14,969,467
Exported last year	3,289
1 to 4,550.	
	Head.
Cattle in United States, 1890	51,363,575
Exported last year	46,320
1 to 1,100.	
	Head.
Sheep and lambs in the United States, 1890	40,876,312
Exported last year	309,087
1 to 130.	
	Bush.
Potatoes in the United States, 1890	217,546,000
Exported last year	255,000
1 to 920.	
	Tons.
Hay in the United States, 1890	66,831,480
Exported last year	155,000
1 to 430.	
	Bush.
Barley in the United States, 1890	78,322,000
Exported last year	85,927
1 to 910.	
	Bush.
Oats in the United States, 1890	809,250,000
Exported last year	18,858
1 to 42,500.	
Lumber sawn, value produced in 1890.	$446,000,000
Lumber sawn, imported in 1901	7,266,000
1,000 ft. to 63,000 ft.	

We had this matter under discussion before the Joint High Commission in Quebec. I presented substantially this argument in relation to lumber, and Mr. Dingley next morning came to me and said: 'Well, Mr. Charlton, I admit the soundness of your argument that importations and exportations amounting to only one and a half per cent of the production of our country can have no material influence upon prices. You have convinced me, but perhaps you would have a little more difficulty in convincing the United States Senate'.

I have no hesitation in saying, and I assert with perfect confidence that the fears of the American lumbermen and agriculturists in regard to the supposed effect of reducing prices in the United States on articles from Canada imported free of duty is a mere bugbear.

I noticed the other day an editorial from one of the Canadian papers copied approvingly by the Philadelphia 'Ledger', an editorial criticising the speech I made in Chicago recently, in which the editor proceeded to set forth that if we had reciprocity of tariffs with the United States it would put us in a bad box, because we would have to impose a duty on cotton and hides and would be obliged to impose a duty on a great many of the things we want for the interest of the people and which we import free. Well, the policy I am advocating does not contemplate any such nonsense. It does not contemplate hampering the operations of the cotton mills by putting a duty on cotton, it does not contemplate

hampering the operations of the woollen mills by a duty on wool, it does not contemplate hampering the interests of our tanners by a duty on hides. What I ask for is, that we shall have duties upon such things as it is desirable to produce in Canada. We want to foster our manufactures. They can have all the cotton they want. We want to foster our woollen mills. But I want to see some arrangement made by which this $65,000,000 worth of these American goods for which we pay hard cash which we receive from England on account of the handsome balance of trade we have with that country ; I want to see some arrangement by which the Americans will allow us to pay for these goods in the products of our own labour—or, I want to see that they are manufactured here.

I spoke upon this question before the Merchants Exchange in Buffalo, and one of the leading Republican papers of that city, admitted next morning the force of my arguments ; admitted that the treatment which Canada received from the United States was hardly what the United States would want to receive from Canada. But, the editor said : There is a consideration here that we do not want to loose sight of; we want to avoid adopting a policy that would promote the prosperity of Canada, because we must bear in mind that the day may come when Canada will be hostile to the United States, and then we will regret that we did anything to promote her prosperity. The editor of that paper reminded me of the story of the elder of the Presbyterian congregation, who in the course of his charge to the new minister who was being inducted said : Now my dear brother, may the Lord in his great mercy keep you humble, and we will keep you poor. That seems to be the policy the United States propose to adopt towards Canada. They want the Lord to keep us humble, and they will do what they can to aid the Lord in that purpose and they will take every means that lies in their power to keep us poor. That is the policy that they have pursued for thirty-five years. That is the policy that some Canadians resent. That is the policy which in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, nine-tenths of the citizens of Canada will resent when they come to understand this case thoroughly.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the tariff of the Amercan nation is essentially unjust to us, but I have not the remotest anticipation that the presentation of proof to the American people that their tariff is unfair would have the slightest influence on their policy towards us. These circumstances do not weigh in the United States; they do not have weight here. The policy is that after you have secured the advantage, you should hold it, and that, I think, will be the policy of the United States. I remember discussing this question with John Sherman when he was Secretary of the Treasury for the United States, and I laid before Mr. Sherman the condition of trade between the two countries, and the reason that Canada had to complain of the tariff policy of the United States. I think I made it perfectly apparent to Mr. Sherman that we were not getting, as the saying is, a fair show; but when I got through, Mr. Sherman said : 'Well, Mr. Charlton, I think that our tariff suits us pretty well.' 'Yes,' I said, 'I rather think Mr. Sherman that it does, and I think moreover that the time will come when the Canadian people will discover that your tariff does not suit them, and then you will have either to do something to remove its bad features or we will do something ourselves to counteract them.'

The question is: whether we should not do that now. My proposition, Mr. Speaker, is simply this. I want to give the Americans an inducement to be just; an inducement to the extent of 40 per cent or more, of the duties levied upon their imports into this country. I would make it 50 per cent; I would make it 60 per cent; I would make it 75 per cent; I would make it almost anything to be effectual if we enter upon this business. I know very well the feelings of the American people. If they see a prospect of this being adopted, then they will be prepared to consider the nature of their own policy on its merits, and we will probably be able to do something. If the inducement is not sufficient; if the inducement when it is offered does not bring the concessions we hope and desire, why all right. We have simply threatened to do what we will do, we have simply threatened to do what it will be in our interest to do, and so far as I feel about this thing, I do not know that I care a very great deal which thing is done, but I am very clearly of the opinion that one thing or the other had better be done. I know that my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Edwards) and my hon. friend to my left (Mr. Ross, Victoria) may tell me that I have gone stark mad on the question of protection. Well, this is a matter out of the ordinary line of protection. This, Mr. Speaker, is a question of self-protection. Here, we are alongside of a mighty nation of 80,000,000 people. Our sons and our daughters are drifting to that country; the choice of our population goes there. We have no arrangement in our trade with them that gives us the advantages which we have a right to demand, and if we cannot get fair trade relations with that great nation, trade relations mutually advantageous and just, then I say that it is not a question of protection per se, but that it is a question of self-protection. It is a question whether we will turn the left cheek when we have been smitten on the right cheek, or whether we will assert our own independence, and proceed upon the principle that the best thing possible for us to do is to care for our own interests.

I am not insensible of the benefits of free trade. I am well aware that the greatest blessing the United States enjoys to-day is that uninterrupted free trade that exists between the forty-four states and the seven territories of the American union. I know that this policy has been fraught with nothing but blessings since it was adopted when their constitution was first ratified. I know that very well, and I know that the nearest approach we can make, in our relations with the United States to that same trade condition that exists between the various states of the American union—the better for ourselves. And so far as our condition will permit, I am in favour of the adoption of that American interstate free trade policy. We must have of course a tariff for revenue. We cannot adopt the zollverein, but we can adopt free trade in natural products, and we can allow a trade to grow up between these two countries in all the articles which are mentioned in our imports and exports, which trade will attain enormous proportions and be to our mutual advantage. But we have got to have that matter arranged on a fair basis. We cannot go on as we have been going on. The Americans profess now—many of them—to be prepared to give this country commercial union. Well, the time was—I am perfectly frank in saying it—the time was when I was under the impression that a zollverein between Canada and the United States would promote our interests. In many respects I am prepared to say it would do so now. But, a zollverein is not now practical. A zollverein now would simply involve the sacrificing of Imperial interests that we cannot honourably sacrifice. We have built up a trade with Great Britain; she is our chief customer for our exports; we are a portion of the empire of which she is the head. To adopt commercial union would be to discriminate against England—to discriminate very seriously against England. We would put the United States upon the same footing with regard to our exports. We would adopt the American tariff, or have a common tariff, which would give to the United States the advantage in our markets which would be represented by the amount of duty imposed, whatever that might be; and while it would give us uninterrupted access to the American market, there would be no investment of money in manufacturing operations in this country. We would buy our goods manufactured in the United States, because no man would invest money in manufacturing here under such an arrangement as a commercial union, that would be liable to be terminated and leave his investment worthless. So that is a question which may be ruled out of court—a question to which, after full reflection, we can hardly give a favourable consideration.

There may arise in connection with this matter a complication of an unexpected character. It is possible that Great Britain may conclude to give a preference to the colonies—possible that we may have some arrangement by which duties shall be levied by England and all the colonies on all imports from the outside world; possible that we may get a duty of 10 per cent on wheat. If this policy were adopted, it would turn reciprocity down. I imagine that if the Americans want to improve their trade relations with Canada, and retain a position which is advantageous to themselves, they had better make haste to give this country reciprocity in natural products; for the time may come, and come soon, when this country would not accept or would not listen to such a proposition.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the House for having detained it so long. I wish to recapitulate just a few of the points I have made. One point is that our tariff is one-half lower than the tariff of the United States—that it permits the admission of American goods into this market almost without impediment, while their tariff excludes our products from their market. The next point is that we give to the United States, notwithstanding the lack of liberality and generosity which they show towards us, lower tariff rates than we give to the rest of the world—lower tariff rates than we give to the mother country. The next point is that we buy from the United States three times as much as we sell to them. Last year we bought from them $119,000,000 worth, while we sold to them, after taking out the precious metals, less than $42,000,000. Another point is that we buy from the United States three times as much agricultural products as we sell to them, if we include cotton; two and a half times as much as we sell to them, if we exclude cotton. The next point is that we buy manufactures chiefly from the United States—$15,000,000 worth more than from the rest of the world, $28,000,000 more than from England; and in view of the fact that we are the best customer they possess on the globe for the finished products of their factories, we have abundant reason for complaint. Another point is that while the United States is doing this enormous business with us, while we are their third best customer for total imports and their best customer for manufactured goods, we are not allowed to exchange the products of our labour for the goods we buy, the very first principle of commercial transactions. We are a four-fold better customer of the United States than we were in 1866, while they are not as good a customer of ours as they were at that time. Our business with them has increased with four times the rapidity that their business has increased with us. The United States has nearly obliterated our farmer's market in their country, which is smaller to-day than it was in 1866, when

our population was only three-fifths of what it is to-day.

Now, the country tires of these conditions; they are intolerable. Something must be done to change the trade conditions that exist between the United States and Canada. Free trade in natural products would afford a reasonable adjustment; nothing short of this would do it; and this concession of free trade in natural products must be granted by the United States without a solitary concession from Canada further than those we have already made; we cannot afford any more. If we are denied these reasonable concessions, I repeat again, we can resort to self-protection, and that is the policy we must pursue.

Sir, we have illimitable resources. Year by year our conception of the natural wealth this country possesses rises. There is not an intelligent Canadian who does not believe twice as much to-day as he believed five years ago with regard to the potential wealth of Canada. We have in Nova Scotia, as American iron masters were well aware when I was chairman of the Mining Commission of Ontario in 1889—we have in the iron region of Cape Breton conditions which will enable us to produce iron at a lower cost per ton than is possible at any other place in the world, even at Birmingham, Alabama. That business will develop until we shall supply our own wants and export iron and steel in vast quantities, and compete with the United States in the neutral markets of the world. We talk about New Ontario; but we have a New Quebec stretching up to James bay, a great region where there are thirty thousand square miles of virgin country, with admirable soil, with a good climate, and capable of supporting hundreds of thousands of inhabitants. We have New Ontario developing with rapid strides, in agriculture, mining, manufacturing, and lumbering—a region possessing vast wealth. We have Hudson bay, our closed sea, one-third larger than the German ocean, towards which we are stretching out railway lines from Quebec, from Montreal, from Toronto; a great expanse of water, with great piscatorial wealth. We have on the Ungava river, in Labrador and on the eastern shores of Hudson bay, millions and trillions of tons of iron. We have the isothermal line stretching from the American boundary to the shores of the Great Slave lake and inclosing a vast region in every part of which spring opens almost simultaneously, where four hundred million acres of wheat land are awaiting the plough of the husbandman. We have a vast auriferous region extending along the American boundary for three hundred miles to the west of the Rocky mountains, and to the north fourteen hundred miles. We can support a hundred million people from the products of our soil. We have fisheries, minerals, timber resources, and agricultural resources beyond the fondest and wildest dreams we entertained but a few years ago, and, Sir, we putter along, making an advance in population of 11 or 10½ per cent each decade. Shall we go along at the ambling pace we have been pursuing, increasing our population in thirty years from 3,600,000 to five and a quarter millions? Why, it will take us two hundred years at this rate to people the country, which we have awaiting settlement. Something needs to be done; some change of policy is desirable. It is for us to consider what it is. One thing is certain: we do not want to continue the trade conditions that exist between us and the United States. We do not want to pay them tribute annually to the extent of from $50,000,000 to $70,000,000. We want from them some concessions that will enable us to trade with them upon a fair basis. The policy I have to propose is one that will give to any country which admits our natural products free of duty a preference over all countries that do not do so. That will settle the question of the maximum rate with Germany in a summary manner. It will give the United States an inducement to deal with us fairly, and if that inducement does not produce the result desired, we will simply go on and map out a course of our own and strike out our own pathway to empire in the best way we can.

I beg, therefore, to move:

That this House is of the opinion that Canadian import duties should be arranged upon the principle of reciprocity in trade conditions so far as may be consistent with Canadian interests; that a rebate of not less than 40 per cent of the amount of duties imposed, should be made upon dutiable imports from nations or countries admitting Canadian natural products into their markets free of duty; and that the scale of Canadian duties should be sufficiently high to avoid inflicting injury upon Canadian interests in cases where a rebate of 40 per cent or more shall be made under the conditions aforesaid.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). I cannot hope, Mr. Speaker, to command the attention of the House to anything like the extent to which the hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, has succeeded in doing, for not only do I lack the well known parliamentary skill of the hon. gentleman in debate, but I labour under the further disadvantage that the line of argument which I propose to take, is not one likely to commend itself to hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, or to appeal to their sympathies as do the sentiments just expressed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). At the outset of his remarks, my hon. friend said that the policy he proposed to commend to the House was one which he considered best in principle. In taking this stand, he nailed his colours to the mast absolutely as a protectionist pure and simple. Had he said that the course he proposed, was one he considered best, under the existing conditions, as a

policy, but not as a question of principle, then the position he took would be an entirely different one. He asserts, however, policy, but not as a question of principle, Well, Mr. Speaker, I entirely dissent from the hon. gentleman's proposition. I submit that the course he advocates is neither best as a policy for the Canadian people nor is it best in principle. It is not the policy we ought to adopt, no matter what the Americans may do.

The hon. gentleman pointed out that while our imports from the United States have largely increased, our exports to that country showed a decrease, despite the fact that we are giving a preference of 33⅓ per cent to English goods over American imports. He then went on to show that our tariff in general is higher on the dutiable goods coming from Great Britain than on the same class of goods from the United States. To those who do not consider or understand the situation, that statement may have some force, but to me it has no force at all. In order that it should be properly understood, my hon. friend should have taken the articles imported from the United States and shown what tariff they paid, and then compared the rates of duty with those on goods imported from England. If he will do this he will find that many of the articles which we buy from the United States are those which England does not manufacture at all. But if it be true that Canadians, notwithstanding the more favourable tariff on English goods, wilfully buy their wants from the United States, then the people of Canada are not only disloyal but a pack of fools. Why do Canadians buy more largely from the United States than from England ? Because it is in their interest to do so.

The hon. gentleman then went on to show the very rapid growth of the United States as compared with Canada. No one will deny that the growth and development of the United States has been most wonderful in every respect. And we must also admit that the growth of Canada has not been relatively as great. But there are other causes for this disparity besides the trade question. I am of the opinion that a great many immigrants from European countries, where the governmental system is very autocratic and severe, and no doubt also many people coming from our own British Isles, imagine that in the United States they will find a freer country than Canada. Of course, no Canadian, no one who knows anything of the institutions of this country, will doubt for a moment that we are the freer of the two, but none the less is it undeniable that that is not the opinion of the mass of the people who live in European countries, especially on the continent.

There is another fact which must not be lost sight of, and that is the geographical position of the United States. The United States is a country of great breadth and depth. It has many natural resources which Canada does not possess. Its geographical conditions are certainly more favourable. In Canada we occupy a long strip of country—our transit being from east to west. And until there are more means of outlet for the products of our great North-west, until there is competition for the carriage of these products, that country cannot make its greatest development.

But what are the conditions to-day ? My hon. friend says that Canadians are going to the United States. No, Sir, things have changed in that respect. It is not Canadians who are going to the United States, but Americans who are coming to this country to settle here. There are reasons for that. Canada is, to-day, making the very greatest development it ever made. And I just want to show the hon. gentleman that he has proved the very reverse of the position he takes. Any one who watched his speech closely, cannot come to any other conclusion than that it was one of the most illogical speeches ever made in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is the style of argument we hear from hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is the extent of their understanding of this question. Now, I will make a statement and will challenge satisfactory contradiction. Has our tariff in Canada been raised ? No. The consequence of giving the preference of 33⅓ per cent to Great Britain is to lower the prices of goods in the country. But that is a very small matter indeed. The effect of that reduction of tariff is to lower the prices of all similar goods coming into this country. And my statement is that it is in consequence of the lowering of our duties Canada is now making the greatest development she has ever made.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am quite aware, Mr. Speaker, that when I speak to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, I address a very capable audience. But I quite admit also that this is a question that they have never studied. The hon. member for North Norfolk went on to show, about the close of his speech, the glorious advantages of free trade among the many states of the union. If he had been discussing this whole question on the basis of policy and had said that he was going to strike back at the Americans because of something naughty that they had done, I might extend forgiveness to him. But when he says that he is advocating this as a matter of principle, then I desire to ask : If free trade amongst the states of the union has been a great blessing to them on what ground of principle can we possibly say that increasing the tariff as between Canada and the rest of the world will prove a blessing to Canada ? By lowering the tariff 33⅓ per cent on goods

coming from Great Britain—the consequence of which is to reduce the protection afforded to the manufacturers of our country—we have been blessed, as shown by the progress we are making. Let the present government go further in that direction and Canada instead of developing as she is now developing, will develop in far greater ratio.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who choose to speak, will have an opportunity to speak; but nothing will be made out of any attempt to interrupt me. I am perfectly aware that my views on this question are very divergent from those of hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. MACLEAN. And from those of your neighbour.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am sorry for my neighbour. But I cannot help it. In the discussion of a question of this kind there is a class of people who should not be lost sight of, and they are the men who produce the great wealth of Canada. And who are they ? First and foremost amongst them are the agriculturists of our country. They are the men who should receive first consideration in every question of this kind. It is useless for any gentleman in this House or out of it to pretend that a tariff between Canada and the United States on agricultural products would have any general effect. The fact is that the people of the United States are large exporters of manufactured products, and so are we. The general prices, then, must be governed by the markets of the world, and a tariff would only have a local effect. That is to say, in some certain localities, agricultural products might cost the buyer more, but the seller, the producer, would not get a cent more because of the tariff. The tariff on agricultural products does not benefit the Canadian farmer by a fraction of a cent. Next to the Canadian farmer in importance is the Canadian lumberman. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) a few years ago was very anxious that sawlogs should be exported to the United States. I think that now he is glad that they are not so exported. But there is one thing he does desire, and that is that Canadian lumber shall go into the United States free of duty. Though I am a farmer I also do something in sawing wood, and, perhaps, export as much lumber as my hon. friend. But, I will say this—that beneficial as it would be to the Canadian lumberman to have our lumber go into the United States free of duty, I would not cross the line to ask for that concession. And I make this further statement—that if any proposition comes from any hon. member of this House to place a tax on lumber coming into Canada, I will oppose it in any way I can. The taxing of goods imported into the United States is a great detriment and curse to the American people, and because the people of the United States are cursed in that respect, my hon. friend wants the people of Canada to be similarly cursed by a tariff on goods imported into this country. Now, if it is true that the goods coming from the United States are purchased there more cheaply than they can be got anywhere else, who in Canada is hurt by their importation ? Is the Canadian farmer hurt by low duties upon articles that are imported for him ? Not at all. Is the Canadian lumberman hurt by the low duties ? Not at all. Is the Canadian fisherman hurt by low duties, or the Canadian miner ? Not at all. A protective tariff is simply class legislation, legislation for the benefit of the few to the detriment of the many. My hon. friend speaks of our not having made great development in this country so far as population is concerned. My firm belief is that if we had never had the curse of protection our population would be twice what it is to-day. And not only that, but we would manufacture twice what we do to-day. Why, if you want to enable us to manufacture, you must place the people in a position to purchase. Do you place the people in a position to purchase by making it difficult to bring in goods, when the natural products of Canada must be sold in the open markets of the world or in competition with all the rest of the world ? The only effect of such a course is to compel those who are engaged in producing wealth in Canada to pay tribute, not to the public treasury, but to the treasuries of the protected few. There are those who say that, if certain industries in Canada were not carried on to their present extent Canadians could not find employment. What could be more absurd ? In a country such as we have, a country with resources unbounded, is it to be supposed for a moment, that, if a few of our men are diverted from the industries in which they are engaged, they will not be able to find employment within the bounds of the whole Dominion ? There is employment in Canada for ten times the population we have to-day. I have always contended, and I always will contend, that if you would have Canada achieve its greatest prosperity, you must let those who are producing the natural wealth of our country buy in the same way as they sell—in the open market of the world. Until that is done, Canada cannot attain its greatest development.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I have great pleasure in seconding the motion made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I am sure that no more important question has been discussed in the parliament of Canada since those days when discussions of trade and tariff took place during the sessions preceding 1879. I am sure nothing could be of more importance to the people of our country to-day than that this matter which, to a certain

extent, perhaps, has been overlooked by the people of Canada, should receive such full and thorough discussion as would make it impossible for speeches so divergent in tone and in intention as we have just listened to, to be delivered on the floor of this House in so short a period of time. I have not a great deal of sympathy with the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards); but believing as I do that he is convinced of the correctness of the views which he holds in reference to free trade, I listened with a good deal of interest, in the course of his speech, for any remarks which would seem to have the effect of weakening the very strong impression made upon my mind by the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk. Well, I did not recognize anything that to my mind inpaired the force of the argument of the hon. member for Norfolk, to which we listened for a considerable time, without at all, so far as I was concerned, exhausting the great interest that I felt in every word that he uttered. We did hear from our friend from Russell, if not stated with the same clearness and fullness, at least the echoes of the old arguments which were adduced during the debates of almost a generation ago. We did hear in the latter part of his speech what he thinks is the gist of the argument that can be adduced against the speech made by the member for North Norfolk, and that is the contention that a protective system involves a certain amount of loss to the consumers of the country, a certain amount of sacrifice upon their part, and that therefore it is a policy which is not in the general interest.

Those of us who have a clear recollection of the old discussions that took place during the eighteen years of Conservative regime since 1879, have often heard the charge advanced with great force that the imposition of protective duties in any country has the effect of injuring the consumers for the benefit of a protected class, and it is strange to my mind to hear that same argument reproduced in parliament at the present time when we remember that the hon. gentleman from Russell is to-day sitting and voting in support of an administration which has adopted and is maintaining and upholding a protective system in every detail. The hon. gentleman cannot consistently occupy his position as long as he holds the views which he has expressed to-day: he cannot consistently support a government of which he is, I believe, a most loyal supporter holding such opinions as he has expressed to-day. All that he has said, while it leaves his own course in great doubt, and I think it devolves upon him the task of making some further utterance that will explain his course and the support which he sees fit to give to this present administration, does not at all affect that great and important question which has been raised by the hon. member from North Norfolk.

Now, I should not follow the hon. member for Russell in all his remarks, although to my mind one could do so with great profit. I think it would be impossible for him to fail to draw from the speech of the member for Norfolk ample proof of the inaccuracy and mistaken opinions which he seems to hold in reference to this subject. In referring to the abandonment of a protective system as likely to increase the population of this country, he maintained that in this country we have labour sufficient for all the people of this country.

Mr. EDWARDS. And ten times more.

Mr. BELL. And still that state of affairs, as was shown by the hon. member for Norfolk exists in the neighbouring country where there is no free trade, a country which draws directly from Canada many of our labouring people. In that country they have a system which the hon. member for Norfolk rightly praises as being adapted to the maintenance of their prosperity, but which I think is a policy that is antagonistic and injurious to us as a people. Now, it must be borne in mind, and that was very apparent in the speech of my hon. friend from Norfolk, that he does not at all attack the policy of the United States administration in reference to that country; but he does maintain, and I think has proved absolutely, that the two peoples living side by side show such remarkable contrast in the matter of development of population, wealth and resources, as to make any reasonable man consider the relative policies of these two countries in order to discover if possible the reason why the one country is so amazingly prosperous and is increasing at such an amazing rate in population and wealth, while this country is lagging behind in the race.

There are I am sure no gentlemen in this House who have paid the slightest attention to the study of these questions, who are not prepared to admit that a tremendous argument can be made in favour of free trade. The hon. member for North Norfolk told us, at least I gathered as much from one passage in his speech when he pointed to the remarkable career of the United States and attributed it in great measure to that enormous system of free trade which prevails between all the states and territories of the great union. We in Canada have every reason to know and to feel that in that measure of free trade that we enjoy as a people and which, after 1867, threw down all the barriers between the provinces making up the Confederation, Canada has derived an immense advantage.

But this, Mr. Speaker, is not an abstract question as to whether free trade is the right system. That is not the state of affairs that exists in the world to-day. In trade matters we find to-day all countries engaged in rivalry or active hostility, having in view on the part of the governments of

all these several countries, the progress and the advancement of their people, and the success of those people in grasping the prize of power and of wealth which is held up for them all to struggle for. The situation is just this: We are living in a world in which the several governments are endeavouring to overcome the disadvantages, if such there be, of their position, and are for the most part, indeed I may say unanimously, relying upon a system of protection to enable them to surpass their competitors in the race.

The really critical point to which the hon. member for North Norfolk directs the attention of the House is this: Can we as a people afford to allow that great people with whom we are so immediately in contact and who are our natural competitors to maintain a system by which they refuse to give us any part of the trade of the country so far as they can prevent it, while they are absorbing the whole trade of our country? I need not go over the figures quoted by the hon. gentleman. They are accurate so far as I can judge, listening to them in gross, and they are startling. The very fact that it appears that in every department of commercial activity the United States are not only shutting us out of their markets and benumbing our trade and cutting off to a minimum our exports to them, but are grasping the larger part of our trade, is one of the most startling statements to which I have ever listened. It cannot be denied that it would appear that our policy is not a well chosen one—I am not speaking in this connection of the government of the day or of the opposition—but there are some defects in the manner in which we are carrying out our system when it appears that the people of Canada, who have been taking great credit to themselves for giving an advantage in their markets to the mother country find themselves in this position, that upon dutiable imports coming into the country they are levying a less rate upon articles from the United States than upon articles from that great country which receives nearly the whole of their exports. There cannot be any doubt that there is something wrong and there cannot be very much doubt either, because there is not very much reason to doubt, that this state of affairs is one that has been brought about by design. When we decreased the tariff in 1897, the government of the day claimed a great deal of credit and claimed that they were exhibiting a great deal of friendliness to the mother country by giving a 25 per cent rebate—at first 12½ per cent and afterwards 25 per cent. At that time it was pointed out that the expected benefit to the mother country would prove to be much less than it promised and that upon the lines of goods we largely imported from the mother country the cutting down of the tariff was preceded by a raising of the tariff. Duties upon the goods which we import from the mother country had been marked up in the first place so that the taking off of one-eighth and then one-quarter and afterwards one-third did not produce so great an effect as it apparently did.

There is no doubt at all that the figures that have been advanced by the hon. member for North Norfolk are correct. They show that at the present time that country which has shown to us the utmost unfriendliness has come to our markets in such a position of advantage that no other country can compete with it in securing the trade of this country. The result is that the trade of this country is passing not only in the matter of raw products, but in the matter of manufactured goods, very rapidly into the hands of the people of the United States who practically have control to-day of the trade of Canada. Now, under these circumstances, it seems to me that it is amazing that more attention has not been given to this subject. I have watched during the last twelve months with the utmost interest the fact that the hon. member for North Norfolk has been bringing this matter to the attention of the people of the United States by speaking on the subject before a great many of the most important bodies in that country. I have sometimes wondered what his purpose was, because, judging from the efforts that have been made by the people of Canada to derive any advantage in the markets of the United States, efforts in which he himself participated in very great degree during the course of a few years past, I could scarcely hope that he had any anticipation that any effort made in that direction would have any effect whatever. We can, in our province, very well remember the enormous change that took place in our circumstances when the old reciprocity treaty was done away with, and while we are forced to admit, that, to a large extent it has interfered with our trade and with our exports, still, I would feel disposed to go so far as to say that the repeal of the reciprocity treaty was not an unmixed evil for our country. I can recollect very well the position of affairs before the repeal of the reciprocity treaty and what was that condition? Actually, in that country, in Nova Scotia, where, to-day, there are very many important industries, some of national importance, some of them of such great magnitude that they are practically national concerns, such as our great iron and steel industries, the fact of the matter was that at that time, under the operation of that treaty, we were supplying natural products to a large extent to the United States and we were absolutely without any manufacturing industries. The commonest articles, the hay rake of the farmer and the cheap chair that is in the workingman's dwelling, everything in the

line of those articles which it might be supposed a comparatively young people would be beginning to make were imported, we were making no progress in the direction of establishing manufacturing industries and our principal business was to find raw materials to be sent to our more progressive, more businesslike and more active neighbours from whom we received them back in manufactured forms. Then again the effect of the repeal of the reciprocity treaty, while it was largely to promote manufacturing in this country, was also to develop that condition of affairs in which you see the mother country our great purchaser and in which we have created a state of affairs that makes it clear to the world and to every man who has Imperial interests in view and considers of the safety of the empire that we are now, or very shortly will be, in the position in which we can feed the mother country and make her independent of outside sources of supply. In these directions, both in the stimulus given to our home manufacturers in Canada and the stimulus given in the direction of swelling our exports to the mother country so as to make us more important to that country, to bind us closer together and to give us an enormous part in the welding together of the empire which has built up the Imperial sentiment existing to-day, the repeal of the reciprocity treaty was not an unmixed evil but rather an advantage to Canada. Now, however, we have advanced many steps in the course of our life as a people, and these steps are perhaps best marked in the minds of most of us by the decennial periods in which our census is taken. In 1879 the government of this country adopted a system of protection and they promised and hoped for very great things in the direction of industrial advancement from that policy. The census of 1891 was unquestionably a surprise to the people of Canada. It was a painful surprise; it was startling to find that we had made a progress so small as we had made under the stimulus of the effort to swell our industries and to keep our people at home and increase our population. Living as we have done since 1896 under a government, which has certainly, no matter what else may be said of it, enjoyed a period of enormous prosperity, which has lived under a most auspicious star and enjoyed luck beyond what it is ordinarily to be expected will fall to the lot of any government, We could not help supposing that the census of 1901 would show an enormous increase, or at least, an increase that would prove a fair rate of progression in our population. But what is the result. I am sure there is not a gentleman on the other side of the House who is not prepared to admit as I was prepared to admit in 1891, that the result of the last census is a disappointment. If we are a wise people we must not lose much time in considering the disappointment, and we should lose not one moment in sinking under the disappointment, but we must, following the lines laid down for us by the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) consider whether or not that system under which we are working out our course is so well devised that it does not admit of change. I believe that the resolution introduced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) should be followed up by a sufficiently exhaustive discussion, from which I would like to see all feeling of party spirit removed, and all party recrimination eliminated. I believe that if we exhaust the subject as this parliament of Canada is capable of exhausting it, we cannot fail to come to some definite conclusion as to whether that course of conduct indicated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) be or be not a wise one. I must admit that we should all approach such a question with an open mind, and that it is not well that we should have our opinions fully formed upon it. Although I am proud indeed to have the honour of seconding a resolution moved by a public man of such a reputation as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), I feel that I cannot at this moment absolutely make up my mind as to the correctness of the course he indicates, though I am prepared to say, from the observations of years past and from that spirit of national pride and self-respect that all Canadians have; I feel very much inclined as a man to follow the course that is marked out for me in that resolution, and when I find Canada treated with unfriendliness and unkindliness, and apparently overreached in the great bargain conducted between two neighbouring nations; I feel inclined to strike back and to meet unfriendly blow with unfriendly blow. I feel inclined to go back to the old ways in which we discussed this matter a long time ago, and to decide that we do not want a jug handled trade system on this continent, but that we want a system that will give equal and fair treatment to both contracting parties.

I am satisfied that the government of Canada feels that having made the fullest efforts possible—and having done so in that spirit that the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) said he could have wished the preceding government had shown—I am persuaded that having made every effort consistent with national self-respect, they are satisfied that they need not hope for any measure of relief from the administration of the United States in the direction of bettering our trade relations. It is not for us to criticize the policy of the government of a nation friendly in a sense, and with which we wish to cultivate the most cordial relations. We in this country cannot lose sight of the fact that we must occasionally suppress our wishes, and modify our demands in view of that larger Imperial policy in which we are all involved and to which we must contribute a share of our support. But I do say

that we should not hesitate for one instant to put into force as against that neighbouring country, without apology and without explanation, a system that will enable us to retain for ourselves those industries for which Canada is well adapted, and without which this country cannot achieve that national greatness for which she is unquestionably destined. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) waxed almost poetical and undoubtedly eloquent in speaking of the resources of this country. It was a passage in his speech to which he will look back, I believe, with great satisfaction. It was the portion of his speech to which I listened with the greatest of pleasure, and it touched the hearts and to a certain extent the imaginations of his listeners as he painted the advantages, and the possible wealth, and the future greatness of this our country. But after all, could we realize all these advantages, could we realize within that measurable distance of time in which we may expect to do our part as the builders of Canada, could we expect to achieve these results, without some change in the policy under which we have been acting in the past ? I do not think we could. And, while I am prepared to go a long way in the direction of meeting my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) in his appreciation of the farmer, and of the fisherman, and of the miner, and of the lumberman, still I do not think that it is wise for us to shut our eyes to the facts. It is very true that the farmer is the foundation of all our prosperity. He, and the fisherman, and the miner, directly receive from the hands of the Great Disposer and Provider of all our wants, these natural gifts that are the basis of all national prosperity. But there is another class which have grown up, since the days the old Latin writer spoke of agriculture as being the fruitful mother of all industries. There is in our country and in our time, an enormous development in the direction of manufacturing industries. It is the outcoming, the extension of that great farming class, and it receives at the hands of the miner, and the fisherman, and the farmer, the food and the materials out of which to create national wealth. And by the enormous development of industry, in which not only the body and the brawn, but the mind of man as well, is an active worker, the artisan creates that state of advancement and elevation which sets some countries in the world far in advance of others. Why, the lesson of our times; the lesson taught by our census, is conclusive on that point. To what do our people tend. Do they tend to go to the farm, or when they migrate from our country do they go to some other country where they can secure farms ? Do they go to work at the fisherman's nets ? No, Mr. Speaker, we find that the people of our country, in common with the people of the most enlightened and model countries in the world, go to the towns, to create great centres and great hives of industries, and in that way to do their part in elevating and building up and strengthening our country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having as I have, that sentimental feeling and kindly consideration for the farmer, the fisherman and the miner—and thereby taking the line that seems to be marked out for himself by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) that nothing whatever must be done to interfere with the freedom of trade—even if I were disposed to accept that course with these ample reservations which the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) has adopted in his own case, and which would allow me to support a government which imposes a tariff which in some cases exceeds 75 per cent, and in other cases maintains a tariff very well up to the protective standpoint, I would still not feel disposed to fall in with that view. I would believe it to be more in the interest of the country that we as public men should not allow ourselves to be influenced by such views unless a careful consideration of all the circumstances, and all the facts and figures that could be brought to bear, would confirm our judgments, and support that sentiment by arguments of such a solid character that we could not get away from them.

Now, I cannot help thinking that the hon. member for North Norfolk has made an enormously strong case. He has shown conclusively that the United States, while not solicitous for the welfare of its neighbours, but exceedingly able in conducting its own affairs, has prospered beyond our prosperity in a manner almost surprising. He has made out a case so strong that at the first blush I would be inclined to think we should all give the most favourable consideration to his arguments, and inquire whether we could not at once adopt a system of reciprocity of tariffs which we could apply to any country which would not give us reciprocity of free trade.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the hon. member for North Norfolk, which we were discussing at 6 o'clock, calls practically for a measure of reciprocity—reciprocity in the direction of a very liberal measure of free trade between Canada and the United States. From my understanding of the speech made by the hon. member, his first alternative seemed to be, if it were available, that the United States should lower its tariff and show the same liberality in dealing with the products of this country that we have shown in dealing with theirs. At the same time, it was impossible to avoid the impression that from his knowledge of our relations with the United States, and

his experience and the experience of the government in dealing with that country, he had not very much hope of seeing any great lowering of its duties. Practically, then, such a resolution, if it were to take the form of a measure to be adopted by a government and put into operation, would carry us entirely and irrevocably, if logically followed out, in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs. Of course, it could not for a moment be supposed that this parliament or any member of it would adopt a policy aimed particularly at any country without some good reason ; and yet one noticeable fact in the speech of the hon. member was that it dealt almost exclusively with our relations with one particular country, that is, the United States. The fact first cited by the hon. member, the foundation fact as it were, was a contrast which he drew between this country and the United States exhibited by the census in regard to the growth of population. Not taking into account for the moment any other facts revealed by the census, he showed that Canada has made very trifling gains—only 10½ per cent in the last twelve years, 12 per cent in the preceding, and only 47 per cent in the whole period since confederation—whereas the United States in a similar period, and at a time when there was not the same great activity in business that there is to-day, had made an increase in population three times as great.

There is one noticeable distinction between the policies of the two countries. The United States, with one or two reversions to a comparatively free trade system, has been a protectionist country we may say throughout, whereas Canada has not, in my opinion, been a protectionist country in the full sense of the word. It is certainly not a highly protectionist country. In the old days of the provincial governments, we had duties that were revenue duties solely, and these were placed at such a low point that they afforded no protection whatever. The province of Nova Scotia not long ago had a tariff of ony 10 per cent. While the upper provinces went a good deal beyond that, still we have not had in Canada, either before or since confederation, a really high and effective protective tariff at any time. Now, contrasting the two countries, we have equal natural resources, quite as healthful a climate, and people not at all inferior, and it does not seem unnatural to argue that the marked difference of growth in them is due to the wide difference in their tariff policies. We have had, it is true, since 1879, a certain amount of protection. We have been supposed to have a protective system, but it has not been a high protective system. It has not gone the length of the United States system, either in setting up the duties in the first place or in maintaining them at a high and efficient point afterwards. There are only two exceptions to this remark in our tariff system. We have had adequate protection given to the coal oil industry, and a fair measure of protection to our iron and steel industries in the form of government bounties. What is the result ? While in some other lines Canada may not be holding her own in the struggle for mastery, in these particular industries we find Canada achieving a great and splendid success ; and if that system is maintained without weakening, these industries will be not only established, but will go on and develop their strength to a point at which they will be able to enter into competition and hold their own in the markets of the world with the people of the United States or any other people.

Taking into consideration the fact that we have, on the whole not, afforded protection to our manufactured industries as compared with the United States, and have therefore not made a proportionate advance, and considering on the other hand the instance cited of the iron and steel industry, which has been afforded more generous protection and achieved more gratifying success, it strikes me that a good prima facie case has been made out to justify our revising our policy and entering upon a genuine, earnest system of protection. To any one who has followed the tariff discussions and changes in Canada, it must be evident that even when the principle of protection was adopted by the Canadian government, a very strong influence was exercised by public men, who were sympathetic with free trade and who impressed with great force the interests of the consumer on the attention of parliament. The result followed that even while adopting the principle, only a so-called system of protection was adopted, which did not prove itself efficient and which therefore prevented the development that would have followed the adoption of an effective system. The force of circumstances is compelling us to reconsider our position. A certain condition of affairs is revealed to us. We know that we enjoy natural advantages unsurpassed elsewhere, and yet we have made a noticeable failure to make such increase in our population, wealth and development as might have been expected from our circumstances and the character of our people. We are therefore confronted with a condition of things which compels us to seek its causes, and if we should fail, as we are almost certain to do, in inducing the United States government to reduce its tariff and make it as favourable to our natural products as ours is to them, we will be compelled, by the sheer force of reason and necessity, to adopt the other alternative suggested by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). We will be compelled, if we cannot obtain reciprocity or a reduction of tariff, to adopt, not only against the United States, but against the whole

world—with the sole exception of the mother country which has treated us with every liberality—a policy of protection similar to that under which our American neighbours have achieved such great success.

No doubt the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) will be pressed with great force, not only in this House but outside, especially in the agricultural sections of the country. No doubt people will be told that the consumer pays too much for protection. Well, if we are driven into that discussion again, we will be merely going back to the old controversy, and we will have to prevail upon the consumer to submit to some sacrifice—temporary and not at all serious—as may be necessary in order to give him those advantages that unquestionably flow from great manufacturing industries, such as a large increase in population and consequently magnificent home markets for the farmer, the fisherman, the miner, and every man who is drawing on natures bounty and passing it into consumption. But that question has been threshed out already. It is not possible that the Canadian people could ever have consented to the measure of protection they did adopt unless they were convinced that it would give them some compensation, and the time I believe is within measurable distance when this whole question of developing home industries, and thus increasing our population and creating a home market for our natural products, will force itself upon the attention of the government. It is possible that a government may continue in power which will be half-hearted in this matter—which will give a certain measure of protection—which will pose both as a friend of the manufacturer and of the farmer, but it is not likely that such a state of affairs can long continue, and I have no doubt the time is near at hand when the administration will have to come to a decision and shape its course definitely, either as one of decided protection or free trade. Free traders we cannot expect or hope to be, and therefore it strikes me that the only alternative before us is one leading to a system of protection, which shall be really effective and not merely nominal—one which will give to our manufacturers and capitalists the assurance that their investments of energies and labour and money will rest on a solid and durable foundation. It is therefore of the highest importance that every view on this matter should be expressed—the view both of the man who is in favour of protection and of the man who is opposed to it. There are innumerable instances which may be cited, and special circumstances that may be urged, which we cannot expect to meet in speeches made in general terms. There are special circumstances that modify and affect almost every industry. There are some things we can do better in Canada than elsewhere, and others which it would not be advisable for us to undertake. But a full and thorough discussion of the subject, embracing almost all the various industries of the country and the circumstances which affect each, will bring us no doubt a remedy to our present condition, which is that of stagnation. It will then be incumbent on those gentlemen who do not agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who do not believe in the remedy which he suggests and the reasons in favour of which he gives with great force and power—it will then be the duty of these gentlemen to suggest some alternative measure by which some relief can be brought to this country. We have not done what we should have, and we are doing now still less than we did in the immediate past. Our population, instead of increasing more rapidly, is increasing less rapidly. The exodus is not a thing of the past, but is going on now as it went on before. Our people are leaving the country and going to the neighbouring republic where, owing to protection—owing to their efficient protective system—their young men and women find an ample field for the exercise of their energy and their ability which is lacking in this country. We can unquestionably in Canada, in a comparatively short time, establish some industries on such a footing as to make them perfectly safe. We have already established the iron and steel industry upon a perfectly safe foundation, and there is at least one other great industry which can be established and built up in Canada.

For some things, we have peculiar advantages. I cannot hesitate for a moment to believe that a similar system of protection, not as great in amount perhaps, but given with the same freedom with the same liberality and heartiness, that established our iron and steel industry, would, in a short time, establish an enormous pulp industry that would make Canada not only the great producer of pulp, but the manufacturer for the whole world of those classes of paper which are to-day so extensively consumed. We cannot do these things without making sacrifices, without drawing on our resources, without taxing ourselves. There is another direction in which the government will be bound to give protection in some form, either by bounties or by subvention; and that is in the direction of restoring Canada to the position which she at one time held of being pre-eminently a maritime country, a country with an enormous marine in proportion to her population. In that respect we have fallen behind. We cannot hope, in the face of the competition of countries where the governments are liberal, where they realize the importance of having control of the high seas and of the commerce of the world, to recover our place in the handling of that great world-wide business which has poured

its wealth into one country after another and has given every country that has for a time held supremacy in it a leading place among the nations of the world—we cannot hope to have maritime supremacy restored to our country, unless the government rises above too small, too close, consideration of petty matters, and demands from its party, support in establishing a broad system by which the country will pledge its wealth and resources to the great national duty of pressing Canada forward into its true position as a manufacturing, commercial and maritime country. I do not propose to speak at greater length at this time, because I feel sure that many special cases will arise to which careful attention should be given, and further opportunity for discussion will be afforded as these subjects are considered. It is true that there are some things that cannot be effected by government aid and action; it is equally true that there are some things that cannot be effected without government aid and action. And I believe that careful examination of the questions that rise under the resolution placed in your hands by the hon. member for North Norfolk will lead to a comprehensive view of our situation and will indicate the line that the government should take and that it will be warranted in calling upon its followers to support it in taking.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It has been a matter of curiosity for me during the last few hours to see what course the government would take upon this question. I made up my mind, from the start, that they had sent up this balloon to see which way the wind blew ; they wished to keep silent on the question itself so that they may not be committed before the country. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is listening to me, and I have no doubt that I have been sufficient of a mind-reader to express what is passing in his mind. I have been much interested in the figures given by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Looking over those figures we can come to but one conclusion, and that is that our country is not in a healthy condition with regard to its trade. We have heard it said many times, and the representatives of the Crown was caused to say it in the Speech from the Throne, that our country is in a thriving condition, that the people are prosperous and happy. But, if the conditions exist which the hon. member for North Norfolk has shown by the figures he has given, it is not possible for the country to be in as favourable position as we would desire. The hon. member for North Norfolk, last summer, was sent to the United States, if not on the advice of the government or the premier, at least with the premier's approval, to make a missionary tour of that country, either to convince the Americans of the truth of the views he laid before them or to ascertain what their feelings were with regard to this question of trade or reciprocity. When I saw the announcement of the hon. gentleman's meetings, I said that it seemed to me that it was belittling the country from which he went. I thought that if the government did its duty, it would call him home and say to him that our highest duty would be to assemble the representatives of the people in parliament and have them pass such legislation as the interests of the country required, quite regardless of what other countries did against us—saying nothing about retaliation, not going upon a begging expedition to a foreign country, not going upon our bended knees to any other country to implore them to change their tariff because if they did not it would bring us to ruin. Such a course seems to me unworthy of a great nation like Canada, and it seems to me belittling to Canada that any prominent supporter of the government should be found going through the United States with such a wail. The hon. gentleman went to Detroit, Chicago, New York, Boston, Washington, and some other places I do not recall at the moment. But he came home without having brought about any beneficial results so far as we know, and, I think so far as he himself knows. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that, so far as I can judge the sentiment of the Canadian people, that sentiment entirely disapproves of his course. We should legislate for the benefit of Canada, and let the United States legislate according to their own sweet will. We need not talk about retaliation or about what we can do to drive eighty millions of people to take the course we want them to take. We should take the means which seems to us most liable to promote the best interests of our country and say no more about it. The hon. gentleman's speech will be an interesting disclosure to the Canadian people, one that they did not expect, especially in view of the speeches that have been made, not only by the ministers of the Crown, but by prominent members of the Reform party throughout the country during the past few years. The country has been told that the policy of the present government was a wise one—that it raised revenue, that it kept Canada for the Canadians, that it did something for the mother country, and developed our trade with that country, and, in every respect was an advantageous one. And the result of this policy was, we are told, that there was nothing but prosperity and happiness in this country. But to-day the hon. gentleman tells us that the condition of affairs in Canada is a very unfavourable one. He said that, last year, we sold about $42,000,000 worth of goods to the United States, leaving out gold and the goods of other countries that only passed through Canada. But we took back $119,000,000 worth from that country. That is, the balance of trade against us with the United States that we must pay

for in gold or something else, is $71,890,000 for one year. That is going on with increasing ratio every year. The balance of trade against us with Germany, after this government had succeeded in getting England to denounce the German treaty, was $4,829,000; the balance of trade against us with France was $3,816,000; the balance of trade against us with Holland was $610,000; the balance of trade against us with Spain was $557,000.

We have been told over and over again that the reduction in the duty on British goods was in favour of the mother country, that we did it in our generosity to favour the mother country, and that we were giving her this advantage which other countries did not enjoy in our market. But the hon. member for North Norfolk tells us that the rate upon dutiable and free goods coming from the United States was only 12·05 per cent, on the total importations from that country, while the goods coming from England, dutiable and free, paid an average rate of 18·2 per cent. Yet we are told that we have been giving England a great reduction in the duty so as to favour her.

Now, the hon. member disclosed what many on this side of the House have always contended, that instead of the tariff change favouring England it was in reality a discrimination against England. We said years ago when that duty was put on that such would be the result, and facts have verified our contention. What we contended years ago is amply justified by the speech which has been made to this House this afternoon. Take the dutiable and free goods from England and what do we find? That the duty on them is 18·2 per cent, while on the dutiable and free goods from the United States it is 12·02 per cent. We have often heard it said that the bulk of our free goods come from the United States, and if we take the rate of duty on the dutiable and free goods from the United States, it is unfair to take the rate on dutiable goods from England, and we are told that 33⅓ per cent of the duty as against other countries is thrown off in favour of England. But the average on dutiable goods from England last year was 24·83 per cent, while on the dutiable goods from the United States it was 24·87 per cent. Is it not as plain as anything can be that instead of the duty being in favour of England it discriminates against England? Or in other words, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister of Finance told the British people that in our generosity towards the mother country we had thrown off 33⅓ per cent, we still are charging a higher duty upon the goods coming from England than upon the goods from the United States. I think he will be loath to admit that. But if he is not inclined to do so, let him establish beyond any question that the figures given by the hon. member for North Norfolk are incorrect.

Mr. SPROULE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). My hon. friend is proving there is no reduction. Then how can this preference do all the harm we hear about if it does not exist?

Mr. SPROULE. I am proving that the contention of the Conservative party all along was that there was no substantial preference given to England, and the trade figures now prove it beyond question. If these figures be correct, and I assume that they are, Canada has paid a higher rate of duty upon free and dutiable British goods, than upon free and dutiable goods from the United States. We were told that this was going to do a great deal of good to the people of Canada, but we find now that it has not done a great deal of good. We were told that it was going to improve our trade with other countries, and the balance of trade would turn in our favour; but we find now that the reverse is the case and the balance of trade is against us, and yet we have a government sitting still. We ask them, what are you going to do about it? Will you give us any information, as to what you propose to do to remedy this terrible state of affairs? But not a word from the government benches, they are as silent as the grave upon these questions. They have sent up a balloon to see what is the sentiment of this House, and then they will try to square themselves with the favouring gale. We ask the government, what remedy do you propose for this unfavourable state of affairs to Canada? When told they were making no reforms, the Prime Minister said to the people of Canada a short time ago, in Montreal, the older I grow I am becoming more and more conservative; and I find myself and my colleagues in the happy position that we are reformers without anything to reform. What an acknowledgment to make to the country! Is it possible that the evolutions of time bring us to no new conditions that require reform year after year? If so, this is the only country in the world in that happy condition. But that is the acknowledgment of the present government—they are reformers without anything to reform. They have nothing to reform, though the trade is going against us in our dealings with every country in the world. We are being out-done in every market, and there is no effort being made to remedy that condition of affairs. There is a balance against us everywhere, and the government are allowing it to go on, still drifting—yet they are reformers without anything to reform. Now, we are told that they have done a good deal. If the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) were talking he would tell us how much we had developed our trade with England, and how many agricultural products we have sent there, and what a wonderful thing his cold storage system was

in increasing that trade. I was struck with the figures in a speech made a short time ago by the Hon. Dr. Montague, who spent eight months in Australia, and I wish to quote those figures to put them alongside the figures we have heard in regard to what has been done with the admirable cold storage system given to Canada, so that our people may understand how much they are entitled to appreciate the efforts of the Minister of Agriculture. Dr. Montague said :

> The recent figures published by Waddell & Co,. London, go to show that England imports about 425,000,000 pounds of frozen meat. Of this Australia and New Zealand sent 72,000,000 pounds, while Canada contributes a little over 10,000,000.

And yet Australia and New Zealand, that are over three times the distance from England that Canada is, and with her advantage of cold storage, have been enabled to send to England 72,000,000 pounds of frozen meat last year, while Canada only sent 10,000,000 pounds. Does not that tell a great deal on behalf of Australia, and is it not a wonderfully strong argument against the contention of the Minister of Agriculture that he has done so much for the Canadian farmer in giving him the cold storage which he speaks about so much ? But we find that the United States have sent over 408,000,000 pounds as against Canada's 10,000,000 pounds. So I do not think we have so much to boast of in the success of the present Minister of Agriculture. But in face of these figures and the disclosures that have been made to-day, we are entitled to ask the government what they are going to do about it. Have they got up and told the Canadian people what they are going to do about it ? Not at all. Have they given us any information in the Speech from the Throne ? Not at all. They are silent on that as on many other things. When they came to power a few years ago they were going to do wonderful things. They have been in power six years and have allowed things to drift along. They have accomplished little or nothing. What have they accomplished ? We have no new or better markets for the people. But what advantage have they been to us when the figures show that the balance of trade is against us in every country in the world with whom we are dealing ? Not a single market has been secured for the people of Canada since the present government came to power six years ago that we did not possess before. But they are drifting along—reformers with nothing to reform.

They were going to get a reciprocity treaty which would help to improve trade between Canada and the United States. With their sunny ways and their liberality, and their good fellowship towards the Americans, they were going to accomplish much. But the figures that have been given to-day by the hon. member for North Norfolk show that although our trade with the United States is increasing rapidly every year, the balance of trade is against us, and they have failed to secure either a reciprocity treaty or any other treaty that would be in the least degree favourable to the people of Canada.

They told us that they would settle our disputes with the United States and that we would be able to trade with them on more favourable terms. But, these disclosures prove that they have not done so. What disputes have they settled ? Is it the Alaskan boundary or the Atlantic fisheries or the seal fisheries dispute ? Not a single dispute has been adjusted between us and the United States since they came into power and yet they are sitting there helpless and telling us that they are reformers when they have nothing to reform. They are practically doing nothing. They told the farmer of the great wonders they would do for him. They said that they would help the farmer to get the market of 65,000,000 to the south of us which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said was the most valuable market in the world. They would get that market if the Canadian people would return them to power. Well, the Canadian people took them at their word and have they got any market in the United States ? The government have done nothing for the farmer. The hon. member for North Norfolk has told us that the American manufacturers are rapidly taking control of our markets—not taking control of our markets because they have control of them to-day. They practically control our markets to-day in the manufactured goods of our country. They are driving our own manufacturers out of the market, they are hampering their operations and compelling many Canadians to seek homes in the United States. Are the government making any effort to remedy this unfortunate condition of things ? They have not given us any evidence of a single effort that they have made to remedy this condition. They have not given us efficient cold storage, they have not saved our markets, they have not reduced our taxation. What have they done and what do they propose to do in the future ? They have remained in office and drawn their salaries and they have taken pleasure jaunts all over the country. Half of them are in England almost every summer. They have had a Joint High Commission sitting in Washington. It has been going on for the last three, four, or five years and we cannot even get the papers that should be laid before the House and the country to inform us what offers and proposals they made. They are always held back on the plea that these negotiations are not completed. The right hon. leader of the government said, in Montreal, a few months ago, that he did not expect that there would

be anything more done by this commission. Then, I say, lay the papers on the Table of the House so that parliament will see what efforts are made on behalf of the country by our representatives who are sent to negotiate upon the questions considered by the commission. We have no information at all regarding what has been done and we are practically drifting. The government of to-day are doing very little beyond taking their jaunts through the country, drawing their salaries, having a good time and trying to hold themselves together.

I was very much amused at the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) who endeavoured to answer the hon. member for North Norfolk, especially so when I remember that they are both ardent supporters of the present government, the one an extreme protectionist, the other an extreme free trader, the one as directly opposed to the other as day is to night or light is to darkness, and yet they are both together in supporting the same government. The free trader thinks the principles and policy that he stands by are the best for Canada, and the protectionist thinks the principles and policy which he supports are the best for Canada. Well, I am pleased to agree with the principles promulgated by the hon. member for North Norfolk and I would like to say right here that I was especially pleased with the compliment to the policy carried out by the Conservative party during the eighteen years that they were in office, and if anything more were needed to justify the wise policy they carried out in the interest of Canada beyond what we have heretofore heard and seen we had it this afternoon in the free and frank acknowledgment of the intelligent member for North Norfolk who opposed that policy as strongly as he could for eighteen years and more and who came around to-day and frankly admitted that this is the only policy that is suited to the wants of Canada. It is a justification of the policy so wisely carried out by the Conservative party from 1879 to the time they left office, it is a verification of all the arguments they addressed to the Canadian people and it is an acknowledgment from a source that was scarcely expected. I have often seen these two hon. members sitting beside each other, the hon. member for Russell and the hon. member for North Norfolk, and I have asked myself, how could it be possible that they were held together. I could only explain it upon the theory that there is some electro-magnetic influence at work between them. You know that in electricity there is the peculiarity that likes repel each other and unlikes attract each other. If you put a positive pole to a negative pole they will attract each other and stick themselves together, but if you put two positive poles together they will fly asunder. That is the only explanation I can offer as to why these two hon. gentlemen stand together supporting the government. Likes and unlikes attract each other. I am of the opinion that if other hon. members supporting the government were as frank as these two hon. gentlemen it would be found that they hold quite as divergent views as those expressed by the hon. member for Russell and the hon. member for North Norfolk. I am not so much concerned with the divergence between the opinions held by the hon. gentlemen as I am to know what the government are going to do with this proposal. I know if they would speak as freely as the hon. member for North Norfolk what some of them would say. I am sure that if the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) would get up, if he wished to save time, he would say, like the old Quaker 'Them are my sentiments'. I believe he is right and I commend him for it. Notwithstanding that he has gone over there, a protectionist of the protectionists and stands by the free traders, he imbibed his old doctrine too early in life to ever be relieved of it despite the fact that he occupies a place amongst those who hold a doctrine the very reverse of his. I commend him for his courage and intelligence and the Canadian people regard him as being a better statesman in that line especially than many of his colleagues. I believe though that he is bringing them over to his way of thinking. It is sometimes said that he is master of the cabinet. I think he will prove himself so, because, if I judge by the signs of the times in political life, it seems to me they are drifting over there very rapidly and I would not be surprised to see the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), notwithstanding all that he has said against protection, or the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who sits beside him and who is one of the strongest free traders in Canada, getting up and propounding a radical protective policy in the interests of Canada, saying that the interests of Canada required it to-day and that they were prepared to give it and stand by it. I know that the country would give these hon. gentlemen credit for doing what is right though it might not be in accord with their previous history. I think it is a humiliating position for us and for this government that we have not a single word from any member of the government disclosing to the House whether they approve or disapprove of the principle involved in the resolution which the hon. member for North Norfolk submitted to the House this afternoon. I hope that before this debate closes, the Minister of Finance or some prominent member of the government will give his views upon this question. In justice to the country, and to the House, and to the government itself, it is incumbent that this should be done. The government seem inclined to let this question pass without comment. They have got beyond the line of Torres Vedras on

this question, as the prime minister has on other questions, and unless the over sanguine Minister of Public Works gets on his feet to speak out his mind plainly, we may not have the pleasure of knowing what the government think on this question. If the government fail to give its views on this matter they will fail in their duty to the people.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances in which I am placed, I do not think it is wise for me to permit this debate to close without saying a few words in connection with the resolution presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton). I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Sproule) in an address that would be suitable on the hustings, but which is hardly quite germane to the question we are now discussing. It is only necessary to allude to one or two statements he has made to show how inaccurate are his conclusions. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) tells us at this date that our trade is in an unhealthy and unhappy condition he manifests an ignorance on the trade question that is surprising to me. He could easily have seen from the returns of the deposits of the people in the banks, that the wealth of the people has doubled within the past five years, while the foreign trade of the country has likewise doubled during the same period. With our revenue buoyant, with our coffers overflowing, to tell us that the trade of the country is unhealthy and that the people are unhappy is something that one would not expect to find believed by even the most credulous member of this House.

I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) when he says that it is the duty of Canadians to make their tariff in their own interests. I go with him hand and hand in that statement. While the United States in the exercise of their rights have raised a prohibitory tariff not only against Canada but against the people of the world, they have simply done what they had the right to do. They did what they believed to be in the interest of their own people, and having done that the only right we have left is to follow in their footsteps if it is in the interest of the Canadian people to do so. I take exception to the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) when he said that the preference given to Great Britain is an injury to the people of the British empire and to Great Britain herself. It hardly needs the intelligence of a school boy ten years old to appreciate the fact that 33⅓ per cent preference in favour of British goods cannot be injurious to the British manufacturer. It is against all reason, it is against the dictates of common sense that it could be so. Indeed, such a statement does not require an answer. Neither is it fair for the hon. gentleman to say that our tariff is hostile to Great Britain, because the rate of duty on British products is higher than upon American products. That argument can be easily answered by saying that we do not import from Great Britain free goods to the extent we do from the United States. We import from the United States nearly $60,000,000 worth of free goods, and it necessarily follows that the tariff based upon the entire imports from the United States must be lower on the average than the tariff on goods coming from Great Britain, which practically sends us nothing but manufactured articles.

Mr. SPROULE. But it is higher on the manufactured articles.

Mr. HEYD. No. In order to get the facts as to the tariff on the manufactured articles you have to compare the articles on which the duties are levied. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will see at once that the very high average duty on British goods is influenced by the fact that all manufactured goods are not subject to the preferential tariff, and that on $5,000,000 worth of spirits, tobaccos, and other goods which are exempt from the preferential tariff, a duty of nearly 50 per cent is collected. Therefore, in striking a grand average rate that factor must not be eliminated. But, take it article for article on every article with reference to which the preferential tariff operates, and you will find that the preference is in favour of Great Britain. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not the American competition now that has given rise to the trouble in this country. It is this very preference that is precipitating this discussion, and bringing once more this tariff question before the attention of the House and before the country. It is not the competition from the United States that induces the manufacturers' associations to meet together. It is the trouble the woollen manufactures are experiencing in this country because of the preferential condition that exists, that is accentuating their troubles and precipitating the tariff question upon the people once more. It is hardly worth while to waste any more time over the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule). However, as I partially agree with my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—though I do not go to the extent he goes—I want to say a few words in connection with this resolution. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has been for so many years engaged in bringing about more amicable relations between the people of Canada and the United States, and has put forth more effort in that direction than almost any other man in Canada, certainly more than any man in this House; that he, not having been successful in the work he had at heart, like a bow relaxed has gone to the other extreme and from being what, we might almost call a free trader in days gone by, he has now become one of the most ardent protectionists there is in this House. But the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) is not a protectionist for the same

motive that makes other men protectionists. He is a protectionist to-night because through the medium of protection he wants to bring about reciprocal trade relations. He does not believe that extending the hand of friendship across the border will bring about the conditions he has at heart, but he believes that by protection he may bring about conditions that we cannot obtain by any other method. His position is entirely different from that occupied by protectionists on the other side of the House who are protectionists purely and simply because of the benefits of protection to the manufacturers.

I am sorry that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) introduces his resolution just at this juncture. When a country is particularly prosperous it is not the time to bring about violent changes. I myself am in favour of changes in the direction of assisting the manufacturing industries that are established in this country. Although I am not a high protectionist, I am not one of those who believe that Canada should not remain for ever only a farming country. It is all right to have agriculturists in our midst, but there is a time in the history of a country when it should strive to develop all the resources that are placed within its control. That we should go on for ever raising wheat and corn, and cattle, is not the height of my ambition and I am a loyal Canadian

But, Sir, while that is the fact, I am prepared to go only so far as will be in the interest of the people of this country. I am not willing, through the resolution which the hon. gentleman has placed before us to-night, to make changes so vast and so violent that the National Policy, which we had in this country for so many years, will bear no comparison with them. He did not explain to us what the full effect of his resolution was. He did not tell us how high, in his opinion, it was necessary to raise the tariff in order to enable us to take 40 per cent off, and still do no injury to the manufacturing establishments of this country. He did not tell us how we who have been prating about what we have done for Great Britain, would be able to reconcile the statement that we have given her a preference in our markets of 33⅓ per cent with a proposal to take it away again as soon as it pinches. I am in favour of increasing the protection of the woollen industry of this country. I believe in a system that will protect industries that are not alien, but are indigenous to the soil. I am one of those protectionists who say you cannot protect the natural industries of this country too highly. From the iron ore which comes from the mine to the steel spring in a watch, through all the various stages of the iron industry I am a high protectionist. I am not a protectionist with regard to any industry which requires for its success the importation of its raw materials, especially when those materials bear a large proportion to the cost of manufacture. Such an industry, whatever it may be, will always remain a spoon-fed industry, maintained at the expense of the great mass of the consumers. But an industry that is indigenous to the country, and requires for its development only the intelligence, the industry, and the skill of Canadian workmen, I am willing to protect even to the extent of extreme protection. Therefore, holding the views I do, there are some objections to my hon. friend's discourse that appeal to me. The high protectionist notions which he has expressed to-night as applicable to industries that are alien and not indigenous to this country, industries which would never thrive here, do not appeal to my reason, although my antagonism to the United States makes it less hard to swallow them than would have been the case four or five years ago. The mode of operation which my hon. friend proposes is retaliation, which is a very poor mode for securing the object we have at heart. If he supposes for one moment that the people of the United States can be driven to give the people of Canada access to their markets in natural products without expecting anything in return, he mistakes the intelligence of the American people. They have never manifested a disposition to give something for nothing, and they are not going to do it to-day. One of the things I most decidedly object to at the present stage of the proceedings is any kind of reciprocity with the people of the United States. I believe the time has come when Canada may well realize that it has such a future before it that we need not enter into any entangling alliances either with the empire as a whole or with the United States. I as a Canadian want to leave my hands untied, and to be free to take advantage of the bounties which a kind Providence has placed within our reach, to develop our resources to the very best of our ability, and do the best we can for the people of Canada; and I do not think it is necessary to conciliate either the people of the United States or those of any other nation under the sun.

Holding these views, I am not in sympathy with the conditions as they exist to-day. But the resolution which was brought before us gives us the opportunity to express our opinions upon those conditions. It may be said that men such as I have changed our views. True, I do not claim to be so wise or to be so much of a prophet as to see changes in the distant future; and even in 1893, when I endorsed the platform of the Liberal party adopted at the convention in Ottawa, who could have anticipated the changes which have taken place? Great Britain, which was once the most conspicuous figure in the manufacturing world, has assumed an entirely different relative position in comparison with the rest of the world. She no longer reigns supreme in the manufacturing heaven, but, according to the statements of even some gentle-

men in this House, she has been compelled to take a second place to the United States. Germany also looms up on the horizon; and who ten years ago could have foreseen the position that Canada itself would occupy? Who dreamed of the resources that have been lying undiscovered and unused in the bowels of the earth? Who could realize that an industrial development would take place in Canada within ten years such as we see down by the Atlantic coast, at the Soo, and away out on the Pacific coast? All these things were in the future, and I am not so ignorant nor so persistent in my beliefs that I am not prepared to change them when a change in the conditions makes a change in my beliefs necessary. I believed then that it was in the interest of the country to adopt that clause in the policy of the Liberal party. I believe still that it is in the interest of the country to adhere to it as closely as possible, and not to depart from it simply from protection's sake. But when cases present themselves that require special treatment, I do not think we should adopt a cast-iron rule and refuse consideration to industries that are suffering unfair competition for the want of that relief which in other circumstances they might not require. The views I entertain are entertained by the Board of Trade of the city of Brantford. Hon. gentlemen know that Brantford is a manufacturing city, an industrial city. It is the third largest exporter of manufactured products among the cities of Canada; and yet what is the opinion of the Brantford Board of Trade, seven-tenths of whom I presume are Liberals, loyal adherents of the present government? That body passed a resolution not so extreme as that proposed by my hon. friend, who has not a five-cent piece of interest in any manufacturing concern in this country, unless it be in a lumber mill; but these men of Brantford, who own the great industrial establishments of this country, whose names are known from one end of the country to the other, simply say:

> That, in view of the present conditions of trade and the expansion of Canadian industries, it is highly desirable that the government revise the present tariff with a view to the preservation of our markets against unfair competition, thus assisting to maintain and increase our present industries and to establish new ones.

Now, what is meant by unfair competition? That is one of the phrases that must be explained. It appears to each man according to his humour. Some men may consider a legitimate competition unfair. I do not; but I do say that where prices are maintained by a combination in the United States, which sells goods in Canada at lower prices than they receive for the same goods in the United States, that is an unfair competition, and should be put down by an increase in the tariff in the particular line affected. In order to show what I mean, I will give you a specimen case which took place in my own city. In 1898 the first cutlery establishment that has been established in Canada, began its career in the city of Brantford.

They began, knowing full well the conditions under which they were starting their industry. They knew that the duty upon cutlery was 30 per cent. They figured out the cost of raw material and labour, and decided that they could make money upon the prices which the American, English and German manufacturers were receiving, and they put $75,000 capital into the industry, and are to-day making the various branches of cutlery and selling them in the Canadian market. They have secured some of the largest wholesale dealers to handle their goods. But what is the result? Let me just take the article of shears, as an example of the way in which business is done. In 1898 a certain brand of shears was selling at $4.80 per dozen in the American market. The same quality of shears was sold in England at $4.80, and adding the Canadian duty of 30 per cent, made the price to the wholesale dealer in Canada $6.24 per dozen. That was the competition which the home industry anticipated it would have to meet. But what are the conditions to-day? After it was established, although the price in the United States has not varied up to the present time, and although the same shears are selling in England at the same old price of $4.80, when the American travellers came into Canada and found that the Canadian wholesalers were tied down to this Canadian concern—first because its goods are equally good, second because it is a Canadian institution, and third because it sold cheaper—what did they do? They reduced the price of shears in the Canadian market to $2.88, so that the shears which, four years ago, were selling in Canada at $6.24, are now selling at $3.74. I call that unfair. The Americans have a protective tariff which prevents us, under any circumstances, from selling a single razor or knife or pair of shears in the United States, but they can take their goods, which they sell at $4.84 in their own market, and sell them in Canada at $2.88. Of course that would not continue once the Canadian industry was out of the way. The Canadian consumer will no doubt ask why should I be deprived of the benefit of cheap American cutlery? But this benefit is only temporary, and these low prices will only last until the Canadian industry is destroyed, when the price will be raised again. That case is not an unusual one.

We have a similar condition of things in the pottery at Brantford. A few years ago, for the lack of baking capacity, this company was compelled to make arrangements with an American pottery, and it was given a remarkably low price on American goods. The Canadian company consequently did not build an oven, but at the

end of the year, when it wanted to make a new contract, the American establishment raised its prices. Then as soon as the Canadian manufacturers built themselves a second oven, immediately the Americans dropped the price of their earthenware, and again our home industry had to compete against low priced American articles which were selling much higher in the American market.

It is this discrimination and these inequalities which give rise to a great deal of the trouble. If we can succeed in preventing the slaughtering of American goods in the Canadian market and give our woollen manufacturers some measure of relief, which I think they are entitled to, we would do a great deal towards stifling the cry for retaliation, which we hear so often raised, but which is a policy we should never resort to except in the most extreme cases.

It may be that this is an inopportune time for our government to revise the tariff. There will shortly be a meeting of the representatives of the various colonies in London, England, and at that meeting there may be devised some scheme of colonial and Imperial trade that may inure to the interests of this country. And on the eve of a great gathering of this nature, it may be premature and inopportune for the government to declare what they intend to do in the matter of tariff changes. It seems to me that the demand of our hon. friends opposite on the government to express its views in an academic discussion of this kind, when capitalists, who have invested millions of dollars in manufactures, are waiting to hear what possible tariff changes are in the minds of the government, is rather an unreasonable one; and while I go with my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) a certain way, I am not prepared to go so far as he advocates. But any action the government may take for the purpose of removing this unjust competition to which our manufacturers are subject, and anything that we may do to relieve what is apparently the injustice, under which our woollen manufacturers are suffering, I will most heartily support them in doing. We may have gone a shade too far in our Imperial preference. With our first 25 per cent reduction we got all the sentimental advantages that we now get under the 33⅓ per cent, and we have subjected our woollen manufactures to that extra 8 per cent preference against them. I urge with considerable confidence that something should be done, and I am satisfied it will be done. I am satisfied that the men who introduced a tariff in 1897 which, notwithstanding what our friends opposite may say, was immediately followed by a prosperity such as this country never saw before, are themselves capable of solving the vexed question which now presents itself for solution.

Mr. HEYD.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). The House will pardon me for citing a quotation from scripture, for the special edification of my Highland friend from Cape Breton—though not so much for his spiritual edification as his political illumination.

And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest.

And desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem.

And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus; and suddenly there shined round him a light from Heaven :

And he fell to the earth and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me ?

And he said, Who art thou, Lord ? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest ; it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.

* * * * *

And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man.

* * * * *

And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink.

* * * * *

Then Ananias answered, Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem :

And here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name.

But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings and the children of Israel :

* * * * *

And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized.

And when he had received meat, he was strengthened. Then was Saul certain days with the disciples which were at Damascus.

* * * * *

But all that heard him were amazed, and said : Is not this he that destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem, and came hither for that intent, that he might bring them bound unto the chief priests ?

* * * * *

And after that many days were fulfilled, the Jews took counsel to kill him :

But their laying await was known of Saul. And they watched the gates day and night to kill him.

Then the disciples took him by night and let him down by the wall in a basket.

Mr. Speaker, if this falling of the scales from the eyes happened to John of Norfolk, if it happened to Saul of Tarsus, when may we expect it to happen to Richard of Oxford? It may happen at any day. And then even William of York will find it hard to kick against the pricks. After the conversion announced here this afternoon, after the falling of the scales from the eyes that we have seen, we may hope for anything. I congratulate the hon. member for North Norfolk upon his conversion, and I congratulate him no less upon the manliness with which he has admitted that conversion and has advo-

cated the couse of protection for Canada. This conversion may run through the whole government, and, before six months have passed, we may have even the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) making the same statement of conversion as we have heard here this afternoon.

I desire to say but a word about one or two things said by the hon. member for North Norfolk, and also by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), with regard to the exchange of natural products between this country and the United States. The hon. member for North Norfolk said that we could afford to have an exchange with the United States in this respect. I deny that in toto. There is an advantage which the United States enjoys over Canada which invalidates the hon. gentleman's argument, and that is the geographical, or rather the climatic advantage. If we allow the natural products of the United States to come into Canada free, the effect will be to ruin a great many Canadians, such as our gardeners, the people who raise small fruits, and, to a large extent, the people engaged in the poultry business. As a matter of fact, we have had the gardeners of Montreal and the gardeners of Toronto—and they represent an immense industry—protesting against that very thing. I am strongly against the doctrine of free exchange in natural products. Another thing that was said by both these hon. gentlemen was that if free trade was a good thing as amongst the forty-two states that make up the union, it would be a good thing for Canada and the United States, these being contiguous countries. True it is that free trade has made a great success amongst the forty-two states of the union. But that was because of their community of interest. As between us and the United States, there is a diversity of nationhood, and this principle of community of interest does not apply. The whole argument of the hon. gentlemen, then, falls to the ground. The very fact that these countries are contiguous, and yet have a divergence of nationhood, dictates a wholly different policy, even a policy of retaliation if such becomes necessary. These hon. gentlemen may talk about the beauties of free trade as exemplified amongst the states of the union, but what is that compared to the great fact that the United States has vindicated the principle of protection as it has never been vindicated before? Because it has adopted that principle the United States is to-day the greatest country in the world. It is to-day raiding the markets of free trade England, raiding the markets of Canada, raiding the markets of the world. This is not, as is sometimes said, because the United States is a country of great resources—we are a country of great resources and would be in the same position if that were all that was required—but because of her fixed and determined policy to build up her own industries, to create work for her own workpeople, to keep her own markets for her own products, and, for these purposes to adopt a high protective tariff. This is the cause and nothing else. Great Britain to-day has failed in the eyes of the world, because she has allowed protective nations like the United States, like France, like Germany, to raid her markets. Free trade has not vindicated itself, but protection has vindicated itself in the United States, and in every country where it has been adopted as a determined policy. The hon. member for Russell talked a great deal about free trade, but did not bring forward a single argument. He had to admit that this country had gone back, he had to admit the great success of the United States. These two things of themselves are enough to prove that Canada, if she would hold her own, must adopt the principle of protection to the hilt—not quarter protection, such as we have to-day, not half-way protection such as we have to-day, but sufficient and adequate protection to keep our own work for our own work-people, and our own markets for our own products. If we may infer anything from the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk, we may infer that he is a protectionist, that he can only for a very few more weeks continue to support hon. gentlemen opposite, unless they take up the principle of protection and carry it on as he has advocated.

I want to tell the Prime Minister and his government that this country has no future, if we allow the present state of things to continue. There is an invasion, as he called it the other night, and as I call it—an invasion of the manufacturers and workmen of the United States to possess this country. And they are possessing it, according to the evidence that Liberals themselves advanced here this afternoon. There is an invasion of American capital into this country that is taking possession of the railways and other great institutions of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they welcome this invasion. But if it continues, if the American manufacturers continue to raid our markets, if American capitalists continue to get possession of our great railway and other corporations, the day is coming when our hope of a separate and independent nationality on this continent must look very black indeed. I have very poor hope of this country if we do not soon do something on the line of the policy advocated here this afternoon by the hon. member for North Norfolk.

The people of the United States are a wise people. They have made their tariff to suit themselves, and no supplication on our part will induce them to change it. I never was—thank God for it—a suppliant to the people of the United States. The right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads this House, has told us that hereafter there are to be no more missions to Washington. Even that indicates progress.

Let there be an end to this supplication of Washington, and, in a way, let there be an end of all threatening of retaliation. On the other hand, let there be a determination on our part to do for our country what the people of the United States have done for theirs. Let that be our ground of action. The people of the United States will pay no attention to either threats or supplications from us. They are too big a people—too great a people We cannot bring them to time, but we can do something for ourselves. Don't let us go any more to Washington. Let us do something for ourselves, let us show we are equal to the occasion; let us do something on the lines laid down by the hon. member for North Norfolk this afternoon, on the lines laid down by the member for Brant (Mr. Heyd). He was only telling half of what he was told by his own people. The people of Brantford are out and out protectionists, and the people of Ontario, and the manufacturers from one end to the other of the province, and the farmers of Canada are for protection. The farmers of Canada know one thing very well, and that is that wherever there is a great home market, wherever there are prosperous manufacturers, wherever there is a great manufacturing centre, wherever there is a great number of workingmen, there is a splendid home market. You can always get the farmers to support a national policy if it is on good lines. I trust that after the confession that has been made here this afternoon by these two hon. gentlemen, and the statements that have been made throughout the country, and the new principles advocated by the Liberal press throughout the country, that we will have some kind of effort made by the government to move on the lines indicated by the member for North Norfolk.

Now, the Prime Minister dealing with this very question not long ago said: We are a people who wish to buy and who wish to sell; the Americans are a people who do not wish to buy but who wish to sell. Now accepting that definition, I would ask him what is he going to do about it? If they insist on their policy of selling to us and not buying from us, what does he propose to do about it? Are they to continue to raid our markets? I say no. Let us treat them as they treat us. No, I won't use that term, I will say, let us follow their example, and perhaps if we follow their example they will be ready to buy from us as well as sell to us.

Now, what should be the policy of Canada?—we won't call it protection. What should be the policy of the empire?—we won't call it protection. But what is the lesson of this debate? What is it that is coming home to Canadians? What is the thing coming home to Englishmen all over? It is this: If not free trade, then fair play. Fair trade is the word, fair trade is the sign, and in that sign the empire can conquer, and will revive. I will put it in another way, reciprocal trade, or preferential trade between the various members of the empire, and fair trade to all outside the empire. I think that policy was very nearly suggested this afternoon by the hon. member for North Norfolk. I prefer to call it fair trade to retaliation. I have spoken a good deal in favour of what I called a retaliatory tariff. Perhaps another better term is reciprocity of treatment. But the thing for this country, the thing for the empire, is preferential trade within the empire and reciprocity of treatment to all outside of it.

The hon. gentleman who just sat down said that he did not want to interfere with the great conference that was to take place this summer in London. Now, that conference is to take place, and it is well there should be frequent discussions in this House on the subjects likely to come up there. Now the lesson that is coming home to us, and the lesson I am trying to convey to the government is this, that we have two problems to settle, and we must settle them now before that conference takes place. I wish to impress it upon the leader of the government, and upon the keeper of his political conscience so far as the tariff is concerned, the Minister of Finance, that there are two things to do. We have to do something in regard to our attitude towards the United States, and we have to do something in regard to our attitude to the mother country. And we must do it this summer, and we must state clearly and explicity what we intend to do. We must take up the gauntlet that has been thrown down to us this afternoon by the member for North Norfolk. We must say what we intend hereafter to do toward the people of the United States, and we must say what we intend to do toward the people of England in regard to trade between the mother land and Canada. We ought to lead in this matter as I believe we are competent to lead. As I said in Toronto the other night at a public meeting, and it seemed to meet with a good deal of approval, we Canadians as a portion of the empire, have the clearer vision in regard to the trade future of the empire. We vindicated that, and Englishmen to-day are calling on us to make suggestions as to the trade policy of the empire. Then what ought these suggestions to be?

What ought the Prime Minister to say this summer when he goes to England? He ought to go there prepared to say to the empire and in the face of all the world, that we Canadians are determined at last to build up our own country and to follow, if necessary, the example of the United States, and to force them if we can to trade fair with us; and also to say to the empire that we are prepared to join with them in forc-

ing the whole outside world if necessary to trade fair with the empire. Now those are the two great things. I do not know whether the Prime Minister will rise to the occasion, whether he will make a declaration or not. But this discussion this afternoon, and other discussions in this House at other times, and discussions yet to take place will make clear the fact that the manufacturers, the workingmen and the farmers are waiting to know what the new policy of the government is to be under these new conditions. The conditions are new. The future of Canada is in the scales. If something is not done we will be a portion of the United States in a short time. We cannot help ourselves, if they control our trade, if they control our great corporations. But if we have confidence in ourselves, if we adopt those principles which have been vindicated in regard to trade, the principles of protection, then we are bound to stand for our own interests and to keep our own markets to ourselves. We are bound to become much stronger protectionists than we are to-day, and we are bound to tell the empire that we are willing to join with the empire, not only for preferential trade between the different portions of the empire, but for fair trade between the empire and all outside portions as well.

I say the Prime Minister should not let this resolution pass without telling us where the government stands in regard to it. He cannot gain the support of the hon. member for North Norfolk unless he accepts the doctrine laid down here to-night. There is no time like the present to make a new departure. It has got to be made, and it has got to be made in a manly way. There has got to be a confession of mistake in the past. Hon. gentlemen opposite were free traders and nothing else in the past, they were for free trade in Canada as they have it in England. But that won't do. Free trade is a failure in England to-day. What Canada wants is protection as they have it in the United States. What the empire wants is that kind of attitude and that kind of treatment from other nations which she accords to them and if she does not get it she will give to other nations that treatment which they accord to her.

Now in face of all that, in face of the new conditions, in face of the way that the empire is trying to hold its own when it is raided from all quarters from protectionist nations, what advice is the Prime Minister going to give this House to-night on this motion presented by the hon. member for North Norfolk ? What advice is he going to give the empire when he goes to the celebration in the coming summer ? The question must be faced. There is no way of escaping it. If it must be faced let it be faced courageously here and now. Let us not be afraid, as at last the member for North Norfolk has shown that he is not afraid and as the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is not afraid to avow that the only salvation of this country is in the adoption of a protectionist policy.

I congratulate the hon. member for North Norfolk on freeing himself from his bonds. I take it that he is honest in his purpose. They say, and it is said freely, that he is flying a kite in the interests of the government. I believe the conversion is deep and pronounced and that there are scores of hon. members on the other side of the House ready to speak as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) spoke here to-night. If there is one vindication of that old man now dead and buried in Cataraqui Cemetery who introduced the national policy into this country, it is afforded in the conversion of John of Norfolk that we have heard this afternoon. If there ever was a man who went about persecuting the people who believed in protection, it was the hon. member for North Norfolk. Now, he has made his peace. He will feel all the better for it. He has got the trouble off his mind, he has made his confession and he will be a much happier man. The hon. member for North Brant should do the same and the hon. Minister of Public Works should do the same. I believe the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce will yet do the same and that we will have him coming down and approving of the policy of protection. The right hon. Prime Minister has no political principles in regard to the tariff or the future of the country. He has said time and again that he is an opportunist and it will be no trouble for him to do what the hon. member for North Norfolk did here to-day. It will only be making a slight change to adapt himself to circumstances so that he will not be wrestling with his conscience as the hon. member for North Norfolk did. He will do it easily and I believe the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will be able to do the same thing. Why not take the manly course and take the step to-night ? I am following out the line of the exhorter in the revival meeting. Do it now, and do it completely. Don't wait ; to-night is the accepted hour, now is the appointed time. If the hon. Minister of Public Works would only walk up and down among the brethren as the revivalist does, he would be able to bring them in. The wandering boys would all be home to-night, if the head of the government should make a straight and sudden departure just as the hon. member for North Norfolk has done here to-night. This is the easiest way out of it, it is the way that will benefit Canada and benefit the empire and the easiest for his reputation. These hon. gentlemen are like the woman in the problem play ; they have a past and they are ashamed of it. We will give them an opportunity here and now to come out straight and completely for protection as the hon. member for North Norfolk has come

out to-night. I hope this is the last time that we will have to appeal to them. Having gone so far as they have on the road to protection they should take the final leap and admit before the whole country that the only salvation of this country is the national policy lived up to by the government and not the one-sided jug handled protection they seem to favour at the present time.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I would not have intruded on the time of the House even for a few minutes were it not that I have been very deeply impressed by the vast difference between the speech of the mover of this motion and the utterly meaningless and illusive motion that has occupied the attention of the House this afternoon. If I were as conversant as the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Maclean) with the political history of the hon. gentleman who has placed it before the House I might take a different view of the motion from that which I have derived from reading it, but, referring to the motion and confining myself to the subject before the House without wandering over the whole sphere of political economy, I would like to direct the attention of the House to the actual words in the motion which we are asked to adopt. The motion reads :

That this House is of the opinion that Canadian import duties should be arranged upon the principle of reciprocity in trade conditions.

Any person can understand that. It means that our import duties are to be arranged on the principle of reciprocity ; that is if one country favours us we shall favour that country and if another country taxes our products we shall tax the products of that country. But, the sting of this sentence is in the end.

So far as may be consistent with Canadian interests.

Consistent with Canadian interests. In my humble judgment this is dallying with the intelligence of this House. It is a waste of time for any hon. gentleman to bring before the House a resolution asking us to approve of having duties arranged on the principle of reciprocity in trade conditions in so far as may be consistent with Canadian interests. We might take the scene that was witnessed a short time ago in Montreal at the manufacturer's banquet. We had the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) speaking as an out and out free trader. We had the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) speaking, as he has always been, a consistent protectionist, and we had the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) smiling blandly on both ; yet, all these hon. gentlemen can accept this proposition, and while they would differ entirely as to the working out of the proposition, they could all raise their hands to heaven and sincerely say that they would subscribe to the principle of reciprocity in trade conditions so far as they were consistent with Canadian interests. When we go on we find that :

A rebate of not less than 40 per cent on the amount of duties imposed should be made upon dutiable imports from nations or countries admitting Canadian natural products into their market free of duty.

This is a very plain proposition, that if any nation will admit the natural products of Canada into its markets free we will give it a reduction of 40 per cent on manufactured goods. If the manufacturers had no rights in this country, if the desire were to slaughter them and close down their factories, I could understand this proposition but I appeal to any hon. member in this House and even to the hon. member for North Norfolk to say, whether in order to obtain the free introduction of our natural products, or of our agricultural products into the markets of any country we should consent to a reduction of 40 per cent in the duty on manufactured goods is not the height of absurdity. The hon. gentleman goes on to obviate that difficulty by the concluding clause :

And that the scale of Canadian duties should be sufficiently high to avoid inflicting injury upon Canadian interests in cases where a rebate of 40 per cent or more shall be made under the conditions aforesaid.

It may be 40 per cent or 60 per cent or 80 per cent or a hundred fold under this resolution. No matter what reduction you may make Canadian industries are to be protected in the way referred to in this closing part irrespective of protection which these Canadian industries require. Of that I shall speak presently. You are to have a measure of protection according to the views of the free trader. It is asking for bread and receiving a stone. As far as we know this is the motion made by the hon. member for North Norfolk. Unfortunately that hon. gentleman has expressed himself on the subject of protection and free trade very frequently in this House and it is absolutely necessary to use a glossary to understand what he means by any particular words. In the session of 1876 he addressed the House and no man could have given more thorough going or consistent protectionist utterances than the hon. member for North Norfolk. In 1876 as reported in 'Hansard,' page 312, the hon. gentleman said :

It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce or manufactures without having in the course of its history imposed exactions and restrictions. This has been notably the case with Great Britain herself and I think that the assertion of the various industries as necessary to the cultivation of the self defensive power of a nation is incontrovertible * * * When 'industries' are suited to the land it is the duty of the government to foster them.

These are the protectionist views of the hon. member for North Norfolk in 1876. He went on to say :

I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by protection—

Unmistakable words these—

—and that the manufacturer, being brought to the door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were 3,000 miles away.

These were his views in 1876. In 1895 again, the hon. gentleman addressed the House. It is true there was a change in the conditions; in the first instance he being on the government side of the House, and in the second place he being on the opposition side of the House. But when he came to express himself on the subject of protection, he was just as unequivocal, just as clear, and distinct as he had been years before. He spoke of protection to the various industries of the land, and he spoke of protection to the farmers. This is his idea in 1895, and that date you will notice is a great deal less remote than 1873. As reported in 'Hansard,' 1895, page 1189, he said :

I deny in toto that the farmer requires protection or that he has received protection, or that he has anything to thank the government for in connection with its fiscal policy.

At page 1109 he said :

He is in the highest and noblest sense a manufacturer, and he depends not upon man's legislation, but he depends for the outcome of his labour upon the blessings of a kind Providence.

Now, Sir, looking at this resolution framed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and presented to this House by him, asking us to agree that we should adopt the principle of reciprocity so far as may be consistent with Canadian interests, I must read in with that, the glossary of his language which is given in his speech of 1895, and I find that it means that the farmer does not require protection. Therefore, I know that in his judgment the farmer would be injured by protection. In this speech of 1895, further on he spoke of the manufacturers. He discussed exhaustively the question of protection to the farmers, and then he said :

I proceed next to consider the assertion that our manufacturers depend for prosperity upon protection, and I think that I shall be able to show that protection, even in the case of the manufacturers, has not exerted the beneficial influence which is claimed for it.

Further on in the same debate (pages 1200 and 1201 of 'Hansard') he spoke of protection to the mining industries, to the lumbering industries and to several other industries. I will not quote the hon. gentleman at length, but he practically mentioned the whole list of Canadian industries and proved to his own satisfaction conclusively that protection was of no conceivable use to these Canadian industries. Now, then, I am asked, representing a constituency which is not exclusively agricultural but having large manufacturing industries; I am asked to subscribe to this proposition drawn by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that I should vote for protection so far as may be consistent with Canadian interests—which means in his mind, no protection to the farmer, no protection to the mining industry, no protection to the manufacturer. I venture to say that with that explanation of the true views of the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), no hon. gentleman in this House would be justified in supporting such a proposition.

I must confess that I was rather surprised at the view expressed by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) in regard to the speech and motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton). Judging from some of the utterances given expression to by the hon. gentleman from South Brant (Mr. Heyd), he so absolutely fails to conceive the faintest idea of the underlying principle on which this motion is based, that he may be excused for almost any statement he would make in this connection. He referred to the woollen industry more than once, and he expressed the opinion that the government that he faithfully supported had not done justice to the woollen industry, and he hoped that ere long they would rectify the injustice they had done and give additional protection to it. I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. member was sincere in what he said. I have not the slightest doubt that he hoped from the bottom of his heart that the government would give protection to the woollen industry. But time passed on; changes came; new conditions arose; two minutes had rolled by into eternity, and the hon. gentleman then informed the House that he was opposed to the granting of protection to any industry which was confined mainly to the manufacture of goods not made from raw material produced in Canada. Yet, we know that the woollen industry imports the greatest part of the wool, the raw material under which the business is carried on. If the hon. gentleman meant what he said—and I assume he did—if he understood what he meant—and I am bound to think he did—then in one breath he said that there should be protection to the woollen industry and in the next breath he said he was opposed to any protection being granted to an industry situated precisely as the woollen industry is. The hon. gentleman from Brant (Mr. Heyd) went on to speak of the sacrifices that had been made on our market by American manufacturers, and he referred to the question of retaliation, as did the mover of the motion. I venture to say that when these hon. gentlemen spoke on the subject of retaliation they displayed a want of acquaintance with the

first principle of the doctrine of protection. One would think that every man in the country knew by this time what the doctrine of protection means, and yet these hon. gentlemen failed to recognize what protection means, or else they wilfully perverted its meaning. Protection means protecting some one from impending ill. It may be that at one time a duty of 25 per cent would be ample protection, and it may be that at another time a duty of 50 per cent would be required. But nobody will dispute that the harder the times the greater the danger of an inflow of goods from foreign countries; the more necessity there is for protection and the greater the protection must be in order to be effectual. Now, Sir, if I went on to discuss the question of free trade and protection I would be doing what I promised at the outset not to do. I will content myself by saying that I am unable to support the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), firstly, because it is so ambiguous that no meaning can be attributed to it, and secondly, because I believe that a motion of this kind, committing the House to the most important question that can come before us, should be so clear-cut, that every voter in the Dominion of Canada might know where his representatives stood on that question. I believe that it will be a happy day for Canada—whichever the party to occupy one position and which ever the party to occupy the other—when the people of this country will be able to go to the polls and intelligently vote for a party, knowing that party has understood the promises it has made and is prepared to carry them out when placed in power.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I do not imagine from what I have heard from hon. members of both sides of the House, that there is a desire to have a division taken on this interesting and important resolution. In fact, the hon. gentleman who seconded the motion intimated that while he did so he was somewhat in doubt as to whether ultimately it would commend itself to his judgment. I take it that the object was to invite discussion on what is a very important question, and then have the debate on the motion adjourned, if the motion be not withdrawn. However that may be, so far as the government is concerned, I am sure the House will anticipate what I am about to say, namely, that the general practice in matters of this sort is that the government shall declare its intention in connection with the tariff when the budget speech is made, and it is not usually deemed wise to forestall any action in that direction by making announcements in advance. Adopting that view, which has always been adopted by Ministers of Finance in the past, I desire to say that while I agree with some things that have been said and while I dissent from others, I do not think it would be expedient to enlarge on the subject now, though. I have no desire now to preclude any gentleman who wishes to address the House. Therefore, I beg, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask, if the suggestion of the minister is that this debate shall be resumed after the budget speech has been delivered ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would almost suppose that the debate could be merged into the budget debate as it is on a cognate subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This debate will be left over for the present.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, the motion remains on the Order paper.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the minister if he proposes to name the date on which the budget speech will be delivered. We would like to have the customary notice.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As usual a few days notice will be given.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, the House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 25th, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 7) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Ingram.

INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to amend the Interpretation Act.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Will the hon. gentleman kindly explain.

Mr. MONK. The object of this Bill is to declare more clearly in the Interpretation Act that company's incorporated by the Federal parliament or acting under charter from Federal authority are, nevertheless, subject, in each province, as regards damages or torts, to the civil law of that pro-

vince. The necessity for that law has become apparent from the recent decision of the Privy Council in the cases of the Canandian Pacific Railway Company vs. Roy. In this case our courts decided that, though a railway company incorporated by and subject to the Federal law was authorized to prosecute its business, it nevertheless was subject to the law of our province as regards damages. The effect of the decision was that if an engine of the company, though worked with all the necessary appliances to secure immunity from fire, should cause a fire in the course of its use in the business of the company, the company was liable for the damages occasioned by that fire. That was the unanimous decision of our courts. It was held, however, in England, conformably, as I understand, to the English law, that when a railway company is incorporated and authorized to prosecute its business, and when it prosecutes that business with all the necessary precautions, it is not liable in damages. Consequently it has been thought necessary that an Act should be passed to declare that in our province although railway companies are incorporated by Dominion charter, they are nevertheless subject, under the constitutional Act, to the Civil Code of Lower Canada as regards damages.

Mr. FRASER. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if it refers to the province of Quebec alone ?

Mr. MONK. It does not refer to the province of Quebec alone, but the main disposition declares that laws of that nature will apply to the whole of Canada.

But no law, power of privilege granted by a Federal law, or a charter emanating under some Federal law will have for effect to remove any person or company from the responsibility which it would incur under the civil law or the common law of each province in the exercise of such right, power or privilege.

It merely declares that in cases such as the one I have just described, the civil law of each province will apply, conformably to the dispositions of the Constitutional Act of 1867.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). The question raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is a very timely one, and it is coming up in this House in another respect in regard to the Bell Telephone Company. That company is incorporated under Dominion law, and yet it claims to override the municipal law of Ontario in so far as taking possession of streets is concerned. I imagine that question will come before the House this session. The contention of the Bell Telephone Company all along has been, as against the municipalities, that because it is incorporated under a Dominion Act it does not come under the municipal law. Now, I believe it was laid down in this parliament some years ago that a company so incorporated, no matter what rights they alleged had been given to it in its charter, was still subject to the municipal law, and that it did not require an exact definition of what its rights were, of a clause protecting the municipality. But the question is coming up, and it may come up in a very wide way. I am glad the hon. gentleman has introduced this Bill for the purpose of making the whole question clear.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I may add to the remarks made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that this Bill is a very timely one, because, according to a recent decision rendered by the Privy Council in the case just cited, that of Roy and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the jurisprudence of our courts in the province of Quebec has been completely reversed. In that case, it was decided by our courts, that the railway company was responsible for damages caused to a settler in the northern district of Montreal, and the judgment so rendered by the Superior Court was unanimously confirmed by the Court of King's Bench. The same jurisprudence has been upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada in cases arising in the province of Quebec. But when we go before the Privy Council the whole jurisprudence, all the precedents, are reversed, and a new jurisprudence is created. The above judgment, I may say, has caused an uneasy feeling in the province of Quebec. Our judges have been slighted and our law has been completely ignored. We have been told by their Lordships of the Privy Council, that in matters of damages and torts we are to be governed by the English common law. With all due respect to that law, I may say that we, in the province of Quebec intend to maintain the system of laws and the customs which have been granted and secured to us by the constitution of this country. I think the Bill presented by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is a timely one, and ought to receive the full support of this House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My sympathies are altogether along the lines enunciated by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). But my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, I am sure, who is an eminent counsel, cannot fail to realize that it is questionable whether the legislation which he has in view will remedy the evil which he seeks to remedy. The question is whether we can at the present time evade the powers which have been granted to us under a Federal Act. I doubt if we can do so. But the question which my hon. friend has raised is not a new one. That question is as to what extent a charter granted by the parliament of Canada can invade a disposition

of the Federal Act which provides that civil rights are under the control of local legislatures. There is a line of demarkation between the two, but it is sometimes difficult of application. Whenever we give a charter to a railway company we necessarily invade private property. For instance, we give to the chartered railway company the power of expropriating a property for the benefit of the company. That is clearly an invasion of civil rights. Still there is no doubt whatever that parliament has power to invade civil rights to that extent, in other words, there is no doubt that we have the right to invade civil rights so far as it may be necessary to carry out the object of the franchise which is given by the Federal parliament. But here is a question : How far can these civil rights be invaded ? That they may be invaded to the extent of accomplishing everything which is the consequence of the charter given, there can be no doubt whatever. But there is a great doubt whether the consequences which are not the immediate consequences of the charter, can be invaded. In the case which has been cited, as stated by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, the circumstances were these : The Canadian Pacific Railway Company had committed a tort against an individual, unwillingly and unwittingly, that is to say, a spark which blew from an engine set fire to a barn and destroyed it. Under the civil law of the province of Quebec, which is certainly, in my estimation, most just and most equitable, the company would have been responsible, even if it had taken all the precautions which it could take before the accident. Under the common law, as I understand it, which prevails in England, the moment a company had done everything that could reasonably be done, when they had taken all the precautions they could take under such circumstances, they would not be liable for the consequences. Well, the Court of Appeal of the province of Quebec determined that under such circumstances the law of the province would apply, and the company would be liable for the tort. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided to the contrary. I do not know that the evil which it is sought to remedy will be covered by the Bill introduced by my hon. friend; I doubt it very much, because we cannot infringe upon a Federal Act. But in my opinion the judgment of the Court of Appeals of Quebec was the better judgment of the two. I think that is the law, and not the interpretation laid down by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). I have no doubt the Bill which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has introduced should pass in some way, if not in the terms in which it is drafted, at all events in such terms as will relieve those who suffer under circumstances similar to those suffered by this man Roy.

I do not quite agree with what my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) said when he stated to the House that the Privy Council had held that this question should be decided according to the law of England and not according to the law of the province of Quebec. As I read the judgment, their lordships came to the conclusion that the common law of the province of Quebec was similar to the common law of England and they decided it according to the principles of the English law, which they stated were also the principles of the law of the province of Quebec. The whole question turned upon the interpretation of article 1053 of our Civil Code, which says that if damage is caused by any fault, whether by an unskilful act or neglect, the person is responsible in damages. But their lordships asked : How can it be possible that there will be fault upon the party if the act complained of is authorized by statute ? The present charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company gives the railway company not only permission to run its railway but directs that it shall be run in such a way and on the line which is set out and this becomes part of its charter by following the provisions of the general Railway Act. Therefore, their lordships said this Act being authorized by statute—the particular Act being authorized by a particular statute—there could be no fault upon the company and therefore the case would not fall within the purview of article 1053 of the Civil Code. On the other hand there is a principle of our legislation, which exists in all legislation, and it is that nobody can be expropriated without an indemnity being paid to him. If a railway line is run across the country those whose lands are taken have a compensation fixed either by arbitration or otherwise. Their lands cannot be taken without an indemnity being paid to them, and also those whose lands are injuriously affected, whose lands in part are taken and whose lands are injuriously affected by the passing of a railway have a remedy. They are to be indemnified, but the difficulty, as far is I know the jurisprudence of the country, has been that every one cannot be indemnified for the passing of a railway unless a part of the land is taken in such a way that when a part of the land is taken not only should the party receive compensation for the land taken, but also compensation for the other part of the land which has been injuriously affected by the passing of the railway. If no part of the land is taken then a party has no right and cannot be compensated for the reason of being injuriously affected by the passing of a railway. For instance, here is land which has a barn on the line of railway. The railway company by operating its line sets

fire to this barn. The owner of this property is expropriated just as much as if the company took his barn. But, the law does not give him any remedy. I think that this man should be compensated just as much as if his land, or barn, had been taken for the purpose of the railway and probably when the question comes to be studied in committee, a Bill can be drafted so that not only those whose lands are taken and injuriously affected by the passing of a railway may be compensated, but also those upon whose lands a railway does not pass, or whose lands are not taken, but whose lands are injuriously affected may also be compensated. It seems to me that there lies the remedy to meet the case, and that it would be only fair and equitable that such a person should be indemnified. On these lines compensation could be given and a proper remedy provided in such a case, as the circumstances should warrant.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Archives, $8,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) that I think time would be gained by not going on with these estimates to-day. The hon. gentleman well knows the House has only been a very few days in session and that hon. members on neither side of the House have had any time whatever to consult the reports that I confess have been promptly brought down. I think we would gain time by giving a reasonable opportunity for hon. members on both sides of the House to consult the reports. These are important estimates and while I have no desire whatever to delay them I think we should have time to look somewhat into the reports.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I may say, in the first place, that notice was given to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) last night that these estimates would be taken up to-day, and in the second place, I may say that the report of the department was laid on the Table of the House on Friday last, so that it has been in the hands of hon. members for three or four days. Of course, I have no desire at all to press hon. members opposite, or to debar them from every opportunity of discussing these estimates, or of getting all the information possible, but, I think, perhaps, that the business of the House would be unduly interfered with and delayed if the estimates are not taken up. If these estimates are not gone on with it practically means that none can be, because the estimates of the other departments are just in the same position. I do not see very well therefore how, with due consideration for the progress of the work of the session, we can delay taking up the estimates. I will ask the hon. gentleman to allow them to proceed, of course, with all necessary discussion which he and his friends wish to give to them.

Mr. CLANCY. I think there is a disposition on this side of the House to take as little time as is absolutley necessary to have some intelligent discussion. I hardly thought for a moment that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) would urge, that the reports having been placed for three or four days in the hands of hon. members on this side of the House was a reason for proceeding at once. Unless they are more apt than I think hon. members of this House are, we will be able to have nothing like intelligent criticism. Time would be saved if a reasonable opportunity were given to members to look into these reports. We are in the early days of the session, and while I value the importance of doing some work each day, yet it would be better to have the criticism an intelligent one.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I fully appreciate the necessity for an intelligent understanding of the details of the department, but I would suggest with a view of expediting the business of parliament that there are many items which have never been the subject of very great criticism.

Mr. CLANCY. They might be now.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They might be now, and the hon. gentleman is fully within his rights in criticising them. However, the argument of the hon. gentleman amounts to the contention that under no circumstances can estimates be taken up early in the session, because the reports can only be laid upon the table of the House at the opening of the session. We went into Supply last week and no objection was taken. I do not think we should call a halt to-day and practically suspend the business of the House. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will appreciate the reasonableness of this suggestion. Should any controversial item come up, I will be glad to allow it to stand; and if there is any information which the hon. gentleman wishes and which I cannot supply at the spur of the moment I will be very much pleased to let the item stand until I get that information. If the hon. gentleman's contention is maintained, it would mean that no work would be taken up to-day and that would be rather unfortunate.

Mr. CLANCY. The members on both sides of the House should have a reasonable time for consulting these reports, and if the work of the House cannot go on by reason

of no other business being ready that is the fault of the government. So far as I am concerned, and in order to facilitate business. I will give the minister notice in advance, so far as I can, of what information I may require so that it will be on hand when needed. I confess that I have not had time to open a book. When the minister says that these items usually have gone unchallenged, that is no argument, because reasons may present themselves this year why they should be sharply criticised.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) means not merely that we should not proceed with these estimates, but that we should not proceed with any estimates, because his criticism would apply to all others.

Mr. CLANCY. I have not been discussing the other estimates. I speak particularly of these.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But the same reasons given by the hon. gentleman will apply to all the other departments as well as to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CLANCY. They are good reasons.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If they are good reasons they should have been given at the beginning when we commenced Supply last week. Hon. gentlemen opposite, with the object of proceeding as rapidly as possible with the estimates, did not take that objection. The leader of the Opposition asked me last evening what estimates would come up to-day, and I told him that we would take the estimates of the Department of Agriculture. Every reasonable provision has been made to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite, and when the minister states that he will allow any controversial items to stand over until he can supply the information required, I think that ought to commend itself to the fairness of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CLANCY. Although there is no increase in this vote I hope the minister will give us some information as to the nature of the expenditure. There are some new members of the House who probably have given this only a passing notice.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am very happy indeed to meet the desire of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy). This vote is for the purpose of carrying out the work which has been entrusted to Mr. Brymner, Dominion Archivist. He issues every year an annual report dealing with the historical documents and incidents in the history of Canada. This report is considered by students, and by every one who is interested in the history of our country, to be of the utmost value. Numerous endorsations of this work have come to my predecessors as they have come to me. About half of the vote, roughly speaking, is expended to pay the salary of the Dominion Archivist and his small staff at Ottawa. A great deal of the work is done in Europe, and about $4,000 is expended in the investigation of works in the British Museum and the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris, and in the transcription of documents relating to the history of Canada. The Archivist himself, from his knowledge of these libraries, indicates what works and documents ought to be copied, and we have in Paris an officer whose duty it is to search in the records there for papers and items connected with the early history of Canada. The expenditure is represented by the salary of that gentleman and the expense of copying in London and Paris. The work here is carried on by Dr. Brymner, with a clerk, a binder, and a young lady who answers letters and makes copies. We also have to buy standard periodicals to keep up the record from day to day, and occasionally books, which are available and useful in connection with Canadian history.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. For how many years has the copying of these documents been going on in London and Paris ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not state the exact time, but practically ever since the archivist has been at work. There was an assistant archivist for many years, a Mr. Marmette, who died some time ago, and I appointed as his successor Mr. Richard, shortly after coming into office. There was a slight interregnum during which there was no person in Paris, but the copying went on. When I came into office I found that there was a large mass of material which Mr. Marmette indicated ought to be copied. The work must have been going on for about 15 years.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. By this time I should think whole libraries might be copied.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, no ; there are hundreds of thousands of volumes.

Mr. INGRAM. How many of these reports are circulated, and to whom are they given ? Does the department furnish them free to the different historical societies ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This report is a supplement to the report of the Minister of Agriculture, and is printed by order of the House, as are all other documents which are laid on the Table. I could not say off-hand just how many are supplied to the department. The department has a certain number given to it, which the archivist distributes to certain scientific and educational bodies in the country regularly, and there are a number of copies available for persons who are interested in these subjects, and frequently apply for them.

Mr. INGRAM. The different historical societies would be very glad to receive this report, and if they are not supplied with them now, I think the department would do well to supply them.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the minister what was the amount in the estimates for this service in the year 1895-6 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. $6,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, why has the amount been increased $2,000 in the last five years?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. More work has been done.

Mr. TAYLOR. More employment for friends of the government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that out of this $8,000 is paid the salary of the gentleman in Paris, whereas formerly it was paid out of the civil government contingencies. I think, speaking from memory, that he was paid $1,500.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the minister state to the committee how much is paid for each service ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Richard is paid $1,400, Mr. Pennington, the binder, $804, Miss McKay, who is described as a stitcher, $400, and Miss Casey, a clerk, $600, making $3,204. The amount required for the London office is $4,000. That includes the expenditure in Paris, which goes through the High Commissioner's office. The purchase of periodicals and newspapers, binding, and some travelling expenses, make up $796. These items make up the $8,000.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not given us the expenditure for each service in the London office.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is entirely for copying, which is paid for as it is done at a certain rate per folio. There are four or five people in London and several in Paris. I have not the details of the amount paid to each. The items are brought in monthly from the High Commissioner's office, the money is sent over there, and the details are managed there.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Is this copying done by Canadians appointed by the government here ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is done by people who have been copying in the libraries for years. In London it is done chiefly by women, and in Paris chiefly by men. I cannot give the names of the people employed in London, but they are people of London who are engaged there. I do not know whether they are Canadians, or English, or what they are.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it is just as well that we should not hasten too rapidly over this item. It is a very interesting one, as is anything connected with the history of our country. I would like to learn from the minister how far down the copying of these records has proceeded—whether it has reached the beginning of the last century, or the middle of it. For my part, I have always regarded the archives as rather dry reading, and have spent very little time over them. I do not doubt the desirability of a proper and sufficient record of interesting historical facts being made and preserved in our vaults. I do not suppose it is the intention of the minister to continue the work from year to year down to the present time, because it seems to me that when you reach a certain period, the records which we have will be amply sufficient for the purpose ; or is it the purpose to continue this work from year to year in order to give persons employment and to spend a little more of the money of the tax-payers of this country ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can assure the hon. gentleman that this work is not going on for any such purpose, but for the purpose of obtaining information which Dr. Brymner, the Dominion archivist, who has been at the head of this branch since its inception and, whose reputation is very high both inside and outside of Canada because of the work he has done, thinks it necessary to obtain. These documents are not available to Canadians ordinarily. I may refer to my annual report which states :

> The state papers for Lower Canada published in this report, including the years 1836 and 1837, contain the correspondence of the Earl of Gosford, who was sent out as the head of the commission to investigate grievances. Those for Upper Canada contain the final correspondence of Sir John Colborne, afterwards Lord Seaton, and the appointment of Sir F. B. Head, who succeeded him, with copies of dispatches addressed to him in 1835 and 1836.

The House will see, therefore, that the work which is covered by the report of this year deals chiefly with the troublous times of 1835-6-7, a time sufficiently removed to be called historic in the young life of this nation.

Mr. INGRAM. But there is very slight reference to these documents in the report, and members of the House and others can have but little idea of what those documents show. Would it not be better to have more extended account of these documents given in the report ? It would make a more bulky volume but it would give information in a form more satisfactory to the public.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the minister could tell us what the instructions were that Dr. Brymner sent to the high commissioners to have these papers copied, or might, possibly, give us a copy of those instructions. As my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) points out the report is so meagre that the reader cannot draw intelligent conclusions from it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be able to give that information and, if he has it, a copy of that report, that we may see what work is being done there. There is now in the neighbourhood of $4,000 spent on the London office; but, so far as anything disclosed in the report is concerned, there seems to be little explanation of it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of course, the report of my department does not contain this information; it is to be found in the report of the archivist, which is a supplement to the report of the department. Dr. Brymner's instructions to the people in London are of the ordinary nature of departmental instructions from the head of a branch to those under him. I might bring down the letters Dr. Brymner has written to the London office in the course of the year, but I fancy they would not be very instructive or interesting to the House. I know I would not care to read them myself. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) speaks of the report of the archivist not being a summary of the documents, but I think, perhaps he did not apprehend what I tried to explain. The copying is not done for the report of the archivist. The documents are put upon the shelves of the archivist's office, and there they can be consulted by students. The report comprises a list of the documents and also, generally, papers on some particular subject—I mean articles taking up some particular phases or periods of our history. This conveys a great deal of information for the public; but students who wish to consult the documents are expected to visit the archivist's office and consult them there. It would be impossible to print all the papers that are copied; or, at least, it would make a large addition to the report each year and would greatly increase the cost of printing.

Mr. INGRAM. I have been spoken to on this subject by members of historical societies. It is of no particular advantage to many of the members of such societies to know that they can come here and consult the documents. Nor can these students obtain such information by consulting the reports as they are now compiled. But whether it would be wise to extend the report so as to cover, more or less the information I suggest, is a matter, it seems to me, worthy of consideration by the minister. It certainly would add to the practical value to the public of the report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will speak to the archivist on the subject.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has stated that there has been a considerable increase since 1896. The expenses were about $6,000 in 1896, and they are about $8,000 now. I think the committee would like to know the reason of that increase—what portion of the service has been increased and what additional work is done.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In reply to the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), I pointed out a few minutes ago—the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) could not have heard me—that, before 1896, the salary of one officer in Paris, then $1,500 a year, was paid out of civil government through my department, but it is now paid out of this vote. The salary now is $1,400, but paying it out of this vote, accounts for by far the greater part of the increase of $2,000. The rest is due to the fact that more work is done and a larger number of documents are being copied year by year.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Though I have been asking for information about the archivist's branch, it must not be supposed that I am opposed to the expenditure made with the object of securing information bearing upon the history of our country. I read every report made by Dr. Brymner, and I regard the compilation that is brought down every year as a very important one. I approve of the efforts that are made to get at the documents lying at the archives both at London and at Paris, because they throw light upon the general history of our country, and also because they form part of our political history. These are most important documents and we read them with interest when they come to us. I can readily understand that they cannot all be published because they would be too voluminous and some are of much less importance than others. Still they are so classified that we can readily refer to them and get copies, if required for any special purposes. I would ask the hon. minister if the allowance of $1,400 to Mr. Edouard Richard in Paris is all he gets for his expenses and salary ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Richard is certainly a very good man and very well qualified for the position, but he is not paid commensurately with the services he renders. I cannot understand how a man of his ability will remain in Paris for the paltry salary of $1,400 a year. I can speak more freely with regard to Mr. Richard perhaps than any other member of this House because he was the first opponent I had when

I presented myself for election to the House of Commons, and I, therefore, cannot be charged with being biased in his favour by my political opinions. I believe him to be thoroughly qualified for the position and to be very poorly paid.

Patent Record, $12,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase here of $3,000 over the estimate of 1895-6. How does the hon. gentleman account for that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By the increase in the number of patents and of publications. We are publishing all the trade marks and the list of the copyrights and this whole expenditure is for printing.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the intention of the government to amend the Patent Act this session? Every session we are called on to pass legislation renewing patents that have lapsed, and if the government would amend the Patent Act we might be relieved from that work entirely.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If I understand the hon. gentleman rightly, he wishes to have the Act amended in the direction of providing simpler machinery for the renewal of expired patents.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well, that question came up in the Committee on Private Bills and also in the House, and the expression of the House indicated clearly its desire to hold that power in its own hands and not delegate it to anybody else. The most frequent applications are in cases where the parties allowed the time to elapse within which they had the right to extend the life of their patent by paying the additional fees, and then apply to parliament to have that extension of life which the department is debarred from granting them through their own fault. I have constant application for such extensions but am absolutely powerless. If the government were to undertake to grant an extension by Order in Council, once the delay for granting it has expired, that would be of no effect, because it is distinctly contrary to the law. The parties have to apply to this House to pass a private Bill for that purpose, and the question which the hon. gentleman has put has frequently been discussed both in the Private Bills Committee and the House. Two years ago the question came up of amending the Act in the direction suggested. What I proposed was that after a patent had expired without any commercial use having been made of it, and the inventor subsequently found a chance of utilizing his invention, we should give to the Exchequer Court the power to reinstate such a patent under certain conditions. A Bill to that effect was submitted to a special committee and the committee failed to report on it, and I believe did so designedly. Under the circumstances, I felt that this House did not desire to delegate its power in this respect to any other body. On several other occasions also, both in the Private Bills Committee and in the House, it has been made clear that parliament does not wish to divest itself of this power.

Mr. BENNETT. In the event of a party applying for a patent and the examiner refusing to grant his request on the ground that it clashed with an already patented article, is there any appeal from his decision ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, to the minister.

Mr. BENNETT. Have any such appeals been made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not remember any particular one, but there have been two or three since I have been in office.

Mr. BENNETT. When were these two or three made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot give the dates. I think there was one last year, but am speaking only from memory.

Mr. BENNETT. I presume that in such cases both parties—those making the application and those opposing it—are represented by counsel.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Were the counsel members of the House ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not remember, but I do not think so. I am certain that the counsel were not members.

Mr. BENNETT. Were the parties who appeared before the Minister to argue the cases members of this House ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. gentleman recollect any cases which, if not dealt with by himself, were dealt with by an officer of the department who afterwards reported to him, and in which members of this House did appear on behalf of the parties interested.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I remember no such case. The usual course is for the deputy minister, who is the assistant commissioner of patents, to go into the details and prepare a memo. for

me. Then when the case finally comes before me, I take that memo. and hear the case. What occurs before the deputy minister I am not aware of in all cases.

Mr. INGRAM. Are not all those cases, cases which have been legislated upon since by the House of Commons or Senate ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so. I do not carry in my mind the exact cases. There were three or four, but I could not mention one of them.

Mr. INGRAM. Has it never been suggested to the hon. gentleman that a period of eighteen years was sufficiently long and that there should be no extension after that time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no extension after that time. The only proposal was to give power to increase the time.

Mr. INGRAM. Has there been no application to have that part of the Act wiped out which allows the parties, after twelve years have elapsed, to have the term extended ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Mr. INGRAM. Once the term elapses there is no power to grant an extension ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The only power is the one we have now, of granting an extension by special Act of parliament. There has never been any proposal to legislate that that should not be done, and if we did so legislate parliament could the next day legislate to do it.

Mr. INGRAM. There are many cases where a patent lapses, and some parties may have acquired certain rights after the lapse of a patent. Is it not sometimes possible for the parties who have acquired those rights to suffer an injustice ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They can come before parliament with a private Bill, and parliament can protect them if it sees fit. As I pointed out to the hon. gentleman a few minutes ago, the parliament of Canada has retained that power in its own hands, and not delegated it to anybody else. That is the law to-day, and I do not think there is any disposition to change it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire to say to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that in the course of my experience I have become convinced that our American cousins have not a very good opinion of our patent office as it is now constituted. I do not for a moment wish to throw any blame on the officers who are there now, and who I know are doing their duty. But I think the law so far as I can see should be amended so as to be assimilated as much as possible to what I consider the most perfect patent law in existence, and that is the law of the United States. In the matter of examinations, for instance, the safe-guards which are given by their statutes to patents are much better than the safe-guards which are given patents by our laws. I think that the manner and mode of examination here should be improved, and the number of examiners should be increased if possible. I suggest to the hon. gentleman that it would be expedient now, not only to amend our patent law, but probably to make a consolidation of it, and change it so as to make it resemble as much as possible the law of the United States. If this were done not only would our patents in the United States have greater authority, but our counsel and courts who are engaged in patent cases could get more assistance, more knowledge, from the decisions of American courts than we are able to get now. Of course the United States are noted for the great number of inventions which come out every day. The American people have a genius for invention, the patent office in Washington is flooded with patents every day. Their patent officers have to pass upon numberless patents, and of course their experience is greater than the experience of our men here. Their courts also have to pronounce upon more patent cases than our courts, and the experience derived by their courts and counsel would be of great advantage to us if our law resembled the law of the United States more than it does. In my opinion the patent law of the United States is superior to the patent law of England; and if our law could be made more like the law of the United States it would be to the advantage of patentees, and to the advantage of the courts and the profession in general in Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am a little surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say that our law is so inferior to that of the United States. As a matter of fact it is largely similar. I am not a lawyer myself, but I have to discuss these questions a good deal with patent solicitors, and have compared the American patent law with our own pretty closely. I would not like to acknowledge that our law is so far inferior to their law. I do not think that is the opinion of most patent solicitors who apply to my department. When our law was amended some years ago it was largely modelled on the law of the United States. The system of patent examination of Canada is much the same as that of the United States, not at all the same as it is in England where a totally different principle obtains.

So far as the examination itself is concerned, I may say we have had quite a number of instances within the last few years where patents have been issued in the United States to patentees, and when applications came before us here our examiners have found that the patents had been anticipated, and that the issuance of those patents in the United States was really a mistake, and they were not issued here because they were not novel, and because the examiners here had really found anticipation of the patent which examiners in the United States had failed to find. At the time the patent was issued in the United States there was anticipation, the same anticipation of that patent which was found here by our examiners. I may say, however, frankly, that we have not got as large a force of examiners in Canada, in proportion, as they have in the United States. I have been adding to that force, I am glad to say the House has been generous, and I think wise, in allowing me to add to that force, and we have been trying very hard to catch up with the arrears of patent applications which I found when I came into the office. During the last few years there have been a great many more patents issued than previously. I think this last year there were 5,000 patents issued, and when I first came into the office there were but little more than 3,000. We have added fully 50 per cent to the number of patents issued during that period. I may say that during this last calendar year we have issued about 40 or 50 per cent of the patents for which there were applications coming before the office. But unfortunately at the beginning of the year there was a considerable number of patents in arrears, and we have not been able to obliterate that arrearage.

I am adding constantly to the staff of examiners. But when a young man comes in at first as patent examiner it takes him nearly six months before he can become effective, and sometimes longer. Generally I find that the first six months after a young man enters upon the work of patent examiner, he does not render much aid in deciding upon patents, although it prepares him to take his place after that time, and to aid the office effectively. The consequence is that the increase of the effective force of the office has been slow. Patent examining is a profession by itself. You can hardly expect any man outside the office, unless he is a thoroughly equipped attorney for patents, or a patent solicitor, to do the work of an examiner. It takes six months and sometimes eight or nine, before a young man coming in is able to do much effective office work. I am glad to say that nearly all the young men who have been brought into the office have proved effective, and in the course of a little time have aided very much. I think I shall have to add still more to the effective force, because we have not yet caught up with the arrears, although we have come much nearer to it than we were a few years ago. I have hopes of being able gradually to obliterate the arrears and to accomplish that end without having to add much to the staff, because, after having obliterated the arrears, I would not like to dismiss any of the men, as I think that would be hardly fair and hardly wise. I may add further that in choosing patent examiners, I take those who are university graduates, who have had a thorough training in some scientific course, either chemistry, or mechanics, or engineering, or electricity. In that way I have secured an excellent class of men who are eminently suited for the work, and as they gain a little experience and more practice, the work of the office will be very much better done than it ever was before. I may add in this connection that at a meeting held by the Manufacturers' Association in Toronto a few months ago where the patent office was discussed, some suggestions were thrown out for improvements, suggestions which I was glad to receive, and some very complimentary words were used in regard to improvement in the efficiency of the examining force.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I would like to ask the hon. minister if it is necessary for a patentee to produce a model of his patent?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it has not been necessary for about twelve years.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister said that he had increased the staff. If the hon. gentleman will turn to D—2 of the Auditor General's Report he will find that $4,821.48 was paid as follows :—

Classifying all Canadian patents and comparing drawings of same for classification and for exchange with the United States in return for their patents, to be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $4,821.48.

Will the hon. gentleman tell the committee how many are employed in the department, the salary of each, the number of new men the hon. gentleman brought in as experts, as I think, he has told the House in the past, several young men were brought in for technical work, and the number of patents exchanged with the United States ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think part of that work comes in under another item farther on. I am perfectly willing to give the hon. gentleman the information and only hope he will not ask me to repeat it when we come to the other item, No. 47, for classifying all Canadian patents, preparing drawings and so on.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see that there are two items. There is a sum put under item 87, but here he has a service for the 'Patent Record' in the estimates amounting to $12,000, and there is an expenditure under the same heading in the Auditor General's Report of $4,821.48.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is out of the vote of $5,000 which is down below in item 87.

Mr. CLANCY. I have reference to the expenditure of $4,821.48.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That comes out of vote No. 87, which we will get to in a few minutes, and which amounts to $5,000. It does not come out of the vote for the 'Patent Record' at all.

Mr. CLANCY. Then why does it appear here ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are now discussing item No. 80, being the vote for the 'Patent Record.' Of course, I can give the hon. gentleman all the information, but it will come more appropriately under item 87, which is a special vote of which that $4,821.48 is the detail.

Collection and compilation of criminal statisics (R.S.C., chap. 60), $1,800.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the vote been exhausted which was given last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, this vote is exhausted every year. It is the vote which covers the payment to a lot of local officers all over the Dominion for giving us criminal statistics. You will find it detailed in the Auditor General's Report. The money is paid in small sums to secretary-treasurers and officers of courts and people like that all over the country.

Mr. CLANCY. How many are there of these ? I know no more dangerous thing than a service which stands still. It seems to be seized with dry rot. It is incredible that an efficient service should go on from year to year with the same sum of money being voted for it. I have no conception whatever that an important service would pass this House year after year, the same vote being given and that it should go on without the public or this House having any definite knowledge of it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us how many officers there are in receipt of pay for the information contained in the report, how much each of them is receiving, and who directs that work in his department, or whether the hon. gentleman gives it any personal supervision or not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will look up page D—10, Auditor General's Report, he will see the commencement of the list. The list goes over pages 11 and 12 and nearly half way down page 13. I will not undertake to read all these names or to count them. Opposite each name is the amount which is paid. This work has been done for years under the supervision of the statistician, Mr. George Johnson, and has been carried out in the same way. I have not the details as to the exact number of cents paid to each individual, but the same principle has been carried out and if a change is to be made it will have to be made by practically wiping out the collection of these criminal statistics. I confess that I have not myself gone into the value of these criminal statistics. I found the system in vogue when I came into office and I was informed that it was useful to statisticians, lawyers and others who are particularly interested in criminals and I left it in their hands.

Statistical Year-book, $4,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Would the hon. gentleman inform us what the Statistical Year-book cost in 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think it was about $4,000 in 1896.

Mr. INGRAM. Have you increased the number in circulation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice that the two items for the services that Mr. Geo. Johnson, the statistician, has charge of, that is the item for the collection of criminal statistics, and the item for the publication of the Year-book are the same now as they were in 1895 and 1896. This work certainly has increased in proportion to all the other services rendered by the hon. gentleman's department, but notwithstanding this fact, there is an increase in every other branch of from 50 to 100 per cent, while the votes for these services are not increased.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When I came into office in 1896 I found that expenditure. I found also that I was able by reducing the volume of the Statistical Year-book I was able to reduce the expenditure and if the hon. gentleman will go to the years 1898-1899, 1899-1900, he will find that we only spent $3,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. $3,200.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. $3,000 in 1899-1900. Last year it was $4,000, and it is $4,000 again this year.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how the distribution is made ? I understand that four copies are given to each member of this House, so many copies go to the Senate and certain institutions of learning, ministers of the gospel, and so on. Will the hon. gentleman tell how the distribution is made and in what proportion besides the distribution to members of this

House as well as the whole number published ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Johnson has a list of institutions and people who seem to be interested in the statistics comprised in this book. That list is occasionally gone over and occasionally added to. The increased number has been owing to the fact that recently, by request of this House, we have established a regular distribution to members of the House and the Senate. This book is not distributed in the same way as printed matter printed by order of this House. It is paid for by the vote of my department. Ordinary reports which are distributed wholesale to the members of the House of Commons are paid for by the House of Commons and are under the control of the House of Commons Printing Committee. This Year-book is not, but notwithstanding that we are asking in this vote a sum of money to print it and to distribute a certain number to every member of the House of Commons and every senator. The others are distributed to public libraries, mechanics' institutes, to some teachers, and to those who have asked for it. The list is in Mr. Johnson's hand, but I have no doubt I could get it. It would be very voluminous.

Mr. CLANCY. How many copies are issued ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Last year 5,000 English and 1,200 French. Four copies are sent to each member and senator. making about 1,200 copies, and the rest are distributed generally.

Mr. CLANCY. In what proportion ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say.

Mr. CLANCY. Then the item had better stand.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is only one copy sent to any particular body. Fifty copies are sent to the High Commissioner in London, and a considerable number are distributed on personal application.

Mr. CLANCY. My reason for asking is that some persons, for unaccountable reasons, seem to be in possession of the Year-book, while others seem unable to get it. There should be some uniform distribution and some system adopted. I would ask the item to stand.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will certainly consent to that, but I may say that I do not think that any application for the Year-book has been refused so long as there was a book available in the department. There has been no picking and choosing. There has been considerable demand for back numbers, but the English edition for 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896 is exhausted. There is now a greater demand for the French edition than in former years, but there are no copies of the French edition left for 1891, 1893, 1894 and 1895. I repeat that no applicant has been refused so long as there was a copy of the book left.

Mr. CLANCY. My object is to arrive at some uniform system of distribution, and with that object in view I want the information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Would it suit if I got a report from the statistician and sent it to the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. CLANCY. The minister is very anxious to get his estimates through and he should have all reasonable information ready to give us in the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Very well, I will let it stand.

Mr. WILSON. The Year-book is a very valuable document and it would be more valuable still and much more appreciated if it could be published earlier in the year. To get the information it contains, requires research in many other public documents, and when we get that information in the Year-book it is so old that it is comparatively valueless.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman himself gives the reason for the Year-book not being published earlier. The gentlemen who compile the Year-book have to go through the blue-books, which they cannot obtain until they are compared and finished, although as a matter of fact they get them before they are published. The blue-books of the last fiscal year are not generally ready to be placed in the hands of the statistician until the beginning of the year that follows. Last year the book was out very considerably earlier than it ever had been before, and the same will be true of this year.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). I am not going to raise a question about the figures, but I think our Year-book should be bound so that it may compare favourably with the year-books of the other colonies. The Year-book of New Zealand and the Australian colonies is well bound and presents a very pleasing appearance. I do not think that any member of this House will ever go through all the weary details of figures that we find in our Year-book. The practice in other countries is to give a chapter on important subjects such as butter and cheese-making, wool products, mining interests, agricultural interests, the fishing industry, and interesting information about the history and habits and progress of the natives. If some able writers in Canada were to treat on these different subjects in our Year-book, it would be of more value to ourselves and of far greater value when it is distri-

buted abroad. I throw out these suggestions in the hope that the minister may be able to adopt them.

Mr. HOLMES. My objection to this vote is that the amount is too small. Last year the discussion took the same trend, and I urged that the item should be increased, because I think the Year-book is so valuable that the more we can distribute it the better for the country. I would be glad if the minister could see his way to increase the vote in future years.

Mr. CLANCY. I would expect an objection to this from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). He worried this book for many years in this House on the ground that it was unreliable and of no value. If the hon. gentleman is not too modest now, I expect that he will object to further expenditure on the Year-book; unless indeed he has changed his mind with regard to this, as he has with regard to everything else.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman is slightly mistaken. I have not changed my mind in the slightest degree, as he will possibly find out before the session is over. With respect to the Year-book, I think there has been considerable improvement in it since it came under the management of my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher).

Mr. MACLEAN. Then the speech of last night is to have no effect.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Your speech.

Mr. MACLEAN. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I had not the pleasure of hearing it, but I understand it did great credit to my hon. friend's acquaintance with Scripture.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Item allowed to stand.

General statistics, $3,200.

Mr. INGRAM. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This has appeared in the estimates for many years. It is to pay temporary clerks engaged on statistical work ; but these clerks are about as permanent as any clerks in the department. Mr. Johnson finds work for them to do all the time.

Mr. CLANCY. Who is Mr. Washington, whose name appears in the Auditor General's Report as having received $722.31 for 124 days' services and for railway fares and other expenses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Washington is a gentleman who was employed to investigate certain statistics in regard to the trend of land values last year and the year before.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the nature of the service ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The service was to investigate and find out the trend of land values in the country parts of Canada.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that any person engaged for so short a time could give any definite or even approximate idea of land values ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, he must be a very clever gentleman. It is utterly imposible, as the hon. gentleman knows, for any person to obtain any fair notion of land values in the country in so limited a period. If we are to have statistical information of this kind, it ought to be reliable. I am not complaining of the item, but one can see at a glance that the information obtained under such circumstances must be so very limited as to be of no great value. Has he made a report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, yes. While I appreciate what the hon. gentleman says that a complete investigation of the trend of land values would be a very valuable affair, and would extend over a long period, what was done was this. Certain counties in the older provinces were taken, which were supposed to be fairly representative, and the registry offices of those counties were examined to show the sales of land at different periods, and in that way a fair criterion was obtained of what was generally the case throughout the country.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows that it is not a new thing in this House to cite the increase or decrease of land values as showing the failure or the success of the existing government. I suppose the hon. gentleman has in his possession the report of Mr. Washington, showing the number of registry offices examined throughout Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and I shall be very glad to lay the report on the Table if I have not already done so. I am rather under the impression that I laid it on the Table last session.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought a good deal of this information was got from the Ontario Bureau of Industries.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The information which we got was not obtained there.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that when it was proposed to supply these general statistics, that was one of the sources from which they were expected to be obtained, and the reason was that the work could be done cheaply.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this Mr. Washington provided with any transportation by the department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. His expenses were paid when he travelled.

Mr. INGRAM. I see that his railway fares amounted to $54.67. It would be impossible for a man to examine the registry offices of Ontario for that amount. He must have relied upon correspondence.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. There were only some registry offices selected.

Mr. INGRAM. But I doubt whether he could do that in the province of Ontario alone at so small an expense. Were these inquiries confined to one province ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I think he went to three counties in Ontario, to one or two in Quebec, and to one or two in the maritime provinces. I know he was in Prince Edward Island, and I think he examined a county in Nova Scotia.

Mr. INGRAM. Could the hon. minister state the counties he examined ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not off-hand. The report contains that information.

Mr. INGRAM. Because I think it would be unfair to the counties which were not visited. I know that some counties flatter themselves as being the garden of Ontario. If only three were picked out, it would not be a very good way of obtaining reliable information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Carleton county, I know, was one.

Mr. WILSON. Who selected the counties which he was to visit and report upon ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did myself.

Mr. INGRAM. At whose recommendation was this gentleman engaged ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know that he was recommended by anybody. I think I proposed the idea myself.

Mr. INGRAM. Who is this Mr. Washington ? Is he a relative of the late George Washington ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say. I never looked into his genealogy.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has he been permanently appointed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, only for particular work.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where did he reside before he came to Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not say.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did he simply come to Ottawa and ask for the position and obtain it without showing any qualification ? Was he recommended by Mr. Johnson the statistician ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister says that the inspiration to appoint such an officer came from himself. As it was he who inspired the idea, he must have known who this gentleman was and where he came from. Did he come from the hon. gentleman's own riding ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, he did not. I never knew the gentleman until I met him here at Ottawa and do not know where he came from.

Mr. BENNETT. Are we to understand that he was a casual visitor who dropped in on the minister just as the inspiration came to him, just as the minister conceived the idea of appointing such an official, and having dropped on the minister at the phsycological moment, got the appointment?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Washington is a gentleman who has been engaged for years in statistical investigation. When I first met him we had a discussion on statistical work. I believe he was at one time in the press gallery, but I did not inquire particularly into his antecedents.

Mr. BENNETT. Was he on the Montreal 'Herald' ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think he ever was connected with the Montreal 'Herald,' and I cannot remember who introduced him to me, but I have known him a good many years and have frequently discussed statistical work with him.

Mr. COCHRANE. When was he in the press gallery ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know. Some years ago.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman seems rather hazy about this appointment of this mythical gentleman who bears a very distinguished name. He does not know who introduced him or how he came to know him. All he remembers is that Mr. Washington was engaged in statistical work. Where was he engaged in such work and how ? Was it under Mr. Johnson ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Did Mr. Johnson recommend his appointment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think he did.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, this man is putting into the statistical Year-book information utterly worthless as the hon. gentleman must admit himself, and there cannot fail to be a lurking suspicion in the House that Mr. Washington, although he may be a very estimable gentleman, was, in a party sense, a lame duck who had to be taken care of. I might venture to guess that Mr. Washington will disclose in his report a very extraordinary advance in land values since the hon. gentleman came into power.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Naturally.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman give any other reason for the appointment ?

Mr. BLAIN. His appointment was about the time of the general elections.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Washington began the work about three years ago. It was rather intermittent.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the hon. minister ever read any of Mr. Washington's tracts on free trade ? I am informed that he was a gentleman of a literary turn of mind and that he published in the days of old tracts on free trade. Did the hon. gentleman ever read them ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I never did. Perhaps I did not need the enlightenment.

Mr. GANONG. Will the hon. minister tell his nationality ? This government has been appointing United States citizens to office and the name is very suggestive of that citizenship.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should say he is an Englishman from what I have seen of him.

Mr. SPROULE. The information given in this statistical record must of necessity be very unreliable. Every one knows that the differences in value among different counties in Ontario are so great that you could never get a fair approximate estimate by taking only three centres. In some counties around Toronto land is worth $100 per acre, and in other counties it is worth only from $10 to $40 per acre. You can scarcely find two counties in which the values are alike. In some they are very high and in others very low, and to strike an average from three counties, and give that as an average of the whole, is absurd.

Item allowed to stand.

Aid to agricultural societies, $7,000.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not a large sum. What is the nature of the service ? It is a service which I think ought to be increased.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This money is for the purpose of aiding agricultural societies in the North-west Territories. Ordinarily these societies are supported by the provincial government, but as the North-west Territory has no provincial government, this government many years ago stepped in and granted this money. It is paid through the agency of the territorial government, to the different societies according to their membership. The amount is distributed among 23 societies.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there any increase in the number of agricultural societies ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The local authorities there have been rather hoping to decrease the number of agricultural societies by getting two or three to join together and so make a stronger organization. The same amount of money has been paid out to societies actually fulfiling certain conditions required, mainly with regard to membership.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister knows better than I can explain to him that that country is growing rapidly and that agriculture is its chief interest. This item, it seems to me, is entirely inadequate for the important service for which it is intended. It is a mere beggarly sum for such a service. If the people there prefer to consolidate their societies, the result, no doubt, will be commendable as making the organizations much stronger. But that is no reason for voting so small a sum for this most important work. I, for one, would be prepared to support the hon. minister in vastly increasing it.

Mr. WILSON. Would the hon. minister tell us in what proportions this money is distributed ? Some societies seem to get much more than others.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The money is distributed in proportion to the membership of the several societies.

Mr. WILSON. Are these societies on a basis of paid membership ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They must have a certain paid membership—I think the number is fifty—before they can be accepted as efficient societies under this vote.

Mr. LANCASTER. How does the hon. minister get the information on which the payments to societies are based ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That detail is managed by the Agriculture Department of the Territories. The societies must send to that department a statement of their membership before they can receive any money.

Experimental farms, $80,000.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the hon. minister to allow that item to stand. It is a very large item and involves a great deal.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Very well.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Before we pass from that item, I would like to say to the Minister of Agriculture that, when it comes up for further consideration, I intend to direct attention to the necessity of making experiments in the North-west Territories in the growing of beet root for sugar purposes.

Item allowed to stand.

Printing and distributing of reports and bulletins of farms, $4,000.

Mr. CLANCY. How many of these reports are sent out, and what is the number printed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is a special vote, which is practically added to the Experimental Farm vote so as to enable the farms to put out a large number of bulletins for the information of farmers from time to time.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that if names are supplied by hon. members to the department the parties whose names are thus given will be supplied with bulletins.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a list at the Central Experimental Farm of something like 50,000 names of persons, to all of whom these bulletins are sent. That list we try to keep up to date as much as possible. Anybody who asks, can have his name put on that list. Members of the House frequently send in names.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice that, in the estimates of 1895-6, this item of printing of bulletins and distribution of seed grains, trees and shrubs amounts to only $2,000. The hon. minister now asks for $4,000. How does this increase come about ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware of any increase in this item, and am surprised to hear what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) says. I cannot but think that he is in error. Of course, I have not the estimates of 1895-6 before me.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have them here and will send them to the hon. minister.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I confess I cannot explain the point. I am pretty certain that when I came into office this item was $4,000. The estimates the hon. gentleman has sent me are those of 1895-6, and the increase may have been made the year I came into office.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is the printing done ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At the Printing Bureau—all of it.

Mr. SPROULE. There was an arrangement some years ago under which every member of a farmers' institute received these bulletins. Is that continued ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That arrangement never existed.

Mr. SPROULE. I feel sure it did, for I have attended meetings at which the speakers sent out by the government urged those present to join farmers institutes, giving this as an inducement.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is thinking of the Ontario Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SPROULE. No, of both, I know that on several occasions a number joined the institute for this very reason. They were told that they would receive not only the bulletins of the Experimental Farm at Guelph, but those of the Dominion Experimental Farms as well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I dare say the hon. gentleman is quite correct as to what was said. I know that Ontario speakers frequently talked in that way; and, whenever lists of names were sent in those names were added to the list at the Experimental Farm. But, frequently, large numbers of the names sent in were already on our list. Neither since my time nor before, has it been the rule to put the names of members of farmers' institutes or any local societies, ipso facto, on our list. It has been found, as a general rule, that these names are already on our list. But if any of these members ask to be put on our list they are put on individually.

Mr. SPROULE. Our whole membership list was sent in.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That list would be compared with the list at the farm, and any names not found there would be added.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to know what other distribution is made of the farm report. This only refers to the bulletins, as I understand, in connection with the Experimental Farm. But there is an agricultural report and an Agricultural Committee report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The farm has nothing to do with these, the House deals with them. This vote is simply for the printing of the bulletins, and for the cost of distribution of the bulletins and and also of the report. But this does not pay for the printing of the report. The report that is laid on the Table is printed by order of the House. This $4,000 pays for sending out about 50,000 copies. When you come to mail 50,000 copies of a pamphlet, or a volume as thick as this, it costs something.

Mr. CLARKE. Why is that not done at the Bureau ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The farm has the list, and the work has always been done there.

Mr. CLARKE. Could not the work be done more expeditiously at the Bureau ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so. It is better done under the supervision of the farm officers. They are the people who have to make up the lists, and to correct them, and if the distribution was done at the Bureau they would have to be constantly sending corrections to the Bureau. It would be a very awkward arrangement.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that this only applies to the bulletin ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It applies to the printing of the bulletin, also to the distribution and mailing of the same.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about seed grain and shrubs ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is paid for out of the $80,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Probably the minister could inform us as to the mode of sending these out from the farm. How are these reports sent out from the farm for which an expenditure of $4,000 is asked here ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the first place the great bulk of this money is spent for printing the bulletin, and the rest of it is spent to pay people for mailing it, men who mail not only the bulletin, but the report. There are 50,000 odd copies of the report and 50,000 odd copies of each bulletin sent out. I do not mean to say that every bulletin is sent out to that number, but the ordinary bulletins which apply to farmers generally are sent out to the number of over 50,000. They have a printed list like that of a newspaper, and each name is cut off the list and put on by a machine which is used in the office of the farm.

Mr. CLARKE. From information I have obtained I am rather strengthened in the opinion that if these documents were sent to the Bureau with the lists, the work could be done there much more expeditiously and more economically. If the hon. gentleman will inquire into the method of large newspaper offices sending out their papers, he will find that persons employed in that work become expert.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not likely anybody could be more expert than the men at the farm who are doing this work. They send out every year from 300,000 to 400,000 copies. They are practically engaged in that work the year round, and they are as likely to be expert as anybody the hon. gentleman could find. They employ the same system as is employed in newspaper offices, although of course they do not send out as many copies as large city newspapers.

Mr. CLARKE. How many men are employed at this work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Two.

Mr. SPROULE. How is this list of the report kept up from year to year ? Is it revised periodically ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is revised not only from year to year, but constantly. A notice is sent to every postmaster in the country asking him to notify the farm when any of these reports or bulletins fail to reach the person to whom they are addressed, that is to say, if they are not called for or refused. It is almost unknown that any are refused, but people who die or remove from place to place fail to call for their reports, and postmasters are requested by special notice to inform the Bureau whenever that occurs, and then the name is stricken off the list. In addition, we constantly get reminders from people about their reports, and correspondents of the farm frequently ask us to replace some names by others. The result is that changes of address are constantly taking place. We are always glad to receive such information from the members of parliament or others.

Mr. MONK. Does this item cover the cost of printing the departmental report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has nothing to do with it.

Mr. SPROULE. A system was adopted a few years ago which I thought was a very good one in connection with the distribution of these reports and bulletins. A copy of the list was sent to each member of the House, and he was asked to go over it and revise it according to his knowledge of the persons on the list. In looking over the list in my riding I found a good many changes had to be made. I think that with all the means the minister is taking to keep the list correct, he will still find that many of these reports are sent to people who are dead or have left the country. It ought to be revised in some other way from time to time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are doing that constantly, but unfortunately a good many members of parliament do not take the trouble to help us.

Mr. MONK. Has the departmental report been printed at the Bureau this year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, it always has been.

Classifying all Canadian patents, and preparing drawings of same for classification and exchanged with the United States in return for their patents, to be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $5,000.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman promised to give us some information as to the number of clerks employed, the salaries paid, the number of exchanges made with the United States, and so on. I would like him to explain a number of items here, and first I will ask his attention to the item of $4,-821.48 on page D—2 of the Auditor General's Report, and to another item of $9,900 on page D—10.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What is the other item ?

Mr. CLANCY. The first is D—2 and the second D—10.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are the same item. The one at D—10 contains the details of the one at D—2.

Mr. CLANCY. Ah, but it is more ; one is $9,000 and the other is $4,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One is $4,821.48. This is the only item in this vote, and the details of that are at page D—10, under the heading of 'Classification of Patents'.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see that the principal cost, here, at D—10, is for lithographing and printing, while the other is paid under the head of 'Classification' and amounts to $4,821.48.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is the same work. Classification requires lithographing and printing. The practise is this ; we had 60 odd thousand patents in the department which were not classified in any way. They were filed on shelf after shelf without classification. The result was that when an application came in for a patent, the patent examiner had to trust to his memory, or to his general knowledge, to find any patent which he thought might clash with that of the application. I found that at Washington there was a very good classification ; that is to say patents were divided into general classes and these again into several classes. I have not the technical knowledge to describe the method employed, but hon. gentlemen can quite understand how mechanical patents would be in one class, which would be divided again into a class containing the different classes of machinery, the chemical class, the electrical class and so on. In a report made by the examiners of that day, I was requested to make a classification of Canadian patents as being a necessary thing for the easy and proper investigation of every new application. I explained that item at the time I first asked for this vote, and I set the most experienced patent examiner, Mr. Caron, at that work. He has been at it ever since and he has made progress to the extent, speaking from memory, of having completed about three-quarters of the work. In that connection we found it was necessary for two reasons to take photographs and have duplicate copies of the plans, or designs, or drawings of the patents which had been applied for and in that way we were obliged to take photographs of these old patents and these are to be put into folios in the classification. A great deal of this work has been work of a photographing or lithographing nature. In this connection I would say that at the same time we were doing this we were exchanging with the Washington authorities our classification for theirs. On the occasion of the visit of the deputy commissioner of patents, Mr. Scarth, an arrangement was made with the Washington people by which they were to send us copies of their classification and we were to send them copies of ours. The Washington classification is the one that is most needed by our patent examiners of all classifications because, in a great many instances, I think in about three-quarters of the instances, patents applied for here are also applied for in Washington, and when a man applies for a patent here it is more necessary for our examiners to find out whether it has been anticipated in Washington than to find out whether it has been anticipated in any other foreign country. We therefore arranged not only to take photographs for our own use here but also to send two copies to Washington in exchange for which we were to have copies of their classifications. I regret to say that recently the authorities of the Washington patent office have ceased to send their classification. They kept it up for a while, then they began to drop off little by little and quite lately they have told me that they cannot longer continue it as they have not a sufficient vote to enable them to make that expenditure. I was surprised at this, I was very much disappointed indeed, because it was a distinct, although an informal arrangement, made with them. They carried it out for two or three years and it has been of very great use to us but unfortunately they gradually dropped off. I inquired of the commissioner of patents there officially in regard to the matter and he has informed me that he was no longer able to continue the arrangement. Still, we go on with our own classification and I think it will take fully another year to finish all the arrears of patents which have never been classified before. There will always be a little of this work going on in the classification of the 5,000 or 6,000 patents which are issued every year. Of course, they are classified as they are issued. This is the reason why we have to pay out money for paper, photographing and so on.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has raised a very important question respecting foreigners who are seeking patents in Can-

ada. If I am rightly informed the life of a patent in Canada is the life of that patent in a foreign country, say the United States. For instance, if a patent expires in five years in the United States I understand that the life of that patent will not extend beyond that time in Canada. I am speaking now generally rather from hearsay than from any explicit information I have myself. If there be anything in what I have just said, the hon. gentleman will see, as he has seen long ago, no doubt, the importance of being furnished by the United States with all the information that will enable the office in Canada to place that limit that I understand is already placed on an American patent; namely, that when it expires in the country where it originated, it expires in Canada. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state whether I am correct in the information I have given in regard to it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is true that a patent expires in Canada when it expires in a foreign country ipso facto. As a rule we have patents here issued almost simultaneously with those of the United States. A patent cannot be issued here one year, I think it is, after it is issued anywhere else.

Mr. WILSON. What regulation is there in the United States with reference to that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot give any information off-hand about the United States law, but I think it is about the same as ours. The actual time allowed may be a little different. As a matter of fact the life of a patent in the United States is seventeen years and in this country it is eighteen years. If you were to get a patent in the United States to-day it would expire 17 years from to-morrow, and if you were to get a patent in Canada to-day, it would expire 18 years from to-morrow, but if it expired in the United States at the end of 17 years, it would expire here also.

Mr. CLANCY. How does the office in Canada manage, since the American patent office has refused, or neglected, to furnish the classification, for the office in Canada must to a very great extent be in ignorance of the time at which a patent was taken out in the United States?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The classification is not a record of patents, or anything of that kind. The classification is for the purpose of facilitating the search by the examiners of old patents so as to see whether a new application has been anticipated or has been already patented. We have the record of all the patents issued in the United States. It comes to us and it has always come to us. We have all the records of the United States patent office in our office, and therefore we have available the exact date of every patent issued in the United States and consequently we know the date of its expiry by the laws of the United States. But the classification is another thing, and it is a description of the patent or the pictures of the plans of the patent to enable the examiners when a new application comes in, to look up the classification of the United States as well as of Canada to see whether a certain invention has already been patented.

Mr. CLANCY. How many are employed in the classification?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Caron is the patent examiner, and he gets $500 a year for the expert work required, in addition to his salary as clerk. When this work was undertaken he was practically the only specialist in the department able to discharge the duties which were far more important and intricate than the work of an examiner. His salary was then $1,400 and I gave him $600 extra, but he has been getting statutory increases since and I have reduced the $600 to $500. The other employees are Mr. Kilgallin $700, Mr. Bourrett, $625, Mr. Brown $550, Mr. Rae $500, Mrs. Brunet $400, Mr. Proulx $300, Mr. Foley $365 and Mr. Desjardins, who is also a clerk, gets an extra allowance of $50. This amounts to $4,115 and there is $600 spent on photographing paper, $75 in stationery, and $210 in sundry small items.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the 'Patent Record' printed in the Bureau?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Agriculture asks $12,000 for the 'Patent Record' besides a new item of $5,000 that was not in the estimates in 1895-96. This makes a total expenditure of $17,000 for the 'Patent Record,' whereas the Conservative government did exactly the same service for $9,250 according to the estimates of 1895-96. There we have an increase of $7,750 in this item.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. In the first place the classification has nothing to do with the 'Patent Record,' and in the second place the Conservative government did not classify the patents at all. That work was commenced in 1897.

Mr. TAYLOR. And you are asking $5,000 additional for that, and increasing the old vote by $2,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is because of the increase in the number of patents. When there are 5,000 patents, it takes more to print the book than when there were 3,000, and in addition to that the trade marks and designs are included in the 'Patent Record' now, which was not the case in 1895-6. I was asked

by members of the House to include them, and I thought it right to do so, but it adds to the expense of issuing the volume.

Mr. CLANCY. Where is the lithographing done ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In a room in the Langevin block.

Mr. CLANCY. Under the control of the department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. You mean with regard to the classification ?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Fumigating stations, $3,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Although the amount of this item is small, it is still very important and the committee should have full information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am ready to give as full information as I can. The hon. gentleman is aware of the origin of this work. Some years ago parliament passed a law prohibiting the importation of any nursery stock from any country where the San José scale was known. This prohibition lasted for about two years without relaxation, and an amendment was then passed by which nursery stock was permitted to be imported at certain ports of entry designated by Order in Council on the condition that it should be carefully fumigated. This sum is for the carrying out of that law. Nursery stock is allowed by the Order in Council passed under that Act, to come in during a certain season of the year at St. John, N.B., St. Johns, P.Q., Niagara Falls and Windsor, Ont., Winnipeg, Man.,and Vancouver, B.C. At each of these ports there is a small building made as nearly air tight as possible and a man is employed there during certain months of the year who takes the stock from the customs, puts it in the air chamber, fumigates it with hydrocyanic acid and then sends it back to customs. This has been carried on for two seasons and has been found to work on the whole very satisfactorily. There have been many requests that the period for importation should be lengthened, but the Order in Council was drawn up on the advice of the experts of my department, and I believe that the time is sufficiently long for people who pay attention to their work to import what they find necessary. The relaxation of the original San José Act was due to the request of growers of trees and shrubs in this country to enable them to import certain varieties, in some instances which they could not get in this country. It was also due to their demand that they would be allowed to have some check, so to speak, on the growers of nursery stock in this country who at that time were hardly able to meet the market demand.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see from his experience that good came of the necessity. It has been the means of largely increasing the growth of nursery stock in Canada. Whether or not that stock is entirely free from the San José scale is yet an open question. It has no doubt come to the notice of the hon. gentleman that there is a murmur throughout the country that either from imperfect examination at the fumigation station, or from the rapid spread of the insect in Canada, it is becoming more dangerous all the time, to such an extent that in some directions people are somewhat discouraged at the prospect. I fully approve of the measures that were taken with regard to nursery stock imported into Canada ; but there is the greater question as to how we are to deal with the insect as it is now planted on Canadian soil. The hon. gentleman and the Ontario government made some efforts to stamp it out, either working together or working separately, I am not prepared to say ; and some orchards were cut down in the face of almost open rebellion against the conduct of the two governments. It seems, however, that the whole matter has come to a standstill. I am told, although I am not prepared to vouch for the correctness of the statement, that forest trees are becoming infected with the insect. I believe it was stated at one of the meetings of the Agricultural Committee last year, that that was not the case ; but I have made some inquiries since, and I am told that many forest trees have become infected with this insect. If that is true, it becomes a very serious matter, and I am sure nothing would be more welcome to the committee than to have some intimation from the hon. gentleman as to what his policy is for dealing with this very important matter in the future.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am very glad to meet the hon. gentleman's wishes. First, I would like to say, not in connection but in amplification of what he has said, that while the Ontario government has done something towards stamping out the scale in the province of Ontario, this government and my department have had nothing whatever to do with that part of the work, which has been entirely under the control of the provincial authorities and their officers. The work which we have done in my department has been two-fold : First, by means of the San José Scale Act, to prevent the importation of the scale into this country from abroad—that was the object of this vote ; and, secondly, by means of the officers of the Experimental Farm—through Mr. Saunders, the head of that establishment, who is himself a horticulturist, a botanist and an entomologist ; through Mr. Fletcher, who is the entomologist and botanist of the farm, and through

Mr. Macoun, who is the horticulturist of the farm we have been spreading information among the fruit-growers and tree-growers of the country in regard to the dangers of the San José scale and the best treatment for exterminating or checking it. That has been the work of my department. Now, I think I may safely say that there is hardly any San José scale, if any at all, in any part of the Dominion of Canada except in the province of Ontario. It is barely possible that there may be a little in the province of British Columbia, but the people there say that it has been entirely stamped out, and I am disposed to believe them. We are not aware of a single instance in the province of Quebec or in the maritime provinces. In the province of Ontario the provincial authorities have passed laws and issued regulations which have been fairly effective. They have been trying to stamp out the disease in some instances by cutting down the trees and burning them, and in other instances by elaborate methods of fumigation. They have been checking it by the regulation that all nursery stock grown in the province of Ontario must be fumigated by hydrocyanic acid gas before being issued from the nursery. If the fumigation is properly conducted—and the report of the officers is that it is—it effectually kills any scale that may exist on nursery stock; and I think I am safe in saying, what I have stated frequently—and I have been supported and corroborated by experts, that the San José scale is not being spread by nursery stock grown in the province of Ontario. I do not believe that the stock sent out from the province of Ontario can carry the scale after the treatment it universally receives before it is issued. The scale does spread most wonderfully by the ordinary means of spreading disease or insect life, and in days gone by it has spread somewhat considerably in certain parts in the province of Ontario, but only in that province. I am happy to understand, from the reports of those who have been inspecting it of late, that the methods of fighting the scale have been very much improved, and that if the proprietors of orchards and forest trees and shrubs choose to carry out properly and effectively the instructions given to them by the entomologists and botanists, they can destroy it. Unfortunately, however, these gentlemen are human, like the rest of us, and a great many do not attend to their work properly, while others do not attend to it at all. So that occasionally no doubt the scale will get on forest trees. If this kind of thing goes on, the scale will perhaps increase in certain parts; but any one who chooses to carry out the instructions given by experts on the subject can stamp it out and keep his orchards and small fruits free of it.

Mr CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will remember that Professor Fletcher stated that there were two methods of meeting the difficulty. One was to use certain solutions on the trees, and the other was to fumigate with hydrocyanic acid gas. The latter method, however, was said to be so expensive although the really effectual method of destroying the insect that it would not be generally adopted. Therefore, the milder and less effective method was being pursued, and while it served as a sort of check, there was no assurance that it was stamping out the disease.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The treatment by hydrocyanic acid is very difficult in the case of large trees and very expensive. The cost and the trouble makes it almost prohibitory. That method is used in fumigating nursery stock and small bushes, which can be easily covered and effectively fumigated.

Mr. CLANCY. Where is the nursery stock fumigated ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is only fumigated in Ontario. There is none grown anywhere else where we are aware of any scale being in existence. That work is done by the nursery men at their own nurseries under the inspection of an officer of the Ontario government. The fumigation stations only deal with importations and have nothing to do with nursery stock grown in this country. As regards the methods of destroying the scale, the fumigation by hydrocyanic acid gas of large trees is a very difficult, expensive and troublesome operation, and, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred would probably not be effective. But no doubt the hydrocyanic gas is absolute death to the scale wherever the scale is touched by it. The ordinary method of spraying petroleum or whale oil is much more easy and cheaper and can be applied by anybody. It is not as effective as fumigation but is none the less a very effective method of dealing with the scale. While in one treatment all the scales might not be destroyed, any one who would take the trouble to spray the trees several times will effectively destroy them.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at Eight o'clock.

Towards compiling historical data in regard to the Acadian families in Canada, $1,400.

Mr. HACKETT. Might I ask how this work is proceeding ? There is no more interesting work, or one that could be more advantageous to Canada than ascertaining and compiling information with regard to the old Acadian families. We know that after the expulsion of the Acadians from Grand Pré, they were scattered all over the maritime provinces, and of their des-

cendents, many hardly knew who their ancestors were. I do not criticise the vote, but I would like to know when we may expect the report. The matter is in the hands of an able gentleman and one who will carry out the work faithfully.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The work has been going on steadily. The gentleman in charge of it, Mr. Gaudet, has spent a considerable time in the maritime provinces investigating and making notes. For some little time he has been in Ottawa compiling his notes and preparing the book. He has not yet placed in my hands any portion of the work, but I understand, from what he tells me, that the work has been progressing satisfactorily. I have no definite information to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett), but as Mr. Gaudet is in town, I could without doubt, learn from him anything that might be desired by hon. members. The work has not progressed quite so fast as I had expected. Mr. Gaudet informs me that there has been more work than he anticipated, that he has had more travelling to do, and more work of investigation, if I may call it so, though that is not the right word, than was originally expected. As his work proceeded he found new facts which led to further investigation. This item covers $1,200 for salary, at the rate of $100 per month, and an allowance of $200 per year for travelling expenses when moving about.

Mr. MONK. I think that it is desirable that we should have communication of the results of the labour of this gentleman as they advance. We had, in the province of Quebec, a gentleman who made a similar compilation in respect of the old French families, and, from time to time, he gave the public the results of his investigation. I do not know how long the work under this item has been going on, but I think it is most desirable that we should have part of the results as they are gathered. Has the hon. minister any objection to that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the work in shape to communicate to the House, but I will see if it is not possble to have a volume put in form for publication as soon as possible. I quite agree that it is desirable that this should be done.

Mr. TAYLOR. When did this item first appear in the estimates ? How long has the work been going on ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the item now before us is the third one. That is, the work has been going on during the current year and the last year.

Mr. CLANCY. Before we pass to the next item, I desire to ask a question with regard to the Glasgow Exhibition and the Pan-American Exposition at Buffalo. Have the votes for these exhibitions been exhausted, or will the House be asked later on to vote a further sum to clean up matters ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The amount voted for the Glasgow Exhibition, I believe, will cover the whole expenditure. The amount voted in the original item and in the supplementary item made a total of $66,000, if I remember well, and the commissioner has informed me that he expects to pay everything with this amount, though he will have little to spare if any. As to the Buffalo Exposition, $50,000 was voted for that service, and I expect to bring down an item in the supplementary estimates for the current year to cover some additional expenditure.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Will not this come up under the next item ?

Mr. CLANCY. No; but if the hon. minister wishes to put the item, I will discuss it later on.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I am perfectly willing to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) all the information I can now.

Mr. CLANCY. What I wish to point out is that the hon. minister's main estimates are rather misleading to the country. He pretends that there has been a reduction of $20,000 in the expenditure on this service of arts, agriculture and allow me—the estimates we are now disclose there is to be no further expenditure but——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will allow me—the estimates we are now discussing are for the next fiscal year, and there will be no item in the estimates for the next fiscal year for the Pan-American Exposition. That item will be in the supplementaries for the current year. Therefore, the statement as it appears in this item is correct.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, there will be no item in these estimates under which we can discuss the Pan-American Exposition ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It can be discussed on the item in the supplementary estimates for 1901-2.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. minister have any objection to stating what he did with the Canadian building at the Pan-American ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was sold.

Mr. BENNETT. Who exercised supervision over these expenditures at the Glasgow Fair ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. W. D. Scott.

Mr. BENNETT. And who is Mr. James Brodie ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was appointed secretary to the Glasgow Exhibition. He is a gentleman from the city of Quebec. He has shown the most excellent capacity for work of this kind, so much so that I have appointed him secretary for the Wolverhampton Exhibition this season.

Mr. BENNETT. At page D-14 of the Auditor General's Report appears a detailed statement of the expenditure in connection with the Glasgow Fair, and it seems to me that there are items there that ought not to be charged to the country. When this Mr. Brodie started off on an expedition of this kind, I should think he ought to have provided himself with his own travelling bag. We find here that he charged the country $12 for a travelling bag, kit bag, I presume he meant. Further on 'portfolio, $8.' The whole bill throughout seems to me to have been on a most extravagant style. Then I contend that these gentlemen were not treated fairly. For instance, Mr. Brodie had a living allowance of $6 per day.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That included his pay.

Mr. BENNETT. Then there were other gentlemen, for instance, Col. O'Brien was allowed $5 a day for living expenses. Coming down to Mr. Scott, I think Mr. Scott has great cause of complaint against the government. He, apparently, was not afforded sufficient means to enable him to keep up his position, because I find this item: 'Grub on boat, $7.78.' Perhaps the minister can explain that item. Surely, if we have men going abroad let us pay their expenses decently, and not limit them on an ocean trip to $7.78 for grub.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose he had a big appetite.

Mr. BENNETT. All through these accounts are such items as tips for porters, tips for waiters, and that sort of thing, stewards on the steamers. It seems to me when these gentlemen are allowed such liberal expenses as $5 and $6 per day, they can pay petty tips out of their own pockets. It may of course appear light to the minister that these men should travel in this style, but to the ordinary taxpayer it must be a matter of comment that, allowing them $5 and $6 a day, they are still permitted to indulge in all these extravagances. No doubt as one of these gentlemen was to have charge of the expenditure everything went according to his taste. I hope that when Mr. Brodie goes to Wolverhampton, as the minister states he will, he will not ask the country to pay for one or two travelling bags for himself.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The living allowance was paid to these gentlemen when they were in Glasgow. The usual incidental expenses of transportation to and from, they are paid for over and above; but when they were on board the boat or travelling, their living allowance was not allowed.

Mr. BENNETT. How is it some of these only had their ship fare paid one way ? In the case of Col. O'Brien, 'Portland to Liverpool, $60'; in Mr. Brodie's case, 'Portland to Liverpool and return, $108.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As a matter of fact that ticket is still good, because Mr. Brodie is still in England. I have no doubt if the ticket is not available or good when he does come back, he will get a refund.

Mr. BENNETT. Why were not the others paid their fares both ways ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think they were, those that came back.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister told us that the Canadian building at the Pan-American was sold. What did he realize for it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say off-hand, I have not the details of that vote here. It was a very small sum, a few hundred dollars. Practically it was given away. I will bring down the information.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you recollect to whom it was given away ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was not given away, but it was sold for so little you might call it given away.

Mr. INGRAM. Have the Canadian government any idea of taking part in the St. Louis Exhibition, and could not this building be utilized for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am afraid the expense of transfer from one place to another would be a good deal more than the buildings are worth. When they were built the St. Louis Fair was not even started. I may mention here that I have been authorized by council to accept the invitation which has been extended by the authorities of St. Louis to Canada to participate in that exhibition, which will take place in 1903.

Mr. CLANCY. From the appearance of the Canadian building at Buffalo the country will not be astonished to learn that it did not bring much. I have no hesitation in saying, Mr. Chairman, that the Canadian building was a perfect disgrace to Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh.

Mr. CLANCY. I appreciate the hon. gentleman's difficulty in securing a location.

He was much in the hands of the authorities there, and perhaps could not help himself. I am not disposed to find fault with that, although it is a regrettable matter that the building was not better located. But those who attended that exhibition could not help but be impressed with the poor appearance of the Canadian building. The smallest state in the union had a more presentable building than we had. I think there is nothing more damaging than to be beggarly, if that was the reason of it. When Canada was taking part in an exhibition of the continent of America, it should not have been behind any state in the union. If we could afford to expend any sum of money in the interest of Canada we should at least have expended enough to make a respectable appearance. Why, Sir, that building looked more like a barn than anything else. I could find horse stables in Canada that had a better appearance. It was not so bad inside, but outside the appearance of that building must have stamped Canadians as a set of people a generation behind the times. Now, I repudiate any idea of that kind. But I think it is not creditable to the management of the hon. gentleman that he permitted a building for Canadian exhibitors to be shown to the whole world as the most shabby building upon the whole ground. There were buildings not so large by some of the states, but they were all tastefully got up, they were presentable. While I think that great care should always be taken in the expenditure of public money, I know nothing of greater importance on such occasions than to present an appearance in keeping with our position. I think we have lost reputation in consequence of that building, if we did not redeem ourselves by other means, namely, by our splendid exhibits that came from all the provinces, and particularly from Ontario, and which gave all Canadians a very laudable pride. But the disgraceful part of it was the shabby appearance of the Canadian building.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). I think the building was a credit to Canada. I had the pleasure of attending the Pan-American twice. I went through that building, and I am satisfied that there was no building on the ground more creditable than that building was to Canada. The way it was fitted up inside and the display that was made in it, was something grand, and every man I spoke to was proud to think that Canada made such a showing.

Mr. CLANCY. I confess I have not that practised eye for architectural beauty that my hon. friend has who lives on the back concessions. I will venture to say that there is not an intelligent man in Canada who will support his opinion. I call upon the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) an experienced judge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not a judge.

Mr. CLANCY. No, but I have no hesitation in saying that the Minister of Public Works would not be prepared to say that if Canada made an exhibit there at all it included the building as well as the contents, and the building ought to be of high order. My hon. friend knows that it had a shingled roof on it, without paint, as other buildings had, and when the hon. gentleman says that it was a credit to Canada, then we will have to ascribe that entirely to his exalted taste, which is at variance with that of every half-cultured gentleman in this country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I fear that I must set myself down as having no intelligence, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman. But I was very much surprised at his strictures upon the Canadian building at Buffalo. I myself have heard very many encomiums made on the style of architecture and the suitability of the building for such purpose. It is true it had a shingle roof, but I think that if the hon. gentleman will examine a great many of the other buildings at Buffalo he will find that they have shingle roofs, too. If he will examine many of the most beautiful and artistic buildings of the present day he will find that they have shingle roofs. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the situation of the building in the Buffalo grounds.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not criticise that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has not criticized that, but I want to point out to him that the situation was for business purposes an extremely good one. The situation was near the exhibits at the exhibition buildings and especially near to where the agricultural exhibits, in which Canada was most largely engaged, were placed. The other state buildings, which the hon. gentleman has compared with it, were placed away at an outside corner of the grounds, a place which would have been extremely inconvenient for Canadian visitors or exhibitors to make their rendezvous or headquarters. As a matter of fact at the end of the Pan-American exhibition there was a gathering of the different state commissioners and they severely took to task the exhibition authorities for having placed their state buildings in such an unsatisfactory situation. They instanced the situation of the Canadian building as being so superior to that in which the state buildings were placed and said that it was an unfair advantage which had been given to Canada, an unfair advantage due to my own insistence that the Canadian building should not be placed among the state buildings.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman was wise in not putting it among the state buildings.

Mr. INGRAM. Who is H. C. Bride, the architect? Is he an American or a Canadian architect?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is an architect, of London, Ont.

Mr. INGRAM. I see that he received $1,300 in fees. What was the total of the fees he received for his work in connection with that building?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot, off-hand, say what the total would be. I will give you the total when I come down with the supplementary vote. Mr. Bride got the usual architectural fees with the addition of some travelling expenses for having to go to Buffalo and spend some time there arranging the contracts for the building.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be a critic of the building; in fact, it was scarcely completed when I saw it. My attention was drawn more to the character of what I saw inside. I thought that if the furniture in that building was intended to be an exhibit of Canadian furniture, it should have been of a higher order. I think I mentioned this to the gentleman in charge at the time. I thought it was a grand opportunity to make a first-class exhibit of Canadian woods and furniture. I do not know whether the furniture was made there or whether it was made in Canada, but it did not come up to the mark of what I thought should have been found in the Canadian building.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The furniture was not intended to be used as an exhibit, but it was supplied by the company, which, I believe, is a consolidation of the furniture manufacturers of Ontario. I forget the exact name, but I think it is the Canada Furniture Manufacturing Company. They asked to be allowed to furnish that building free of charge to the government and they put in what they considered to be their very best exhibit.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think it was.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not responsible for it. They had a free hand, and they did what they thought to their own interest. I must confess that I thought, myself, while visiting it, that it was very handsome furniture. At the end of the exhibition there was some slight damage to some of it and the commissioner recommended that we should pay them a small indemnity for that damage—I think $250. That is all the government had to pay for the use of all the furniture in the building.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

Mr. TAYLOR. What disposition was made of the furniture?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was returned to the people who sent it.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, but that which was used?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was all used and returned to the people who sent it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see that is not the case with the Glasgow exhibition. I see that there were large sums paid for carpets.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, there was no such arrangement at Glasgow.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was done at Glasgow?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The furniture has been packed away for use at Woolverhampton.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose we will get all the particulars of the sale of the building at Buffalo?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, when the supplementary estimates come down.

For renewing and improving Canadian exhibit at Imperial Institute, London, $3,000.

Mr. CLANCY. This is a matter that has invited discussion in the past. It has been stated in this House that the Imperial Institute, as far as it was educational in Great Britain, was a failure. The hon. gentleman is asking for the same sum this year that he had last. I am not urging an increase of the expenditure, but I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that if we had an exhibition of that kind in Great Britain which is ever to serve some useful purpose, it ought to accomplish that end to some extent. Those who have visited Great Britain tell me, because, personally I have no knowledge of it whatever, that it is not in the right place, that it is a back number if one may be permitted to use such a slang, and I think we had a promise from the hon. minister last year, as well as, I think, from the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that something would be done to make that expenditure although a very small one, somewhat effective, either by increasing it or in some other way.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Before the hon. minister rises to speak possibly one answer will serve for two questions. I understand that the Imperial Institute so far as it is being utilized for the purpose for which it has hitherto existed and was designed has been closed and that the materials have been moved to some other part of the city of London.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In reply, first to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), I would say that the Imperial Institute just now is in a transition stage and has been within the last few months. It has been an entirely independent organization under a commissioner, or a president—I think he is called—and a board appointed by various authorities in the old country. Lately there have been several meetings at which it is apparent to me, having had reports of those meetings both from Lord Strathcona and through the press, that the Imperial Institute has been handed over to the Imperial Board of Trade, one of the departments of the Imperial government. So far I have not been able to find out exactly what that department intends to do. The representative of Canada at the Imperial Institute, Mr. Watson, has written to me several times and he informs me that, as far as he can gather, not having entire information from the authorities, that the work and objects of the Institute will be continued very much on the same lines, but under different authority and control. The exhibits are still in the same building and they are to be continued there as far as I can obtain any information, but it is in a transition stage. In regard to the exhibits there, I would first like to point out to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and the committee that the exhibits have not been under the control of this parliament. They have been supplied by the various provincial governments, and it has been the provincial governments which have managed them, looked after them, repaired them and kept them in order. At the time of the Paris Exhibition, when we had a very extensive collection of mineral exhibits from Canada and very considerable forestry and other exhibits, I was urged by Lord Strathcona and those interested in the Imperial Institute to place them in the Imperial Institute. When I was in England I visited the Institute, and I found the conditions much as the hon. gentleman has described. Our exhibits there are not a credit to Canada in their numbers or their character, or in the condition they are in. Many of them are very old, and should be replaced, while others ought to be repaired. In consequence of the opening of the Glasgow exhibition, the Paris exhibits which I intended for the Imperial Institute were sent to Glasgow, and at the present time they are in the exhibit at the Royal Exchange in London. Last autumn various people in London interested in colonial investments decided to have a London exhibition of the colonial exhibits at Glasgow. We were asked to send our exhibits there and after a good deal of discussion and some hitches the exhibit at the Royal Exchange was arranged for, and will be opened on the 1st of March. I was authorized by my colleagues to do this, and as it was believed that especially the mineral exhibit would be of vast interest to the investing public in London, many who are interested in mining matters in Canada urged strongly that these exhibits should be shown in the financial centre of the world. At the close of the Royal Exchange exhibition, it is the intention to send a large portion of this exhibit to the Imperial Institute if the arrangements in connection with the Imperial Institute then admit of it. Some of this vote last year was used in carrying the exhibits to London, and in cleaning them up and repairing them.

Mr. CLARKE. If my memory serves me right, the attention of the minister was drawn on a former occasion to the unsatisfactory character of the Canadian exhibits at the Imperial Institute. Did I understand from the hon. gentleman, that the Imperial Institute is not under the same management now as it was formerly? Are these old exhibits to be permitted to remain or are they to be brought up to date? Friends of mine who have visited the Imperial Institute have expressed their regret to me that a more creditable Canadian exhibit was not made there. Are any steps being taken to direct the attention of those who placed the exhibits there, to the necessity, in the interest of Canada, of having them renewed? There is no use spending money to have a second or third-class exhibit, because that does the country harm rather than good.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have urged on the representatives of the provinces whose exhibits these are that they should do something. I confess that there has been an inclination on the part of the provinces to throw that responsibility and expense on us. I have not received any official documents which would bear on this, but the tenor of the replies I have had in conversation is: If you do not think the exhibit good enough, go ahead yourself. I fear that the probability of the provincial governments doing a great deal towards having a good exhibit at the Imperial Institute is, to say the least, doubtful. Of course, I have no authority to interfere with these exhibits, but I hope that when the Royal Exchange exhibition is over, the management of the Imperial Institute will be finally settled upon, and then I will be able to utilize this vote to the best possible advantage. I want to warn hon. gentlemen, that $3,000 will not be sufficient to make a very creditable exhibit at the Imperial Institute, and especially if the provincial authorities are going to drop out I will have to ask for a larger sum.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the new emigration building which is to be opened up by this government on the Strand, anything to do with the Department of Agriculture?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In some parts of the United States which it has been my privilege to visit, the minister has Canadian products exhibited.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not my department.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the superintendent of immigration in London is to have new offices, on account of the complaints made that the intending emigrant had no means by which he could judge of the resources of Canada, and for that reason arrangements were being made to exhibit the mineral and agricultural products of Canada in the business centre of London. Is it the intention of the department to provide the London immigration office with exhibits, as well as the Imperial Institute ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That matter is entirely in charge of the Minister of the Interior. While it has been discussed in general terms and the council has quite approved of his action, I have not the details which I would like to give to the hon. gentleman. The Minister of the Interior will have estimates before the House in connection with which he will give full details.

Mr. MONK. Has the minister explained how this $3,000 is to be expended ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As I have already explained, the intention is to utilize the exhibits at the exhibitions which have been taking place in Europe. All the exhibits that are not at the Royal Exchange are in the Imperial Institute, and are being cleaned up, so that they may be in thorough order and be creditable to us. When I was in England last summer the authorities of the Imperial Institute, who then appeared to have no expectation of the changes which have since occurred, had arranged for a city show room in the centre of the city near the Royal Exchange, and I agreed with them that if they provided such a place I would take money out of this vote to send Canadian exhibits periodically there. They asked me to pledge myself to spend at least £100 a year on that service. That would be $500 out of this amount. The rest I expect to spend in collecting and preparing exhibits to send to the Imperial Institute; but in the present uncertain arrangements of the Imperial Institute, that work is at a standstill.

Mr. MONK. Then a portion of this $3,000 will be for rents ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, for the purpose of utilizing the showroom in the city by preparing and sending temporary exhibits of fruit, poultry, &c.

Mr. MONK. The minister is of course aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company intend erecting a very large building in the city of London, in a very favourable spot, and instead of selecting a showroom for Canadian exhibits, it is a question in my mind whether it would not be more economical and better to make some arrangement with that company.

Commissioner's branch for agriculture and dairying, including cold storage on steamships, on railways, at warehouses and creameries, and for expenses in connection with trial shipments of products, and for securing improvement and recognition of the quality of Canadian farm products, employees paid from this sum not to be subject to the Civil Service Act, $210,000.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman intends to go on with either this or the next item to-night. They are items of very great importance, and I hope he will allow them to stand.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not want to press them unduly, but I would like to discuss this item to-night. Professor Robertson, who is in charge of this expenditure, is in Ottawa to-day. He will have to leave to-morrow or the next day on some important business, and he has frequently to be away from town ; so that it would be very convenient, and I would like very much to supply the information which my hon. friends would like to have on this very important item to-night. The night is young, we have still a couple of hours before us, and I think the hon. gentleman could get a good deal of information out of me in that time if he made the effort.

Mr. MONK. I do not think it is fair to ask us to enter upon the discussion of such a large item until we have had a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture to examine this gentleman. He is going to be in Ottawa again during the session, and before we go into this item, which shows a considerable increase over previous years, we should have a chance to find out from him what the cause of this increase is.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The question of the Committee on Agriculture is hardly germane to this.

Mr. MONK. Oh, yes it is.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Professor Robertson, it is true, appears before that committee, but does not deal very much with this vote. Besides, the Committee on Agriculture has already asked that the immigration evidence should be given to it before the officers of my department are called, which means that their evidence will be postponed to a considerably later date ; and if my estimates are to stand until Professor Robertson and other officers of my department appear before the Committee of Agriculture, the work of the House will be seriously impeded, in a way that I do not think would be fair or right.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, I imagined that Professor Robertson was a servant of the people of Canada, and that we should consult the convenience of this House rather than that of Professor Robertson or any of the employees.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nobody is suggesting anything else.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend is asking too much in asking us to proceed to-night with an item of this importance, involving such a large expenditure and such large interests. He surely does not propose that we should go on with it before we have had time to consult a single report or to obtain some knowledge of it. The hon. gentleman may be very anxious to make this statement, which will be of use to the House and the country ; but it is only fair to the members of this House that they should have some opportunity of acquiring such information upon it as will enable them to judge intelligently of the hon. gentleman's statements. To deprive us of this opportunity, it seems to me, is going too far, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not insist on taking up any of these large items to-night.

Mr. WILSON. Did the Minister of Agriculture say that the committee have asked that Mr. Pedley should be examined first ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I had it from the chairman that they wished to have the immigration officers before the officers of my department.

Mr. WILSON. No, sir. All I know is that the chairman of the committee came to me some time last week and told me that Mr. Pedley would be before the committee to-day. This was changing the regular order of things. Last year the committee did not meet until late in the session to discuss these questions, though I was anxious that immigration matters should be taken up. They said no, it is much more important that we should first take up the work of the farm, so that the evidence given before the committee would be distributed to members while they are here. The committee has not asked for Mr. Pedley, neither was I anxious at this particular time to go on with Mr. Pedley, because I wanted to have more time to look into the reports of the Minister of the Interior and the evidence given on immigration last year ; but, as a matter of course, when the chairman of the committee said to me that Mr. Pedley was to be before the committee to-day, I raised no objection, and I think we on this side of the House are perfectly willing that the people from the Experimental Farm should be examined first. The committee had a very short session to-day, for two reasons : in the first place, the chairman missed his train yesterday and was not present—he was not to blame for that and, in the next place, we appointed a temporary chairman and had the report of the first meeting read, and, as Mr. Pedley had not come there sharp on time, and there was another meeting which many of us wanted to attend, the committee by a unanimous vote decided to adjourn until next Thursday ; and it was decided that Mr. Pedley should then come before us. But there is no reason why Mr. Robertson or anyone else cannot be substituted for Mr. Pedley, so far as I know.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All I can say is that the chairman of the committee came to me the other day, immediately after the first meeting, and said that an expression had been given in favour of having the immigration officers first—and I think the hon. gentleman himself was the one who asked it.

Mr. WILSON. No, sir.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I of course acquiesced in the desire of the committee, and Mr. Pedley came this morning. The chairman himself was not present. Mr. Pedley arrived about five minutes after the hour fixed for the meeting, but the committee had adjourned at the desire of some hon. gentlemen opposite who wished to attend their caucus, which of course was a proper desire. If the hon. gentlemen wish to change that and have the officers of my department brought first, they must deal with that in the Committee on Agriculture. I have no control over that committee, and the committee will call such officers as it wishes in regular order. But it has commenced by calling Mr. Pedley, and not my officers.

Mr. WILSON. Well, I do not think the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture would wish to misrepresent anybody. He was chairman last year, and a very fair chairman. But he must have misunderstood me. I certainly did not propose that we should have the immigration business first. I may say it has not been customary for the Committee on Agriculture by motion to ask people to come and give evidence. The chairman of the committee has usually arranged that. It is true we brought up the matter at the first meeting of the committee this year, and there was a desire expressed by the members that we should know in advance who were to come before us to give evidence. There can be no difficulty about arranging for Mr. Robertson or any other person the Minister of Agriculture desires, to come and give evidence before Mr. Pedley is heard.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). The hon. Minister of Agriculture is labouring under a wrong impression when he says that the committee only sat five minutes after the hour fixed for its meeting. I am a member of the committee and was there the whole time, and I know that the chairman remained there for twenty-five minutes after the appointed hour.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister must remember that these items relate to his department, as to which there is a regular meeting of the committee, and in this respect they differ from the items of almost every other department. Some of the work, which might ordinarily be done in Committee in Supply, is done before the Committee of Agriculture, and therefore there is grave reason for not pressing any of these items before they have been threshed out in that committee.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am quite ready to allow them to stand or to go on, but if we do not proceed, I will have to throw the onus on hon. gentlemen opposite. I would ask them to allow me to go on with some other items.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly, I suppose there are other items concerning which the meeting of the committee is not so important.

Item allowed to stand.

Quarantine—Salaries and contingencies of organized districts and public health in other districts, $110,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is an item which covers the whole quarantine service of my department. It deals with the seaboard quarantine, and this year it deals very largely with the quarantine along the international boundary line between Canada and the United States. The item has assumed much larger proportions recently in consequence of the unfortunate prevalence of small-pox in the United States and the alarm which our people all along the frontier have felt with regard to it. The vote is however the same as it was last year when we had the same difficulty to contend against. It covers the quarantine at Halifax, Charlottetown, St. Johns, Sydney, Grosse Isle at Quebec, Victoria, British Columbia, and also all the unorganized quarantine work done on our seaboard and along the frontier. In addition to this we have recently had to do a good deal in connection with public health in the territories in consequence of the prevalence of small-pox. We have had to take steps to protect that portion of the country which, not being organized into a province, has no provincial authority or organization to deal with public health. We have had to assume that work and will have to continue it for the future until the territories are so organized as to have proper provincial organization.

Mr. MONK. What proportion of this sum is devoted to quarantine in the North-west Territories, and what portion is rendered necessary by the prevalence of small-pox there ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The work in the territories has been all on account of small-pox. I have here an item for frontier inspection and the prevention of small-pox, of $50,000. That is not altogether for the territories but a good deal has been spent in the protection of the frontier and the international line between us and the United States. I have not the details of how much was spent for the interior work in the territories and how much on the international boundary.

Mr. MONK. That $50,000 is for the protection of the frontier through the whole of Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, as well as the territories.

Mr. MONK. What amount are you obliged to expend in the territories out of this sum against small-pox ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In round numbers about $30,000 for the territories alone.

Mr. MONK. That is impossible.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not realize that that includes the Yukon. That was the amount of the supplementary vote last session, called for by the work in the territories. I cannot say positively that the whole of it will be expended this current year, but it is not unlikely, as the distances are very great and the expenses very heavy and every precaution must be taken to prevent the small-pox spreading among the Indians.

Mr. MONK. What proportion of the $50,000 is spent to protect the Yukon ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said $30,000 for the whole of the territories including the Yukon, and I could not divide it off-hand.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose the hon. gentleman is prepared to give the names of the physicians appointed for the frontier service, the dates of their appointment and the sums that they received.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We do not appoint these gentlemen permanently for the frontier service. We appoint them whenever necessary. They are appointed by the month at the rate of $100 per month. Sometimes their work lasts several months and in some cases the whole year. The reasons of that difference is this. We keep close track of the existence of small-pox on the frontier, through the reports issued by the health authorities in the United States, and where it appears there is a sufficient outbreak of the disease on the other side to menace the people on our side, we appoint an officer to watch the frontier. Then, when the disease seems to disappear from the other side of the line and the necessity for guarding that point of the line ceases, we dispense with the

services of the officer. If the hon. gentleman wishes I can give him a full list of the officers so appointed, but it is a lengthy one.

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister might give the principal officers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are all the same in this list. The principal officers are the permanent officers.

Mr. MONK. Are they all paid the same salary ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, except that there are a couple of officers in the west who receive more. For the rate of pay given in the east, $100 a month, we could not get men for all points in the west. I understand that we are paying one man in the North-west $125 a month and one in the Yukon $150 a month.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman might give the list of names.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In Prince Edward Island, there is Dr. James McLennan, who was appointed on the 15th November, 1901, at a salary of $100 a month, though his services have been dispensed with.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the date of dispensing with his services ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I find that while Dr. McLennan appears on this list as having been released from employment, yet, in consequence of a winter trial service at Summerside, he is acting again. He commenced work on the 15th November, 1901, and has been working since with some intermission.

Mr. CLANCY. In fact, he has been permanently employed so far.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He commenced on the 15th November last, and is still employed. As soon as the necessity for his employment ceases, his services will be dispensed with. At Georgetown, P.E.I., there is Dr. D. A. Stewart, who began on the 13th February, 1902 and is still employed at $100 a month. In Nova Scotia, there are the following :—At Digby, Dr. L. H. Morse, who commenced on the 16th March, 1901, still employed ; Yarmouth, Dr. A. J. Fuller, commenced 18th March, 1901 ; Bear River and Clementsport, Dr. L. J. Lovitt, commenced 20th March, 1901 ; Weymouth, Dr. E. J. Elderkin, commenced 21st March, 1902 ; Louisbourg, Dr. F. O'Neil, commenced 18th May, 1901. In New Brunswick, at McAdam Junction, there is Dr. W. T. Ryan, commenced February 3rd, 1902. The list for Ontario is as follows :—Sault Ste. Marie, Dr. R. J. Gibson, commenced 22nd November, 1900—this was one of the first appointments and this officer is still employed ; Mine Centre, Dr. David McKenzie, commenced 15th March, 1901 ; Beaver Mills, Dr. A. A. McCrimmon, commenced 30th May, 1901 ; Cornwall, Dr. J. H. Wheeler, commenced 17th January, 1902. In Manitoba, there are the following :—At Sprague, J. W. Caldwell, commenced 22nd January, 1901. This officer, I should explain, is a guard, and not a doctor. In some places, we employ a guard to watch the trains and report to a doctor in the neighbourhood. The guard gets $2.50 a day. At Emerson there is Dr. D. Henderson, commenced 22nd November, 1900 ; Gretna, Dr. F. B. McKenty, commenced 22nd November, 1900 ; Morden, Dr. C. F. Sharp, commenced January 3rd, 1901 ; Crystal City, Dr. G. Riddell, with two guards under him ; Killarney, Dr. J. A. Whyte, commenced 22nd November, 1900 ; Boissevain, Dr. R. K. Campbell, commenced 22nd November, 1900 ; Deloraine, Dr. R. S. Thornton, commenced 22nd November, 1900. In the North-west Territories, there are three :—At North Portal, Dr. R. M. Mitchell, commenced 7th February, 1901; Northport, Rr. J. J. Travis, commenced 7th November, 1901; Carnduff, Dr. T. W. F. Lockhart, commenced February 20th, 1902. In British Columbia, there are the following :—Huntingdon, Dr. R. H. Port, commenced 24th April, 1900 ; Grand Forks, Dr. John Westwood, commenced 29th November 1900 ; Carson, T. K. Dunlop, guard ; Cascades, W. W. Coates, guard ; White's Camp, W. L. Wells, guard ; Rossland, Dr. A. C. Sinclair, commenced February 2nd, 1901 ; Northport, Dr. J. J. Travis, commenced February 7th, 1901 ; Kettle River District, Dr. R. W. Jakes, commenced November 29th, 1900 ; Rykerts, Dr. W. W. Walken, commenced February 1st, 1902 ; Fort Steele, Dr. Watt, commenced 9th April, 1901 ; Tobacco Plains Trails, M. Phillipps and Jas. Langley, guards ; Log Cabin, Dr. S. D. Cameron, commenced July 3rd, 1901.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that the whole list of those employed in the frontier service ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. As the hon. gentleman gave it, they still seem to be in the service. Now, if the reports that come to me are correct there are others than those the hon. minister has mentioned. I would like to ask him if there is not a medical gentleman by the name of Dr. McCully employed at Rondeau Point, Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was wrong in saying that these were all that have been employed. This, I am informed, is a list of those who are still employed. Some have been engaged along the chain of lakes during the summer for short periods at different times. I have not a list of them here.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the committee would be interested in hearing the list of those that have been employed, with the

length of service of each and the amount paid. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could give us that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not that list with me to-night.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, the hon. minister had better let the item stand.

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister did not give the list of the chief officers for Quebec employed along the frontier.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am glad to say that the United States immediately south of Quebec is in such a healthy state that we have not required to watch the frontier. We have not had to appoint any one in the province of Quebec, and, I believe, with the exception of Cornwall, none in eastern Ontario.

Mr. MONK. We have had a good deal of small-pox coming into Quebec from the States.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have no reports to that effect either from the local authorities or from anybody who required our action. As a general rule we have taken, in the first place, reports of the United States authorities as to the condition of affairs in the country south of our boundary ; and, in the second place, the request for reports of the provincial health authorities. Where the provincial health authorities have not expressed any fear in regard to the frontier, and where we have reports of satisfactory conditions to the south of the line, we have not appointed any officer.

Mr. MONK. Has there been a report from the provincial health authorities that there is no small-pox in the New England states ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I did not say that. I said that the provincial health authorities have made no request for us to guard the frontier, and that we have had reports from the United States health authorities as to the condition of health in the different states along the border, and that we took these two sources of information as our guide.

Mr. MONK. Is there any report as to the state of health in the New England states in the possession of the department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The reports of the health authorities of the United States are all sent to my department, and my chief superintendent of public health studies these all the time.

Mr. MONK. I understand there is a report in the department that there is no small-pox to fear in the New England states, no smallpox in existence in the New England states. I would like to see that report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no report showing there is no small-pox in the United States. But their reports do say that the health authorities there are handling it and managing it so that there is no likelihood of its spreading.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister tell us how these medical men operate to prevent the importation of small-pox ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They watch passing trains. They go down below the frontier and look at the people on the trains, wherever an officer is appointed.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that he does not put an officer on unless he has information from the American health authorities that there is small-pox on the other side of the line.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not quite that. We watch the health reports of the United States, all the health reports from all sources in the United States come to our department, and the superintendent of public health keeps watch of these, and if the conditions south of the line are not such as to be a menace to our health, we do not appoint any officer; but when in his judgment they menace our safety, then we appoint an officer.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed last season that the disease was imported especially from Michigan. What precautions have been taken to prevent travellers bringing it across the line from that part of the United States ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have had officers at the several ports opposite northern Michigan, where boats come from that region, and they watch the travel all the time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the minister under consideration the formation of a Dominion board of health, or would it come under his department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think if any board of health were organized it would come under my department, which now deals especially with that subject. While that question might be discussed, it has hardly reached a point where I could make a statement.

Mr. SPROULE. In case of the importation of the disease by trains or otherwise, has any effort been made to have the health department on the other side bear the expense of looking after this ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They do it for themselves on their own side of the line, the same as we bear the expense of looking after small-pox on our side of the line. We have not asked them to share the expense of protecting our health.

Mr. PRINGLE. Is there any small-pox now in that portion of New York state known as the Adirondack Mountains,

through which the Ottawa and New York Railway runs ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I noticed something of that kind, and therefore put a man on at Cornwall.

Mr. PRINGLE. What are the reports now in regard to small-pox in that locality ? I understand that there is none, that there is no possibility of any small-pox coming over that line, and that that man is only employed in examining passengers on that railway.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My officer says that the later reports show that there is no danger, and that we may be able to dispense with that man's services.

Mr. HACKETT. I want to ask the minister to take better means to protect the people of Prince Edward Island from a small-pox epidemic. The minister has read the names of several doctors who are stationed at ports along the shores, and they are very good men, vigilant and active, who attend to their duties in every respect. But I want to make a remark concerning a case that occurred at Georgetown, in Prince Edward Island, last fall. I do not know if the hon. gentleman who was at the head of the provincial government at the time is in the House; but I know that a man was smitten with small-pox and so declared by the doctor at that port, and he was taken into a carriage and driven from Georgetown to Keppoch, where there is a marine hospital, a distance of thirty miles, right through the country, exposing the people to the danger of infection all through that section. I would ask the hon. gentleman why that was allowed to occur ? Is there any conflict between the two authorities, or why should not both authorities unite to guard the public health in that respect ? I also want to ask the hon. gentleman if all the employees—not speaking of the doctors, who are able to look after themselves—if all the attendants, and the nurses at the marine hospital at Keppoch, have been paid by the government ? Have all the bills in connection with the marine hospital at Charlottetown been paid by this government ? When we are again threatened in Prince Edward Island with an epidemic originating outside of our island, I want to impress upon the hon. gentleman that he should take the greatest care to protect the people of that province. I say it was a shameful thing that this man, declared to have small-pox, should have been driven across the country in a carriage that was not flagged to warn the people that he had small-pox, that he was allowed to talk and chat with the people on the way, and the driver broke his carriage on many occasions, and all these circumstances increased the danger of spreading the contagion. I would ask the minister why it was that that thing occurred ? Whose fault was it ? Was it the fault of the Dominion government or of the local government ? I would ask the hon. minister to make some statement in connection with the facts and also to say whether these nurses who were employed at the hospital at Charlottetown have been paid as they required.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In reply to the hon. gentleman I would say that I suppose I know by report the case to which he refers. It was the case of a seaman who had been some days in the port of Georgetown before the disease was discovered and the man was no longer subject to our supervision, inspection, or examination. We are responsible on the arrival of the vessel for giving that vessel a clean bill of health. When the vessel receives a clean bill of health from our officers, we have no more responsibility for anything in connection with its crew than we would have in connection with a farmer in the neighbourhood of the town. I am not aware of the details of the case such as the hon. gentleman describes. If anything has been done it has been done in no sense under the authority or control of my department. Such a case would be entirely under the control of the provincial health authorities over whom we have no control and with whom we do not interfere. As far as the hon. gentleman's question about the marine hospital at Charlottetown is concerned, I would say that there is perhaps a little confusion in the name. We have a quarantine hospital there. I do not think there is anything that is called a marine hospital at that place. The marine hospitals are in charge of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland). I have no control over them and they are used for a different purpose to that for which the quarantine stations are used. As far as the quarantine station at Charlottetown is concerned, there was one case which was dealt with by my officer there and the doctor and nurses and everybody connected with the case have been paid. I am informed that at the request of the authorities at Charlottetown, a local case was allowed to be treated at the quarantine hospital, but the local authorities have to deal with it and they have to pay for it. I simply allowed them to utilize the quarantine hospital for the convenience of the city of Charlottetown.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to dispute with the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett), but I wish to say that he has exaggerated the facts in connection with this matter. This man was taken sick at Georgetown, and as the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) states, the marine hospital at Keppoch, near Charlottetown, was used for the reception of the patient. As soon as it was known that the man had smallpox he was driven to the hospital in a closed

carriage. How could he have been taken otherwise ? He could not have been taken on the railway. That would have been a greater danger to the public health. He was driven to the hospital in a closed carriage by a man who had had the small-pox, himself, previously. A bolt came out of the carriage on the way and they had to go to a blacksmith's shop to have the bolt put in. There is no reason why this matter should have been brought up here at all. No government did wrong in that respect and I would ask the hon. member for West Prince if he could suggest any other way for bringing a man from Georgetown to the Keppoch hospital ? There is no use in exaggerating these things, or trying to mislead the committee, or attempting to create a false impression.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there were any outbreaks of small-pox or other contagious diseases amongst the immigrants who arrived during the last twelve months ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, there were several cases and they were quarantined at the various quarantine stations.

Mr. CLARKE. Where were they from ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know. They were quarantined at Halifax and Victoria, and I think Grosse Isle also. They were in every case dealt with and the disease did not spread.

Mr. CLARKE. Where were the immigrants from ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not say off-hand. We do not investigate where they come from in our quarantine stations.

Mr. CLARKE. The reason I asked the hon. minister is that I notice in one of the reports of the American officers who inspect immigrants going through Canada to the United States caustic references to the condition in which some of the immigrants arrived in Canada. I want to know if there is any laxity on our part in the examination of immigrants which would cause such a report by these American officers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think the hon. gentleman has quite understood the situation. Of course, we are not responsible for what the steamship companies do in bringing out immigrants. When they arrive in Canada we have them examined for disease and if there is any disease among them, we quarantine them and treat them. The American authorities, I believe, have an arrangement for officers to watch immigrants arriving in Canada and this has been done at the express desire of the transportation companies who want to get this travel for their lines. It is done by the immigration officers of the United States, I do not think with any intention or desire to examine as to disease, but to examine as to what they consider proper qualifications of immigrants both as to their financial and mental conditions. The United States have stringent rules as to the landing of immigrants and their rule at United States ports is that ships must carry back rejected immigrants. Of course, if ships landed these immigrants in Canada and they were discovered in Chicago or Detroit as being unsatisfactory, the United States authorities could hardly force the ships to carry them back. They therefore made an arrangement by which their officers go to the port of landing and there deal with these immigrants.

Mr. CLARKE. What becomes of those who are rejected ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The ships have to take them back.

Mr. CLARKE. They are not allowed to land in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. We have nothing to do with them at all. This is an arrangement between the shipping companies and the United States authorities over which we have no control and over which we have no responsibility.

Mr. CLARKE. If these immigrants are found unsuitable by an officer of a foreign government they are not permitted to land on Canadian soil and are sent back again. Is that the situation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe so. I cannot say positively, but I believe that is what it amounts to. Of course the immigrants they deal with in this way are only those that are booked for the United States.

Mr. CLARKE. Charges are made that a great many of these immigrants land in Canada, remain here temporarily, and then cross the boundary so that practically a general surveillance is exercised by these foreign immigration officers over our immigrants ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, none whatever. The immigrants that are dealt with are only those that are booked through to United States points, and who declare themselves as intending to go to the United States. Any immigrant for Canada is not touched or dealt with by these United States officers.

Mr. HACKETT. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Hughes) who spoke a moment ago said that I had exaggerated the statement I made in connection with small-pox patients being driven from Georgetown to the marine hospital at Keppoch. The hon.

gentleman corroborated every word I said. Instead of exaggerating the statement I made it as mild as possible. Here was a case of small-pox, a case coming to our shores where an epidemic might have been spread all over Prince Edward Island and the government of this country, or the local government, let that patient be driven through a part of the hon. gentleman's riding of King's, and a part of the riding of East Queen's from Georgetown to a point near Charlottetown, a distance of thirty miles. That man went in that carriage on which there was placed no flag, without anything being provided to notify the people along the line of the route of the fact that a small-pox case was being carried. The hon. gentleman says that the carriage broke down and that they had to go to a blacksmith's shop to repair it. I am not exaggerating the statement at all, and the hon. gentleman has himself confirmed my statement that this patient having the small-pox was driven thirty miles through the province of Prince Edward Island, liable to spread the disease all over the country, and yet the hon. gentleman makes light of it. The public health of our people is of great importance, and every precaution should be taken to safeguard it. When this gentleman gets up here and says I have exaggerated, he says what is not correct.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings). What would you do with the patient under the circumstances ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Kill him.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). Let me make a further statement. There was some local discussion about this, and the patient stated himself in the newspapers that he was quite comfortable during the drive, that every precaution was taken, that he had no fault to find with the means to bring him to the hospital where he would get the best medical treatment, and the proof of his being well cared for is that he recovered in a short time, and that the disease did not spread.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year this same vote was asked for and also a supplementary vote. Will the $110,000 cover the whole service this year or will the minister ask for more ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope that this will be sufficient, but that will depend entirely on the extent of the outbreak of the disease, which I cannot foretell.

Mr. TAYLOR. In 1895-6, $35,000 was all that was asked for this service but this year three times that amount is to be voted. How is it possible that there could be such an increase in this item ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the first place, the work in connection with the frontier was not in existence at all in 1895-6, and in the second place we had not a small-pox outbreak, and we had not the Yukon to look after. All these additions have caused the increase.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the real explanation is that the minister had a number of doctors that he wanted to give $100 a month to, in order that they might draw the money and do nothing. I suppose the minister will give us the names of all the doctors that are employed in the department so that we may know where this extra $70,000 went.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will get that information.

Mr. MONK. Did we spend the entire $110,000 last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The $110,000 is for the current year, and I am afraid we will have to ask for a supplementary vote.

Mr. MONK. What was the amount we spent last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. $75,000.

Mr. MONK. And you are asking for $35,000 more.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and we will have to ask for more still. I regret to say that this expenditure by my department is only a small part of what the people of Canada are to-day paying on account of this small-pox outbreak. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the expenditure by the local and municipal authorities, he will find that probably several million dollars are expended in Canada this year on account of this outbreak of small-pox.

Mr. MONK. But the damage small-pox may cause has nothing to do with the inspection along the frontier. The minister tells us that there is no danger from the New England states, and that the only danger is from the Western states. Thirty-five thousand dollars in addition to what we spent last year is a very large amount, when the prospect is that we will not require so much. I think that vote ought to be reduced.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman does not seem to have followed the discussion. The expenditure along the frontier has been intermittent but constantly increasing, and the prospect seems to be that it will go on. If it does not go on the money will not be spent, but I fear that it is necessary to provide for this contingency, and this year not only will I have to spend $110,000, but I shall have to ask for a considerable amount more to cover the expenditure for the next four months of the current year. A large amount of this money has been spent in the Yukon and in the territories dealing with small-pox

outbreaks, and the hon. gentleman is mistaken in thinking that it has all been expended in watching the frontier.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that we are mounting up this vote at a great rate.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We unfortunately are.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister tells us that a doctor goes on each train and examines the patients. At what distance from the boundary line does he board the train, and what does he do in the case of travellers who come from infected districts, but who may not have the disease themselves ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The doctor works as conveniently as he can, and he boards the train at different distances from the frontier according to the location of the stations. Whenever people come from what are called infected districts in the United States, we require them to be vaccinated if they have not been already. The officer examines them as carefully as possible, and if he sees any suspicious cases, he detains them.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the hon. gentleman mean by suspicious cases? A traveller coming from a district where small-pox is prevalent may have signs of the disease, and he may have been vaccinated. Is he refused admission ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and is vaccinated.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman takes due precautions for preventing the importation of disease ; but if the press can be relied on, we imported a good many small-pox cases from Michigan last summer, and I believe it is pretty prevalent in some of the lumber districts in Canada to-day. It does seem as if some more stringent precautions ought to be taken.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman understands that there is a period of incubation for this disease during which it is not recognizable ; and of course we cannot expect to keep everybody who comes from the United States in quarantine for fifteen days. That would be an interruption of traffic which people would not submit to. What we do is to vaccinate any who are suspected of disease. Of course, any actual cases which are discovered we stop at once and deal with. I do not think we can do much more ; I do not know what more we can do. That has been the working out of the problem by the Superintendent General of Public Health, and I confess I have not myself been able to suggest any further precautions. I may say that one or two cases have occurred which are supposed to have come from the United States. They are cases in which the disease was in incubation and quite unrecognizable ; and we must acknowledge that no quarantine regulations would absolutely shut out such cases when they come into the country overland. If they came across the ocean, we might do so.

Mr. SPROULE. I refer to cases which have come in on trains. I was informed last summer by a passenger that many passengers came from districts in Michigan where the disease was prevalent, and they were neither vaccinated nor detained, but were coming into the province with perfect impunity.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Was there a doctor on the train ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know.

Mr. HACKETT. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that if an epidemic were brought by a vessel to Prince Edward Island, the local authorities would be charged with the cost of dealing with it. At all events, we have this fact, that this small-pox patient was taken charge of by the local government and was driven through the province for thirty miles without any precaution being taken to prevent the spread of the disease. My hon. friend from King's asked, what would you do in a similar case? The proper course to pursue was this—to have a building in the vicinity of Georgetown, where this patient could be placed and attended to by nurses. They have had another case since, and the patient was placed in the vicinity of Georgetown and attended by nurses, and not driven through the country, as the other one was, it would almost appear for the purpose of spreading this dread disease through the province. I have only stated what I know to be correct, and the hon. member for King's has corroborated the statement I made. I think there must be some difficulty between the government of Prince Edward Island and the government of Canada when small-pox cases can be treated in this way. The hon. gentleman said the man was comfortable when he was driven thirty miles through the country, and had his carriage broken down. How could he be comfortable, or how could he be expected to recover ? I was told that the poor man was so terror-stricken that he was unable to walk from the carriage to the hospital, and had to be helped. I say that such conduct on the part of the government or on the part of any man is a disgrace and a discredit to our country, and that we should unite to see that humanity, at all events, is extended to people in such a condition.

Mr. CLARKE. I took the liberty of making an inquiry of the Minister of Agriculture respecting the steps which had been taken by the United States authorities to examine immigrants arriving in Canada. I had glanced over the report of the United States Commissioner of Immigration for the

past year, and I thought I was justified in asking the question I did from the recollection I had of the statements contained in that report. I have obtained a copy of the report since, and it fully justifies the statement I made. I find at page 32 of the report, under the heading of 'Diseased Immigrants' the following statement. I will not occupy the time of the committee by reading the statistics of the number of diseased immigrants sent back by the United States. They totalled 309, composed of various nationalities. The report states :

These represent, however, only such as applied for admission to the United States, and the bureau reiterates the opinion heretofore expressed that the vigilant inspection at our ports has resulted, to some extent, in diverting diseased aliens to Canada, whence they surreptitiously effect an entrance across our northern boundary line. An attempt was made to check this evil by locating a surgeon of the United States marine hospital service at Liverpool, England, who by the consent of the various steamship lines plying to Canadian ports, was permitted to make a physical examination of the passengers. The experiment, however, proved unsuccessful, as some of the vessels brought diseased aliens who had been rejected by the said officer, and there were no means of deterring any of the said lines from bringing diseased persons to Canada, whose declared purpose to remain there would be no bar to their subsequently crossing the boundary line and coming into this country. That diseased persons who have been rejected at ports of this country do actually effect entrance later, probably through Canada, the bureau has heretofore reported that it had satisfactory evidence.

As a partial check on this practice Dr. Victor G. Heiser, of the marine hospital service, has been stationed with the force of immigration officials at Quebec, and there makes an examination of arriving aliens, though, of course, his report that any alien is diseased does not debar that alien from admission to Canada, although the steamship lines agree to return to the foreign port of embarkation those destined confessedly to the United States who are found to be afflicted with a dangerous contagious disease. This action of the steamship line in any particular instance, it seems hardly necessary to say, is contingent upon the willingness of the diseased alien to be returned to the port from which he embarked.

Then there is on page 34, under the heading of Immigration Through Canada, a statement showing an increase since the 30th June, 1897, from 6,542 to 21,647 last year, and the commissioner goes on to observe :—

While the ratio of increase over the arrivals of aliens through Canada last year is comparatively small, it is to be remembered that the figures above represent only such as state their ultimate destination to be this country ; others, who feel a doubt as to their ability to pass inspection, may, and doubtless do, avail themselves of the advantage of a landing and temporary residence in Canada to effect an entry over the boundary line.

The subject of immigration through Canada is now being considered by the department and the various Canadian transportation interests, with the view to effecting an agreement whereby the evils of the present system may be, if not obviated altogether, at least materially lessened.

That is a most extraordinary statement with regard to the quality and character of the immigrants arriving in Canada to appear in the annual report of the commissioner of the United States. It seems to me extraordinary that an officer of a foreign government should go to Quebec and inspect, not only the immigrants ostensibly for the United States, but all the immigrants on the vessels.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He has no authority to do so.

Mr. CLARKE. I take this from the official report of the Commissioner General on Immigration. Surely it is not the practice to bring to Canada immigrants, who would not be admitted into the United States direct because of their physical disability, in order that these immigrants may work their way through this country into the United States ? Should we not have as rigid an inspection of all immigrants as exists on the other side of the line? If they are not fit mentally and physically, they should not be permitted to land here. We should put some barrier in the way of promiscuous immigration. I should like to know whether the Commissioner General of Immigration of the United States is justified by the facts in making the statements I have just read. Those who read this report must be very unfavourably impressed as regards the quality and character of at least some of the immigrants who find their way to Canada, and I would like an explanation from the Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What the hon. gentleman is discussing is an immigration matter and not a quarantine matter.

Mr. CLARKE. I am speaking of diseased immigrants.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At New York and Boston and other American ports, there are a quarantine station and an immigration station. In the one the immigrants are dealt with from a quarantine standpoint solely, and in our ports we deal with the immigrants more severely than they are dealt with by the American officials. The diseases referred to in the report the hon. gentleman has just read are not what are called quarantineable or contagious diseases, but are dealt with by the immigration authorities at the immigration stations. I have not the detailed information necessary to satisfy the hon. gentleman on the point he raises, but that is a point which should properly come up when discussing the estimates on immigration, and

will be dealt with by the Minister of the Interior. What I said a few minutes ago was strictly correct, that while this gentleman may make a report to the United States government with regard to immigrants coming to Canada, that report does not prove that the United States officials have any control over such immigrants. It is only a private arrangement allowed by our own immigration authorities, and agreed between the United States immigration department and the transportation line, so as to facilitate the bringing of these people by our lines instead of directly to the United States. The statements as to our Canadian immigrants I do not believe to be well founded, and I am sure my hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior will deal with that matter when his estimates come up. I do not believe for a moment that the character of the immigrants who come to Canada is such as would justify statements such as have been read by my hon. friend.

Mr. CLARKE. I am very glad to hear the Minister of Agriculture say that the statements contained in this report of the Commissioner General of the United States are not justifiable. It is only fair to Canada that the Minister of the Interior should have an opportunity, when his estimates are under discussion, to make a full reply to the charges contained in this report. I took the liberty two years ago to draw attention to some statements not at all satisfactory, which appeared in the report for the then current year of the United States Commissioner General of Immigration, and I should be very glad to learn from the Minister of the Interior that the same rigid inspection is made of immigrants on this side, which is made of immigrants on the other side, and that the statement that undesirable immigrants are allowed to enter Canada because of lax inspection, is not well founded.

Mr. TAYLOR. I must ask the hon. minister to allow this item to stand until he brings down a statement showing where this money has gone. Take the Auditor-General's Report, page D—71, and you will find there an explanation of how this expenditure has grown from $35,000 in 1895-96, to $110,000 now. The hon. minister has told us that he spent $75,000 last year, but in the Auditor General's Report you will find that the expenditure was $94,000. He has thus deceived the House by $20,000 in his statement. He asks now $110,000, and says he will have to ask for an additional amount in the supplementaries. In the Auditor General's Report, page D—71, you will find an explanation of this extravagance down in the village of Montmagny. I find that Alphonse Labarge draws $848 for a few supplies. Let me give a few of the items so as to show the outrageous prices charged. I find four kegs of nails at $16.25; eight gallons of linseed oil at $1.10 a gallon; 163 pounds of putty at 8 cents a pound; Here is another charge of 163 pounds of putty at 8 cents per pound. You can go to any retail hardware store in the city of Ottawa and buy it at 3 cents a pound. 200 pounds of soft soap is charged at 13 cents per pound. There is another gentleman, Mr. Lesperance, in the same constituency who furnished some supplies. We find, for instance, a ton of coal $8.50; 22 pounds of beef at 22 cents, and 22 pounds of beef at 20 cents; coal oil, 464 gallons at 32 cents a gallon, 306 pounds of sugar at 6½ cents per pound. And so it goes, hundreds and hundreds of dollars paid out by this government buying from retail merchants and paying three or four times what they can get the goods for in any respectable store. Any person who has purchased any of these goods must know that the prices named here are, to say the least of it outrageous ? But, it is just the same through all the Auditor General's Report. This accounts for the amount of expenditure of this government. They spend here $110,000 on a service that was given in 1896 for $35,000. It is no wonder the expenditure of this country has crept up to $57,000,000, instead of $37,000,000, the amount for which the late government conducted the affairs of the country with as great efficiency or more. But there were not so many doctors employed at $100 a month to do nothing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is not carried. The minister will furnish the statement he promised before the item passes.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I think this discussion has been useful. I know that I have gained information regarding quarantine that I had not even dreamed of. When the minister was reading the list of those employed, I did not hear the names of any officers read out as being appointed at Sarnia, Windsor or Niagara, at which points the trains come over from the United States.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, we have none there now. I think that for a time last summer officers were appointed at one or more of these places. I have promised to give a list of those temporarily employed, but not now employed. When that list is ready it will show the hon. gentleman what has been done at the frontier referred to.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). It is generally felt in this country that the state of Michigan is responsible for the small-pox in Canada. In that case, we might expect that the small-pox would come in at Sarnia. To show how the Americans do, I may say that I met a gentleman from our town returning from the west who told me that he had been going to Michigan, but was stopped at Sarnia and not allowed to go over because he had not been vaccinated

within two months. The United States know how to look after the people going into their country. Here was a man perfectly healthy in appearance, but kept out of the state of Michigan, prevented even from going through on the regular line of railway, because he had not been vaccinated within two months. I do not agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that too much has been spent on quarantine. My fear is that the minister has not asked for enough to guard the country against the terrible scourge of small-pox.

Mr. INGRAM. The difficulty does not seem to be that not enough was asked for, but in the way it is distributed. The province of Ontario, is paying a great deal to prevent the spread of small-pox. The matter is in the hands of the provincial government. But, when we refer to British Columbia we find large sums paid out by this government to prevent the spread of disease in that province. So far as I know, in the past few years they have been troubled a great deal in that province. But, if they forget to look after that matter I do not see why this government should be called upon to pay money for that province if it does not pay for the others. Take, for instance, the case of Rossland, in British Columbia. It is a small place and in from the boundary line. Yet, there are two doctors there employed by this government. And other doctors are employed in many cases in British Columbia. It is unfair that the government should take these measures in one province, and, to a great extent, overlook other provinces.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) must not imagine that the expenditure of the money of this vote in British Columbia has to do with the interior of that province. It has to do with the international boundary line. I have already explained that we acted when we knew there was the disease at any point south of the boundary line, and also that we acted on representation being made by the health authorities of the province that it was necessary. In the province of Ontario, it happens, we have been remarkably free from demands, except so far as the traffic between Ontario and Michigan was concerned—and, mainly that with the northern part of the state. We have a number of officers around Sault Ste. Marie and adjacent ports to protect our people. In the state of Washington and Oregon, the position is much worse than it is in the eastern states; and it is for that reason, largely, that we have spent more money in proportion than in Ontario. As to the two doctors at Rossland, there is a junction just across the boundary line at North Port, and two lines come in and Rossland doctors have to watch them both.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the hon. minister to say that there is disease in northern Michigan, but not in southern Michigan. How is it, then, that the papers in Essex county say that small-pox is imported into that county from Michigan ? We see it stated in the local press also that there is small-pox not very far from Detroit—for instance I see it spoken of as existing in the Plymouth district, seventeen or eighteen miles from Detroit. If that is so, it must be the easiest thing in the world to import it with the regular travel across the line. When Canadians seek to go there without being recently vaccinated or under the influence of vaccination at the time, I am told, they are not allowed to cross. We do not seem to be exercising the same strictness against small-pox as the people of Michigan do. But we are told small-pox has been brought across the line not once, but repeatedly, last summer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). At the present time, the municipalities of Windsor, Walkerville and Sandwich are about to apply for a quarantine station. From time to time we have been very much exposed, and these municipalities have acted as a sort of buffer to the whole province. The result is that they have been obliged to spend large sums of money, much in excess of what other municipalities throughout the province are called upon to pay. I think along the line of the discussion to-night it would be a proper thing for the government to establish at that point a suitable quarantine station for the protection not merely of these municipalities but of the whole province.

Mr. SPROULE. That seems to verify our contention that the quarantine regulations are so lax that the disease is brought across the line. There are dozens of cases of it in Essex to-day. I saw the statement within the last two days that there are between 100 and 200 cases in the county of Essex.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). There are not more than two or three cases in the whole county.

Mr. OSLER. The Ontario government is spending a large amount of money in connection with this quarantine. Are the Ontario government and this government working in harmony or on separate lines ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are on separate lines, because the Ontario government's duty is to look after health within the province. Our duty is to look after the frontier alone, we do not undertake to deal with the interior of the provinces. When we have been notified by the provincial health authorities that there seems to be danger of the disease coming across the frontier, we take the necessary steps to protect them.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to call the minister's attention to page D—75 of the Auditor General's report, to the following item : 'Baxter, John, M.D., Thessalon, paid $810.71 ; Parker, F., M.D., Bruce Mines, $387.09 ; Aylesworth, G. M., M.D., Collingwood, $520,000. Now these payments are all in connection with looking after small-pox. May I ask the minister under what rule or system these gentlemen were paid, because these are not frontier towns or villages.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think Thessalon is one of the lake ports, and I think the other places are too. It was represented that ships were coming in from infected parts in the United States and liable to bring small-pox ; therefor we appointed doctors there.

Mr. BENNETT. I am sorry the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment) is not in his place. But it does seem odd that a small village like Thessalon should require a doctor to be paid the enormous sum of $810. There no trade at Thessalon beyond an odd vessel coming in for lumber. There is some reason for the services of medical gentlemen at the Soo. There is Dr. Gibson, $1,130, and Dr. Shepherd, $354. I may tell the minister that the complaint is current that all the small-pox that has infested the northern part of Ontario has been brought in across the border at Sault St. Marie. The result has been not only a huge expense to the province but to the municipalities as well. There must have been a great deal of laxity at the Sault St. Marie to have permitted so many cases to come in across the border there. What was the result ? Men coming from Michigan went to the lumber camps in that district, and with the breaking up of operations in the spring they proceeded to different parts of the province and thus transplanted these cases for distances of 100 miles. I know in our own neighbourhood, in the town of Midland and in the township of Tay, the result has been the expenditure of hundred of dollars by the municipalities in looking after these cases. I am well within the mark in saying that in the township of Tay there were seven or eight cases imported directly from these districts, and the result has been that the township authorities were compelled to quarantine the people in their houses, to place guards over them to prevent communication with other persons. More than that, they had to provide means and supply provisions for them for a long time. There must have been a great laxity of surveillance at Sault Ste. Marie not to have prevented so many cases crossing the border. While I regret to bring up this case of Thessalon in the absence of the member for Algoma, it is a striking thing that at a small village like that a medical gentleman should have been paid the huge sum of $810. Dr. Aylesworth of Collingwood was also paid a large sum, that is in the riding of North Simcoe. For the future I trust the minister will see that better means are taken at Sault Ste. Marie to prevent cases coming across and spreading through the northern part of Ontario. It is not simply a matter of spending money in looking after cases when they had got so bad as they did, but there were many cases where people died. I may mention a case that occurred in the town of Orillia. A man came in from one of those lumber districts and went to a leading hotel in the town, and it was found that he had the small-pox. The result was the closing of the hotel for a long time, and a great loss of money to the proprietor, all in consequence of this small-pox spreading from the Soo eastward and all over that district of northern Ontario.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In my experience I chanced to be in the neighbourhood of the Soo about a year ago. There were two cases of small-pox detected on a train, not by a medical health officer of the provincial government, not by a medical man at all, but by some gentleman who happened to be on the train and who was familiar with it. They were in a second class car. The passengers with whom they had been associated, for how long a distance I do not know, were turned loose into the first class car and those in the first class car were run into the sleeper. One can readily imagine the sensation on that train. Those two passengers were finally quarantined in a second class coach at Sudbury and the train moved on. I can assure the minister that there was a very nervous feeling among the passengers, at all events I can speak for a good many of them. They were in doubt as to whether they should voluntarily go into quarantine, or whether they should go and get themselves fixed up by being fumigated, or what other course to pursue. I mention this to show that these two men had small-pox opened out on them and yet they had been roaming round the country and spreading the contagion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Did they come across from Michigan ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not know whether it is the intention of the government to appoint a travelling inspector of public health, but if they have not one, it would be well to do so. I have not had the pleasure of reading that report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The report of the Superintendent General of Public Health is in the Departmental Report.

Mr. INGRAM. What is his name ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Director General of Public Health is Dr. Montizambert, located at Ottawa. He travels around the country.

Mr. INGRAM. And makes it his business to inquire how the medical authorities are doing their duty.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He does not inquire into what the provincial authorities are doing, they are outside of his purview. He does not interfere with the local authorities.

Mr. INGRAM. I am asking about the Dominion officer appointed by this government. He makes a report as to how the provincial authorities are carrying out their duties, I presume.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. In respect of these two cases, that of Dr. Baxter, of Thessalon, who is paid $810, and the case of Dr. Parker, of Bruce Mines, paid the large sum of $387, what I said as to Thessalon is equally applicable to Bruce Mines. Bruce Mines is not a port of entry for vessels coming from the United States at all. I don't think there is a foot of lumber shipped from that point. There are no saw-mils there. May I ask how these two gentlemen commenced to enter upon their duties ? Was it by the direction of the minister from here upon the complaint of some person, and who was the person that did complain ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot offhand tell you who it was that complained or what representations were made. It was certainly on the local representations that there was a danger of the arrival of the disease at these ports. I have not in my mind the exact representations that were made.

Mr. BENNETT. Since the hon. gentleman has no recollection of the complaints, was it upon the representation of the member for the district ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Possibly ; I cannot say.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask if in the case of Collingwood it was on the representation of the local member ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Possibly ; I cannot say.

Mr. BENNETT. These are striking coincidences in one or two of these cases. I know that these medical gentlemen are strongly of the same political stripe as the hon. gentlemen who represent these ridings and it seems to me very odd that at a small place like Thessalon this doctor should have commenced on July 1st and continued until the 31st October and that he should have commenced on February 26th and continued until June 30th. It is absurd to claim that in the case of Thessalon it was to watch any suspected parties who might come in on boats because it is absurd to believe that boats were plying there at that time of the year, February 26. In the case of Dr. Parker his time commenced on the 5th of March. No boats possibly could have come in at the time. If the minister has reason to pay these medical gentlemen for services performed there, may I ask him if in the case of these applications which have been made by any of these municipalities he will be disposed to recommend the payment of any of the bills that they have been required to disburse.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not make any statement upon such a question until I receive representations from these municipalities.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these medical officers appointed by the Superintendent General of Public Health ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are appointed by him under the minister, of course.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that after this discussion——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am a little in error in saying the appointments are made by the superintendent general. They are made by me as minister through the superintendent general of public health.

Mr. CLARKE. He does not recommend the appointments ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He does not recommend the individual. He recommends the appointment.

Mr. INGRAM. I intended to ask the hon. minister if it is his intention to appoint a travelling inspector under the general superintendent of public health.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not any such intention.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to say to the hon. minister that after this discussion, which has brought out some very important information as to the management of his department, we should have some further information. I am in no sense disposed to minimize the importance of a very effective service to prevent the spread of small-pox in Canada, but it would seem, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and also by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Ross), that there has been a great deal of laxity. Now, the hon. minister will see the importance of giving the committee fuller information. The hon. gentleman stated that wherever an appointment was made for the frontier service it was done upon the recommendation of the local health authorities.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Then the hon. minister would say the local member ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I do not say that.

Mr. CLANCY. Then I will leave it an open question, whether it be on the recommendation of the local member, upon the recommendation of the local authorities, or upon the recommendation of some person or persons other than those already stated. It is important that the committee should have that information before them, also the instructions given to persons employed under such circumstances. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I wish to point out, while we all admit the importance of an effective service, that abuses may grow up under it. The hon. gentleman has stated that many doctors are still in the employ of the government who were originally appointed, while the services of others have ben discontinued. What the committee ought to have in the first place is the information that induced the minister to give the appointment, and in the next instance where there has been a cessation of the service, the reason for its discontinuance. I think the hon. gentleman had better let the item stand until he gives the committee that information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is quite impossible, and I do not think it would serve any particular purpose for the director general of public health to go and visit these different localities from time to time. At the time he might visit one there might be no case of disease, and the next day after he left, there might be cases of disease.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman quite misunderstands me. What I asked of the minister was the information that induced him to make the appointments first ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand that. I was coming to that.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, again, what induced him to dispense with the services of those who had been employed. Was it upon the recommendation of the superintendent general who made a report to the hon. gentleman before he could act, or upon the report of the local physician employed in the meantime in addition to the report of the superintendent general ? The committee ought to be in possession of that information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know if I can explain it thoroughly so that the hon. gentleman will understand it. The ground upon which these gentlemen have been appointed is that it has been caused to appear to the director general of public health that there seemed to be a necessity for guarding the frontier at any one particular place. The necessity, or appearance of it, was derived from two things in particular, although other things might enter into it—the first thing, the conditions prevailing on the other side of the line, and, secondly, the representations of the provincial health officers who had more information in connection with a particular locality than we had. If local or municipal representations were made they were taken into consideration. If representations were made by any well-known individuals in the locality they were also taken into consideration. But, the appointments were made simply and solely when it was believed by the director general of public health and myself that it was necessary to guard the frontier at these particular places. The physicians who are appointed make monthly reports and the condition of affairs on the other side of the line is carefully watched by the director general. Just as soon as these monthly reports showed that there did not seem to be any further necessity of a doctor's continuance in office and when the condition of affairs on the other side of the line showed that the danger had ceased, this gentleman was notified that his services were no longer required and his appointment and pay ceased. There has been continuous employment of some. In the lake ports during the winter time the danger ceases, no vessels are arriving, and therefore there is no danger of contagion being carried. In other ports which are open all winter there might be danger. This is the system which has been carried out and it seems to me to be the only rational system we could carry out. Of course, if we had at the time immediately the scare occurred—I say 'scare,' but I do not mean 'scare' in a discreditable sense at all—but, when the fear occurred, if we had immediately appointed, on all lines of communication betwen Canada and the United States, a doctor to watch for evidences of the disease, this vote would have had to have been two or three times greater than it is, and it would have involved an unnecessary expenditure if we were to adopt such a system. We have tried by all means possible to keep down this expenditure. I know that the director general of public health has kept as close a watch as possible and with my full approval and under my direction he has always tried to dispense with the services of these officers just as soon as the danger ceased to exist. I can assure the hon. gentleman that has been the instruction given, and I believe it has been most fully carried out by the director general of public health.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, every member in this House knows that the inspector general is often helpless against the pressure brought by members and friends of the government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister knows very well that is the case, and he need not try

to deny it. It is the tendency under the system of our government, and every one knows that it is the case. The very statement of the minister himself shows that it is necessary that we should have this information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will give all the information.

Mr. CLANCY. And the item will stand until we get that information ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will let it stand if you wish.

Mr. CLANCY. I assume there is some correspondence between the federal government and the provincial governments on this matter, and I think we ought to be in possession of that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That correspondence would be very voluminous.

Mr. CLANCY. It is very important.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman had better move for a return and I will bring it down.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister cannot get this item passed without giving this information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If I am to read all the correspondence between the director general of public health and the local authorities on this matter, it will take the House several days to listen to me.

Mr. CLANCY. If the minister places the correspondence at our disposal he will have the assistance of this side of the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will have to get copies made.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister has a staff of officers, and the difficulty of getting copies is not insuperable.

Mr. MONK. Has there been correspondence with the provincial authorities of Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. MONK. The minister told us that we spent $75,000 last year in connection with this service, but as a matter of fact we spent $20,000 more.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was the figure supplied me by the acting deputy minister, and I took it to be correct.

Mr. MONK. There was a mistake made.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will find out where the discrepancy is.

Mr. MONK. If the minister does that he will do something which is less necessary than what I want him to do. During that year we were threatened with small-pox, because in the expenditure of $94,000 there is included the cost of vaccine and patrolling and other items which indicate that we feared an invasion of the disease. The minister tells us that this year we are spending not only that amount and $15,000 more, but also a great deal more than that. In what particulars have that increased expenditure been made. Now, the question put by the hon. gentleman for Toronto (Mr. Osler) is very pertinent. In the province of Quebec when we are threatened with an invasion of small-pox, we attend to it ourselves, a fact which is borne out by the statement of the minister that although there is small-pox in the New England states, he has not been asked to take precautions in regard to the frontier of Quebec, and he has not done so. The frontier of Quebec is guarded, and I assume it is done by the local authorities. But the minister has guarded the frontier of other provinces. This very fact shows that the correspondence with the provincial authorities is necessary. I want to know if the department follows one rule in one province and another rule in another province.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. MONK. Then there must be some fixed rule in the department, and we have a right to know what it is before we vote this increased expenditure of $30,000.

Mr. INGRAM. I venture to say that the minister cannot tell me how many cases of small-pox have occurred on the frontier during the past month, because so far as I can see from the report of the director general of public health, there is very little reference to that matter. It is not the duty of the department to tell us where the small-pox is located along the frontier. I have here the Public Health Report of the United States, published according to Act of Congress, and this report shows at a glance the number of cases of small-pox in the frontier states and the date of each case. In Minnesota, for instance, there are 2,676 cases and 12 deaths; in North Dakota, 183 cases and 1 death, and so on. That is a very satisfactory report, and it shows that the authorities in the United States are alive to this important matter, and place before the public the very information which we have tried to get from the minister this evening. If it does cost the people of the United States money they have something to show for it ; but so far as I can find from the report of our department, there is nothing to justify the expenditure that we are making.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The information contained in that report issued by the United States authorities, is obtained from the state authorities. We have not done that.

Mr. INGRAM. Why not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have not attempted to do it. That information is published in the reports issued by our provincial authorities, who have charge of such matters within each province. We are only supposed to deal with the importation of the disease across the frontier, and in our report you will find the number of cases that our quarantine officers have dealt with.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand the minister to say that in the appointment of these doctors in the Algoma district, he acted on the representations of the member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment).

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking from memory, I think so.

Mr. BENNETT. I think so too, and I think it is rather creditable to the hon. gentleman who represents that district, that he seems to have passed the word to his medical friends—for I assume they are his medical friends—that they had better start at this calling on a certain date; because it is a very odd coincidence that Dr. Baxter of Thessalon, started on his duties on July 1st, and ended them on the 31st of October; that Dr. Hamilton, of Fort William, started on the same date and ended on the same date; that Dr. Gibson, of Sault Ste. Marie, also started on the same date, and ended on the same date. It seems that the word was spread about that these gentlemen might give their services to the government at the very fair salary of $100 a month. I find also that Dr. Aylesworth, of Collingwood, started on the 1st of July, and ended on the 31st of October. It is absurd to argue that they were all on the look-out for vessels, because Dr. Parker, of Bruce Mines, started on the 5th of March, long before navigation opened. I would ask the hon. minister specially to bring down the correspondence which relates to the appointment of these medical gentlemen in the district of Algoma at the points which I have referred to.

Mr. STEPHENS. I may state for the information of the committee in regard to the health officer at Rondeau, that in some winters the boats run all winter, and in others they only run to the 1st of January. This year they stopped running in December, and of course the officer quit work when the boats stopped running.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the hon. gentleman recommend the appointment, and was it solely upon his recommendation that Dr. McCullough was appointed at that port?

Mr. STEPHENS. I did not recommend the appointment at all. I think the appointment was recommended by the Ontario Health Department—by Dr. Bryce.

Mr. CLANCY. I think Dr. Bryce has quite as much zeal in a party sense as the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. STEPHENS. I have no doubt it was a good appointment, because I understand that he found men who actually had small-pox, and sent them back to Cleveland. On the whole, it strikes me that it would be very hard for any minister to do what the opposition recommends. One man gets up and complains that he is spending altogether too much money, while others recommend that more money should be spent.

Mr. CLANCY. I had no intention of referring to the appointment, which I believe was made on the recommendation of the hon. member for Kent. I prefer to discuss the question on its merits. So far as I can learn, there was not a case of small-pox in that quarter; but I ask the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Johnston), who represents a constituency where people may come across at all times, whether it was not reported on good authority that there were a good many cases of small-pox in Marine City on the River St. Clair. That hon. gentleman, I will say it to his credit, did not load physicians on the public service, although he is a physician himself. My hon. friend from Kent knows perfectly well that the object was simply to take care of Dr. McCullough. I would have preferred to be spared making any reference to the appointment, for which there is no defence whatever. If Dr. Bryce made the recommendation, he had better turn his attention to the frontier along the River St. Clair or to Windsor, which escaped his vigilant eye.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has spoken of Rondeau. I may say that boats run direct to that point from Cleveland, which was one of the places most infested with small-pox. In regard to what the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has said, there is a very simple explanation. The fear of small-pox existed in the month of June, and there was a very general demand for the immediate appointment of health officers. These appointments all commenced about the 1st of July, because that was when the fear arose and the demand was made, and they ceased on the same date, because that was the date when navigation on the lakes ceased.

Mr. STEPHENS. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) tries to make out that the appointment of an officer at Rondeau was all my doing. I say openly and above board that I never recommended it.

Mr. CLANCY. I am glad the hon. gentleman repudiates it.

Mr. STEPHENS. I did not know the government were going to place an officer there until I was told so by the department here. The hon. gentleman knows that Rondeau is seven or eight miles from any town or any medical man. It is far different in that respect from Windsor, where

there are many doctors, and also a medical health officer, who could prevent any person with small-pox from coming into the country. At Rondeau boats come from Cleveland every day, and on some days there are two or three boats. As soon as the boats start again, if the department does not appoint a man there, I will ask it to do so, because I think it is really necessary.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the minister keep himself posted as to the prevalence of small-pox in the large centres along the boarder ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The director general of public health does. I do not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The minister is the Minister of Public Health. There is no need of quibbling.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no intention of quibbling.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What are the steps which the minister takes ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The director general of public health receives the reports of the local health officers, as I have already stated to the committee.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there a health officer at Port Stanley, from which a boat runs to Ashtabula, Ohio ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say whether there was an officer there during the summer or not. There is not now.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the minister's reason why the services of these men in Algoma were discontinued in October is a very poor one, because I am informed that small-pox assumes a worse phase as the weather gets colder, and instead of the boats stopping running on the 31st of October, they often do not stop until November, and sometimes December. I am afraid that the fact is that the pressure on the minister was too great for him to resist, and that after a time the appointments were swelling so much that the gentleman in charge of the department called a halt. However, when the reports come down, they will show who recommended the appointments of all these doctors in Algoma. It appears they were appointed for very different reasons. At some places, where a large vessel called, they were appointed on account of the vessel; in other cases, where there was superior zeal on the part of the doctor in applying for the position and on the part of the member in recommending him, the doctors started their duties before navigation opened at all. When the minister brings down the papers, I hope he will bring down those respecting the appointment of Dr. Aylesworth, of Collingwood.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did these officers give certificates or clean bills of health to persons coming on the trains ? What charge per head was made for the certificate ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was no charge and no certificate.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly the doctors issued certificates and there was quite a rivalry among them. In some instances, in the absence of the doctor, their wives made out the certificates. The usual charge was a dollar, but finally they got it down to 50 cents each.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. MONK. I think it would be necessary for us to see the reports of these medical appointees.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are monthly reports from each of them.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the minister to say that I was complaining that the expenditure was too heavy. What I complained of was that we were either spending too little or too much. We are spending too much for a very imperfect service and too little for a very good service. And while we have been spending a very considerable sum, our expenditure is without much effect, because the disease has been imported over and over again from the other side notwithstanding all our precautions. I cannot understand how so large a number of cases could come in if ordinary precautions had been taken. I do not complain of the expense, but of the laxity of the regulations and the provisions taken to prevent the importation of the disease.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the services of these local medical officers dispensed with on the recommendation of the chief medical officer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, he reports to me and I authorize him to dispense with their services.

Mr. CLARKE. Have any steps been taken by the officers of the department to secure the co-operation of the provincial authorities ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The work of each is entirely separate. We have not asked them to do our work, nor have they asked us to do theirs.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any correspondence in the department between the two ? It would be very advisable for the Dominion to secure the co-operation of the local authorities in stamping out this disease. In some sections of Ontario it has made considerable ravages, and our urban muni-

cipalities have had to expend large sums. It is utterly impossible to think that if there were co-operation between the Dominion and the provincial officers more satisfactory results would not be obtained. It is unfortunate, notwithstanding the appointments of so many officers along the frontier in Ontario, that such a vast number of cases have been allowed to pass.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is exaggerating. We have no such information.

Mr. CLARKE. The newspapers say so, and they got their information from the medical authorities very largely, and their reports have been found substantially correct. At any rate, I think that better results would be obtained if the Dominion officers would co-operate with the provincial officers.

Mr. MONK. Is there any correspondence between the Quebec Board of Health and the hon. gentleman's department on this subject ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are one or two letters and I will bring them down.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any correspondence with the Public Health Department of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will bring that down also.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I would ask for the same privilege for Manitoba. I understand that the disease spread considerably in Manitoba on account of the laxity of the service at the boundary in allowing cases from Dakota to cross the line. We have had several cases traced to Dakota.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My inspector denies point blank that anything of the kind occurred.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. There is a general complaint in Manitoba that cases of small-pox were allowed to cross the border. The fact is notorious.

Item allowed to stand.

Tracadie Lazeretto, $5,500.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the vote been exhausted ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is exhausted each year. It is a fixed sum paid the Sisters of Charity to manage the hospital and to pay the doctor's salary, and other expenses.

Public Works Health Act, $4,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman appointed a travelling physician, as he stated he intended to do ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I appointed a travelling inspector, but not a physician. His name is C. A. L. Fisher, of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. What are his particular qualifications and what are the duties ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The duties are to inspect the operations of contractors and managers of public works, to see that they carry out the provisions of the Health Act.

Mr. MONK. Is not that more the work of a physician ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not necessarily.

Mr. MONK. Has it no reference to hygiene ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has reference to carrying out the provisions of the Act.

Mr. MONK. What was Mr. Fisher's occupation up to the time of his appointment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think he was a real estate agent in Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. It would seem much more proper to have appointed a medical man. To look after the sanitary condition of a public work would require the judgment and knowledge of a physician. In many cases an ordinary person could judge, but in others the knowledge of the physician would be necessary.

Mr. MONK. What is Mr. Fisher's salary?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is $1,800.

Mr. MONK. Is he paid expenses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Travelling expenses, not living expenses.

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose this has to do with public works under the authority of the Dominion, not those under provincial authority ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Quite so.

Mr. INGRAM. Has this officer furnished a report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, it forms an appendix to the report of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. Has he visited the public works during the year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, those coming under the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. All public works carried on by the government would be under the Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, or those under contract with the Dominion or on which Dominion money is being spent.

Mr. SPROULE. If he finds an unsanitary condition of affairs, would he be competent to deal with it, not being a medical man ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Under the Act, the manager of the work or the contractor or his representative is obliged to have a physician on the work or within reach. The duty of the inspector is to see that these provisions are carried out. He is not required to act as a physician himself. It was thought that we could get a layman to carry out the provisions of the Act as efficiently and at less expense than by employing a physician. The Act calls for proper accommodation in the way of hospitals, proper medical attendance for employees and so on. The inspector sees to it that these provisions are carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. If the inspector found something in an unsanitary condition and referred it to the company's physician, he would refer it to one whose interest is with the contractors. The contractor will not wish to undertake the expense necessary to change the conditions. How are they to agree upon what is a proper sanitary condition ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a sanitary board for each public work under the regulations. This board consists of the physician, the manager, or contractor, or his representative, and the inspector. If there were a serious dispute, the director general of public health would be called in. This work is done under his supervision and control, and he would be the professional referee.

Mr. SPROULE. I apprehend that the inspector would have but little influence, having against him two men whose interests are those of the contractor.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He can always refer to the director general of public health.

Mr. SPROULE. How many times is it necessary for the inspector to visit these public works ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Taking up his duties last year, he visited every public work, and he will probably visit them again during the coming year. We get reports from these local boards.

Mr. SPROULE. I fear that these reports will not be as valuable as if coming from the inspector, because of the fact that they are from the representative of the contractor, and it would be their object to defend themselves as far as possible.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of course, there is a penalty upon the contractor if he does not carry out the regulations, and it is the inspector's duty to see that the law in this respect is lived up to. Of course we cannot have an inspector on these works all the time, but we can have him go whenever possible. Mr. Fisher went through to the Pacific Coast last year and visited every work.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that if the work is to be effective it will be necessary for the inspector to visit each public work from time to time. Premises might be in a sanitary condition to-day then, a month hence, be in the very opposite condition. The object is a good one if properly carried out, it would no doubt have beneficial results for the labouring men who have but little influence in controlling the situation in these matters. But, to carry out the Act effectively it seems to me, an intelligent medical man should be appointed, and he should visit the works every two or three months.

Mr. MONK. I think it a great pity that the government, when inaugurating the work of this Act, did not choose as inspector a physician. From what I know, of Mr. Fisher, I believe that he is an old man. I have known him as a real estate agent, I believe, and, I think he is one of the principle organizers of the Liberal party.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was secretary of the Liberal Club.

Mr. MONK. I think the department made a great mistake in not choosing a young physician. One could have been employed at far less expense than this. The government could have chosen a young physician, one at the beginning of his career, and thus have given him encouragement, which is always welcome at such a time. I cannot understand why we have an expenditure last year of $600 and, with a salary of $1,800 which is far too great for the nominee, we have now an expenditure of $4,000. Is there mention in Mr. Fisher's report of travelling expenses ? There must have been considerable to bring the item up to such a figure.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When this question came up on the first item for this purpose, it was distinctly stated in the House that the appointment should not be given to a physician. The work is being done largely in the interests of the workingmen employed on these public works, and it was thought that there would be far more confidence in the operation of the Act if a professional man were not appointed. So far as the expenditure is concerned, Mr. Fisher's term of office did not commence until quite late in the year, the expenditure for travelling will be considerable, as he has to travel nearly all the time.

Winnipeg and St. Boniface hospitals $4,000.

Mr. McCREARY. Last year when this item came before the House, I asked that it be increased, but I find that it still remains at the same figure. I think it is well to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture and of the committee to the fact

that these two hospitals are practically doing Dominion work. Most of the members of this committee are aware that we have coming into that province now pretty nearly 50,000 people per year, coming from Europe, from Great Britain and from the United States. We have two hospitals there, the St. Boniface hospital, under the supervision of the Roman Catholic Church, but which is by no means confined to members of that church, it is a general hospital in every particular; then we have the general hospital at Winnipeg. But I want to say that nearly one-third of all the patients treated in these hospitals are immigrants who have arrived either at once or within a year. Now, is it fair to the people of the west that they should be asked to support these hospitals when the balance of Canada gets the benefit ? I think this item should be increased to at least $10,000, and should be distributed equally between the two hospitals. It should be charged, if that can be done, to the Department of Agriculture, if not, then to the Interior Department. I know when the Minister of the Interior comes to lay his estimates before this House, and when the Minister of Finance comes to make his budget speech, they will both boast of the great progress the west is making, of the large number of immigrants coming in; they will both talk in loud tones of the large quantity of wheat being exported from that country, and undoubtedly will talk loudly of the great progress of the west. If that is so, why should they not contribute at least something to help the sick of those people who come to the west to create that wealth ? I think my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRiviere) will back me up in saying that the amount voted for these two hospitals is too small, that the Dominion governmen should pay at least $10,000, to be divided equally between them.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. We had in the estimates in former years the sum of $10,000 for these two institutions. I am sorry it has been decreased, not so much by the present government as by the former one. At any rate, the amount is quite inadequate, as my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) said; because these two institutions are performing the duty of taking care of sick people not only for Manitoba but for the Northwest. When immigrants arriving at Winnipeg take sick, as they frequently do after the long sea voyage, they are sent to either one of these two institutions regardless of creed or nationality. They are both general hospitals. In fact, I may say that the St. Boniface hospital, though known to be a Roman Catholic institution, cares for more Protestants than Roman Catholics. I agree with my hon. friend who has just spoken, and join him in begging the government to reconsider their recommendation and to increase the amount which is offered to these two institutions.

Mr. McCREARY.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 26th, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 9) respecting the United Gold Fields Company of British Columbia, Limited.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 10) respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Parmalee.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—Hon. Mr. Sutherland.

MEDICAL COUNCIL IN CANADA.

Mr. T. G. RODDICK (Montreal, St. Antoine) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 11) to provide for the establishment of a medical council in Canada. He said : Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up the time of the House at this stage with any lengthy remarks, but I would simply like your permission to say, Sir, that since I had the opportunity about a year ago in this House, of explaining this measure fully, I have met representatives of the medical profession from every province in the Dominion of Canada, at a convention held in the city of Winnipeg in August last at which this measure was endorsed in its entirety with one or two exceptions or amendments, notably an alteration in the proposed composition of the council. The council, will, under the present draft bill, be somewhat changed in its method of election ; that is to say, that instead of three representatives from each province, as was originally intended, the representation shall now be based on the number of medical men in each province, making for the larger provinces a very considerable increase. Another change which was decided upon was to have the ten universities of Canada represented on this council. With the exception of these there have been no alterations in the original Bill as presented to this House at the last session of parliament. I have reason to believe that the medical men in this House, of whom there are fourteen or fifteen, are almost unanimous, if not unanimous, in their endorsation of this measure, and I hope they will join me in the request which I intend making on the second reading of this Bill, that the right hon. leader of the government shall consent to the appointment of a com-

mitte, which shall be composed chiefly of the medical men of the House with one or two legal gentlemen, who shall have an opportunity of studying the measure and of hearing any delegates who may come from the various provinces in order to suggest changes or amendments in it. I have been anxious that the profession should thoroughly understand the measure, and now I am exceedingly anxious that the medical men in this House and my hon. friends of other persuasions, shall also thoroughly understand it. I have purposely not pushed the Bill because I was most anxious that every one should be thoroughly satisfied with it. Now, I think the time has come when I may proceed to a second and a final stage. My motion is seconded by Mr. Bell.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

WATER PRIVILEGES IN WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. HOLMES asked :

What is the nature and extent of the water privileges on the Welland canal enjoyed by the Merriton Paper Company ? What rental do they pay therefor ? Have they any privileges granted by a previous government for which they are not paying the usual rate ? If so, how long have they had the same, and for what length of time is it yet to run ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). The name of the Merriton Paper Company does not appear on the records of this department either as lessee or as the assignee or sub-lessee of any lease of water privilege on the Welland Canal.

THE PERMANENT CORPS.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. What was the total cost of the permanent corps for the year 1901-2

2. How many military certificates were issued to officers during the same year ?

3. How many to non-commissioned officers and men ?

4. How many of each (a) officers, (b) non-commissioned officers and men attending the schools were from (1) rural corps, (2) city corps, (3) permanent corps ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden) :

1. The cost to 31st January has been about $300,000, divided as follows : Pay, $181,619; supplies, $83,909; clothing, $19,000; stores, $12,000; transport, $4,000.

2. Officers, 323 certificates.

3. N.C.O.'s and men, 256 certificates.

4. This information is being obtained from the officers commanding the units of the permanent corps. It will be some time before it is complete.

SALE OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. BLAIN—by Mr. Ward—asked :

1. How was the binder twine advertised that was unsold on June 30th, 1901 ?

2. Was the binder twine sold by public auction or by tender ?

3. To whom was it sold, and what was the price ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) :

1. By advertisement in newspapers, and also by circular to previous customers.

2. By tender.

3. To S. S. Dickinson, one ton of sisal at $6 per cwt. To Henderson Black, balance of twine at $4.80 per cwt. for sisal twine, $5.10 per cwt. for mixed twine.

EMPLOYEES KILLED ON CANADIAN RAILWAYS.

Mr. PUTTEE asked :

1. How many employees of Canadian railways were killed during the year ending June 30th, 1901 ?

2. How many were injured ?

3. What was the classification of employment of each ?

4. In how many cases were railway companies found contributory by negligence through faulty appliances or otherwise ?

5. In how many cases was indemnity paid by railway companies (a) to the injured, (b) to the relatives of those killed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). In the absence of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) I beg to say :

1. One hundred and eighteen employees were killed.

2. Nine hundred and seventy employees were injured.

3. Unable to answer this question, as there is no such information on record in the department.

4. Unable to answer this question, as there is no such information on record in the department.

5. Unable to answer this question, as there is no such information on record in the department.

AMENDMENT TO SUPREME COURT ACT.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. Has a copy of the following resolution, adopted at a meeting of the bar of Manitoba, held at Winnipeg on Saturday, the 15th day of February, 1902, been received by the Honourable the Minister of Justice :—

'That, as there is now a large and increasing population in Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia, and in view of the rapidly growing importance of these provinces, it is in the opinion of the bar of Manitoba due to that portion of Canada lying west of Ontario that there should be appointed for such territory at least one judge to the Supreme Court of Canada, and the bar of Manitoba respectfully urges that the government of the Dominion of Canada make such amendment

to the Supreme Court Act as will enable such additional judge to be appointed.'

2. Will any amendment be proposed by the government to the Supreme Court Act in order that judges of that court may be appointed from the bars of Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). A copy of the resolution referred to was received in the Department of Justice. It is not the present intention to make any amendment to the Supreme Court Act.

TRENT VALLEY AND RICE LAKE CANALS.

Mr. WARD asked :

1. Has the Minister of Railways and Canals taken any action since last session regarding the continuation of the Trent Valley Canal from Rice Lake to Lake Ontario ?

2. Has any engineer's report been obtained by the Department of Railways and Canals since the last report of Mr. Rogers, C.E., as to the comparative advantages of the routes by the Trent River and Port Hope ?

3. Has the government decided upon the adoption of either of these routes ? If so, which ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. No action has been taken since last session.

2. No engineer's report has been obtained since the last report of Mr. Rogers.

3. No, the adoption of either route has not been decided.

YUKON TERRITORY—SHERIFF EILBECK.

Mr. WARD asked :

1. Is Mr. R. J. Eilbeck, sheriff of the Yukon Territory ? If so, when was he appointed, and at what salary ?

2. Has Mr. R. J. Eilbeck had leave of absence from his duties for several months past, and, if so, has he being drawing his salary as sheriff during the time of such leave ?

3. Is the Minister of the Interior or any other member of the government aware that Mr. Eilbeck took an active part in the recent election in West Durham ?

4. Did the Minister of the Interior or any other member of the government meet Mr. Eilbeck in the West Riding of Durham while the election was pending there ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) :

1. Mr. Eilbeck is sheriff of the Yukon Territory and was appointed 24th October, 1899. His salary was fixed later on at $2,000 per annum. His present salary is $3,000 per annum.

2. Yes, as to leave of absence. He has drawn his salary up to the end of December last. In regard to the third and fourth paragraphs, I have to say that it is not to my knowledge that Mr. Eilbeck was in West Durham during the last election, and I am requested by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) to say that it is not to his knowledge that he was there.

CHANGES IN THE CABINET.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Before the business of the House is proceeded with, I may call to mind that some few days ago the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition asked the government to make some explanation as to the ministerial changes which have taken place recently. I thought at the time, if I may say so, that his request came a little too late for he had noticed the changes in his speech in the debate on the Address from the Throne, and he presented to the House his observations in regard to the matter, which on the whole were not at all unfavourable. But, if my hon. friend wants to have the subject re-opened, of course there can be no objection.

I have only to say, what is within the knowledge of every one, that in the interval between last session and the opening of this session two vacancies occurred on the bench of the Supreme Court caused by the deaths of Mr. Justice King and Mr. Justice Gwynne. The government, in view of the situation, came to the conclusion that these vacancies on the bench would be worthily filled by Sir Louis Davies and the Hon. Mr. Mills. As to the qualifications of the Hon. Mr. Mills and of Sir Louis Davies it is needless to say anything in this House. They had both been for many years very valuable and trusted members of the House of Commons of Canada. Mr. Mills was one of the oldest of our parliamentarians ; he having sat continuously, with the exception of one session, either in one branch of the legislature or the other, since confederation. Of his legal abilities, and of his constitutional talent and knowledge, we who are his old colleagues in this House have had many and many evidences.

Sir Louis Davies after having served an honourable career in his own province came to this House for the first time in 1882, and he immediately took a leading and commanding position which he retained to the end of his parliamentary career. Those who have been members of parliament and in public life for a great many years, know that the responsibilities which are involved in this country by the discharge of parliamentary duties are very exacting and very absorbing in their nature, and that they tend to produce a strain upon the system which it is hard to bear. There comes a craving at a certain period of life for rest —not absolute rest, at all events that comparative rest which is to be found in the performance of duties which are not so absorbing. Had it not been for this consideration, for my part I would have hesitated very much before thinking of offering these gentlemen a position on the bench, because I realize as parliament must realize also, how much the government and parliament loses by their absence. Nobody can realize how much I shall lose personally, having

had their valuable support since it was my privilege to become the leader of the Liberal party in Canada. However, these considerations were put aside and we thought we owed it to these veterans in public life to call them to a sphere where their services would be of a different nature but still equally profitable to their country. But what parliament will lose the bench will gain. As to the fitness of these two gentlemen for the position to which they were called, I have not heard a word of dissent, nor do I believe that on this occasion there will be any objection raised. That they are eminently fitted for the positions they occupy was testified to, I am happy to say, by such a prominent member of the House as my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), and so far as Sir Louis Davies is concerned a tribute was paid to him by the hon. gentleman from Prince (Mr. Hackett) who has been a long life friend, although a political opponent of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The question then arose as to how the portfolios which were vacated by the accession of these gentlemen to the Supreme Court bench were so well filled. Sir Louis Davies had been Minister of Marine and Fisheries from the formation of this government, and the administration came to the conclusion that we would recommend as a most fit and proper person to succeed him, the Hon. James Sutherland, member for North Oxford.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. We believed that Mr. Sutherland was a most qualified person to discharge the duties appertaining to that important office. We knew Mr. Sutherland beforehand. He had been for two years a member of the administration without portfolio and during these two years the House has had on more than one occasion reason to appreciate his great administrative abilities, as the House had also occasion to appreciate for many years before the sterling qualities with which he is endowed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is the first time that the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries has been held by a gentleman who does not belong to the maritime provinces, but though the fishing industry in the maritime provinces is of very great importance, it must be remembered that there are other provinces in the Dominion which also have very great interests in that industry. The province of Ontario, if it is a second, is a good second to the maritime provinces in the extent of its fishing interests. Moreover, while it is proper that the portfolio should be held by one who represents a province in which there is a valuable fishing industry, it is not to be disputed that it is fit and proper that in the representation in the Cabinet all provinces should have a voice, and everybody will agree with me that the proportion as to the representation between one province and another province is not absolute, nor can there be a cast iron rule about it. Some elasticity must prevail according to time and circumstance, and I think that under the present circumstances the choice that we have made will not be criticized in any part of the Dominion.

With regard to the portfolio of Justice we came to the conclusion that nobody could fill it better than the hon. gentleman who for five years has been Solicitor General, and who has discharged the duties of that office not only with marked acceptance from both sides of the House, but with conspicuous ability.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. We believe that although the portfolio of Justice has been held in the past by lawyers of very great eminence, the Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick will prove himself in every way their peer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. This left a vacancy in the office of the Solicitor General, and though the Solicitor General does not belong to the Cabinet, perhaps it may not be out of place that I should say that we thought of offering the position to a young gentleman from the province of Quebec, who has shown himself on every occasion that he addressed the House, to be a man of very great ability indeed. Mr. Carroll is Solicitor General.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. It only remains for me to say that in view of the growing importance of the west, Senator Templeman has been appointed and sworn a member of the Cabinet without portfolio.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. These are the changes that have taken place in the Cabinet, and such as they are we present them to the House with the full belief that they will command the support of our friends and challenge the criticism of our opponents.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is perhaps better that a motion should be made. It is moved by Sir Wilfrid Laurier that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, as there seems to be some doubt in the mind of my right hon. friend as to whether or not it was proper that these explanations should be made to the House, I took the opportunity of looking into that question, and I find that it is laid down by the highest authorities that a government should, even when reconstructed, offer explanations to the House. In 'Todd's

parliamentary practice in England,' at page 489, it is said :

> The most eminent authorities agree that when a cabinet is reconstructed it is as necessary to enter into explanations as when a total change of government takes place. When Mr. Gladstone retired from the cabinet, in 1845, he said, that he freely and entirely recognized the claim of the House to be correctly informed of the motives which lead members either to accept office under the Crown or to undertake the scarcely less grave responsibility of quitting it.

If my right hon. friend supposed that I desired to have these explanations for the purpose of making any extended criticism upon them, he is entirely mistaken. I took the ground from this side of the House that it was proper that the leader of the government should, with respect to the reconstruction of his cabinet, make the explanations to the House which he has now made. With regard to the two gentlemen who have been appointed to the bench of the Supreme Court, I can only say that my relations with them, during the short period I was with them in parliament, were of a very kindly nature. I do not know that it would be proper for me, a barrister, likely to appear before them in the Supreme Court of Canada, to make any remarks with regard to their fitness for that position. I can only add to what the right hon. gentleman has said, that the position occupied by both of these gentlemen in the parliament of Canada was a very high one.

With regard to the changes which have been made in the cabinet by the appointment of my hon. friend from Oxford (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), I am glad to add my word to that of the right hon. premier, that I do not see any particular reason, although I am from the maritime provinces, why that position should always be held by a gentleman from those provinces. Possibly it may be of advantage to the country that a gentleman from Ontario should hold that position and come into nearer touch with the maritime provinces than he otherwise would; because I am prepared to say here, what I have said elsewhere, that I believe it to be very much to the interest of this country that the public men of one section should become thoroughly familiar with other districts of the country, and the hon. gentleman's duties will necessarily bring him into contact with the maritime provinces. I desire to say further that I believe the hon. gentleman will find plenty of opportunity for active, careful and energetic administration in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that he is undertaking great responsibilities when he assumes that department, and that I trust that in the future we may have the opportunity of congratulating rather than criticising him upon his work there. At the same time, I am bound to tell him that when occasion does arise for criticism of his future work in that department, we shall always be ready to give him a helping hand in that way, and to point out the right course when we think he is not steering exactly in the proper direction.

With regard to the position of Minister of Justice, I agree with the right hon. gentleman that that office has been held by very able men, and I believe that my hon. friend the present Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) will uphold its high traditions. I may say in passing that the office of Minister of Justice has been held by no less than four members of the bar of the province of Nova Scotia, of which I have the honour to be a member. The first was the present chief justice of the province, the Hon. James McDonald, the next was Sir John Thompson, then Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, and lastly the Hon. Arthur R. Dickey. Therefore, we of the bar of Nova Scotia always feel a considerable interest in the Ministry of Justice and in the gentleman who happens to fill that position for the time being. I have not the same intimate acquaintance with the hon. gentleman who takes the position of Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Carroll), that I have with the Minister of Justice, but I desire also to extend to him my congratulations on the honour which has been bestowed upon him.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask how the present government can reconcile these acts with the position of their colleague, the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock), in view of the fact that he placed on record a few years ago their opinion, that no member of this House should be appointed to a place of emolument under the Crown until at least two years after he had left the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is something which is very easily explained. That is one of those falsehoods which have been started by some gentlemen on the other side, repeated by his neighbour, and then by him to his neighbour, and at last by everybody. The truth of the matter is simply this, that I think in 1894 or 1895, my hon. friend the present Postmaster General, who was then a private member of this House, introduced a Bill in the sense which has just been mentioned by my hon. friend from Grey. My hon. friend the Postmaster General thought, rightly or wrongly—for my part, I thought wrongly—that we should have that legislation on our statute-book. I never favoured it, nor do I know of a single member on this side of the House who expressed approval of it. My hon. friend the Postmaster General was in advance of the time. He received no support from the other side of the House. Hon. members opposite scouted his Bill, they would not vote for it, and it never came even to a second reading. It was read the first time, and never went beyond that, and the matter was absolutely for-

gotten until four or five years afterwards, when these hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House thought fit to resurrect that old dead issue in the hope of making some political capital out of it. But I can say to my hon. friend that after all I am only flesh and blood, and I am satisfied to have the approval of the country for the changes we have made.

Mr. MONK. May I ask the right hon. gentleman if there is any truth in the rumour of the resignation of the hon. Postmaster General ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I can assure my hon. friend that there is no truth in it.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, however the right hon. leader of the government may have answered the remark of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I hope he does not deny that that position was a strongly advocated plank of the Liberal candidates throughout the province of Ontario. I really forget what happened to that Bill, but I know that a number of Liberals were in favour of it, and I know that throughout the province of Ontario, not only during the contest of 1891, but in 1887 and previously, one of the great subjects of complaint by Liberals was that the Conservative party were appointing members of parliament or men which had been members of parliament to offices of emolument. For my part, I am on record in 'Hansard' in favour of doing so, because I am one of those who are willing to express their opinions, whatever they may be, upon all questions that come before this House. At the same time, it is perfectly proper—and that is one of the reasons why I rose at this time—to ask explanations from a party which in opposition advocated a measure on which a great principle was at stake, and in regard to which the electors of the country held very different and very strong opinions. It is very proper to recall to the recollection of hon. gentlemen a principle which they advocated when out of power, and which they abnegate when they are in power.

This is not a matter worthy of long discussion, but there is another subject on which I would ask leave to trouble the House in connection with these same appointments. Let me say that, so far as the two hon. gentlemen themselves are concerned, I have every confidence in their integrity and ability to fill the high positions to which they have been called. I think their appointments are excellent ones, but there is, in this respect, another high principle departed from entirely. In a session not long since, legislation was introduced to fix a limit of age, after which no one should be appointed. It was proposed to go even further and make this legislation retroactive. I opposed it because I considered that it would be a breach of faith on the part of parliament to make ex post facto legislation with regard to gentlemen who had accepted positions under the law guaranteeing their retention of these positions during life. What more do we find ? We find the hon. the Minister of Justice declaring that he proposes to introduce this session a Bill fixing an age limit in the case of the county court judges of Ontario, and fixing a limit which would have prevented the making of one of the appointments lately made. I could not gather from the remarks of the hon. minister whether he proposed to make the Bill relating to the county court judges retroactive or not, and I wish to place myself on record as opposing any such proposition. Why should he deal with the county court judges of Ontario and not with the judges of other courts ? Why is Ontario specially singled out, whose county court judges are in every way capable ? And if you are going to apply any limit to the county court judges, you should make the same limit apply to the higher judges. Were you to apply to the Supreme Court the age limit, which it is proposed to apply to the county court judges, you would render the last gentleman appointed to the Supreme Court bench ineligible for the position.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend was not in the House when I made a few remarks a day or two ago with reference to prospective legislation affecting county court judges, and I know him to be an extremely fair minded gentleman who would not willingly misrepresent any statement made in this House. My hon. friend must bear in mind that there never was any intention to introduce exceptional legislation with regard to Ontario. Any legislation that may be introduced with respect to the county court judges must be made applicable to all such judges throughout the Dominion. With respect to the other question, as to whether or not similar legislation might be made applicable to the High Court judges, I drew attention to the fact that the county court judges hold their office under an entirely different tenure, and while we have no right to interfere in any way with the High Court judges, we have special jurisdiction by statute with respect to county court judges. In any event there is no desire to interfere at all unnecessarily with any judges. On the contrary, my desire is to respect the bench in every particular, to hold absolutely sacred the position of judges. But at the same time, while I hold their position sacred, it must be borne in mind that the public have certain rights and that it is no advantage to the bench that men should occupy positions there for which they are admittedly not qualified. With respect to the age limit, it was intended to provide a limit which would vary from seventy to seventy-five years, coupled with a tenure of office of at least twenty-five years. And in

addition it was suggested that the change should be made optional, so far as the High Court judges are concerned, because we could not make it compulsory with them. With respect to county court judges, if a man has reached the advanced age of from seventy to seventy-five and has in addition been twenty-five years on the bench, to allow him to retire on full pay would not be a very great hardship.

COMMUTATION OF SENTENCES—ARSON OR INCENDIARISM.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for :

Return showing (1st) the number of commutations of sentences that have been granted through the Department of Justice to prisoners convicted of arson or incendiarism during the years 1899, 1900 and 1901 respectively ; (2nd) the places where the crimes were committed ; (3rd) the sentences imposed ; (4th) in which cases the report of the trial judge was favourable to conviction.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). There is no objection to the motion, except so far as concerns the fourth paragraph, that which refers to the report of the trial judges. These reports have invariably been considered by the Department of Justice as confidential communications, and it is not intended to depart from the rule that has been followed by the department since confederation. I am sure that my hon. friend will see that we cannot bring down these reports.

Mr. MONK. I have no objection to withdrawing the fourth paragraph.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In that case I will move to strike out all the words after the word 'imposed.'

Motion (Mr. Monk) amended as proposed, agreed to.

COMMISSIONS TO CANADIAN OFFICERS IN THE BRITISH ARMY.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle) (translation), moves for :

Copy of all papers and correspondence relating to the granting of commissions to Canadian officers in the British army.

Mr. Speaker, last year I moved a similar resolution to this one ; it was agreed to, on March 11th. On May 11th, I again moved for the production of those papers, and the government gave me the formal promise that they would be brought down as speedily as possible, but it was only on the day before prorogation that I got a certain number of the documents called for. I have now before me papers brought down last year ; and they came partly from the Department of Militia, partly from Rideau Hall. In the file coming from Rideau Hall is to be found, a telegram dated March 31st 1900, from Mr. Chamberlain to His Excellency, in which reference is made to two despatches sent by His Excellency to Mr. Chamberlain, the first one dated March 20th, the other dated March 30th. The latter is not to be found in the return. It seems but fair that, having the answer, we should also have the question which called for that reply.

In the other file, I find a despatch from Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Minto, dated April 9th, in reply to a despatch from His Excellency, of April 6th. Well, I should like to have the despatch of His Excellency to Mr. Chamberlain, which has given rise to the reply of the latter. On April 19th, Mr. Chamberlain wires again to Lord Minto, replying to a despatch of April 15th. Here again, we have the answer ; but the telegram which called for this reply we have not. Then comes another despatch dated April 27th, from Lord Roberts, the then Commander-in-chief of the troops in Africa, to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to a despatch of April 17th from His Excellency to Lord Roberts. The latter despatch is not to be found in the return. Then we have a despatch from Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Minto, dated May 17th, in reply to a despatch from His Excellency, dated April 18th. That despatch of His Excellency is missing from the return. Then comes a despatch sent by Lord Minto to Mr. Chamberlain, on November 25th, 1900, which reads as follows :

'It will be recollected that Her Majesty's government originally offered 30 commissions, and it was arranged that of these 24 should be allotted to Canadian troops serving in South Africa, the nominations to be forwarded to me by Lord Roberts, and submitted by me to the War Office, and the remaining six gentlemen of the Canadian Militia not serving in South Africa, recommendations to be forwarded by myself to the War Office.'

So, in this despatch, reference is made by His Excellency to arrangements entered into—between what parties ? I do not know. How those arrangements were made is another matter as to which we are left in the dark. Under these arrangements, the terms on which Canadian officers were offered commissions in the English army seem to have been altered.

If we are to be enlightened as to that matter, the whole correspondence must be brought down.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are met with a very important question here. Last session, I raised that question ; but as it was on the eve of prorogation day, and as from want of time, I could not use the phraseology required by parliamentary etiquette, I recollect, Mr. Speaker, that you called me to order ; but it is desirable that we should once for all come to an understanding on the point I am now referring to.

That His Excellency the Governor General does occupy a position in this country

which is perfectly identical to the position occupied by the Sovereign in Great Britain or, by sovereigns in countries where a representative form of government like ours obtains, is a fact that no member in this House questions. But if we are to take any stock in what well recognized writers on parliamentary law state, the inference to be drawn is that the conduct of the Governor General was not always what it should have been, for one who really occupied the position of a constitutional sovereign.

We have been told over and over again that the Governor General is the chief of the Canadian executive, the representative of the British Crown. In that capacity, of course, His Excellency plays in this country the part acted in Great Britain by the King. I do not wish to drag in the personality of His Excellency, which I am forbidden to do by rule 13 of this House, not to mention the rule imposed by good breeding in such matters, But I think, Sir, that if the constitutional rule laid down by Todd and several other authorities in parliamentary procedure holds good ; namely, that His Excellency is in this country both the chief of the executive and the representative of the British Secretary of State for the Colonies, there is, so to say, a dual personality in His Excellency. As chief of the Executive, he is, just like the chief of the Executive in England, liable to err. If the conduct of His Excellency is open to blame, that blame I have to cast upon the Governor General's advisers, namely, his responsible ministers. But when we come to deal with the representative of the Colonial Office, with the employee of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, I think the representatives of the people of Canada have the right to criticise his course of action and to say whether the acts of the functionary of the British government, as well as the acts of the colonial secretaries, are deserving of blame or not.

From that two-fold doctrine it follows that the Governor General is playing a very dangerous rôle when he seeks shelter under his prerogatives as the representative of the British Crown.

So the Governor General could establish two classes of papers, in his files : he could give publicity to such documents as he might think fit to communicate to parliament, and in the same breath, assuming the rôle of an employee of Downing Street, he could withhold other documents and say : ' For these papers I am not responsible to the people of Canada, as they refer to my secret relations with the Colonial Office.'

Within the last two years this question has been threshed out in the Canadian press. On several occasions, if we are to believe press reports, differences of a rather serious nature have arisen between the Governor General and his ministers, either in connection with the sending of troops to South Africa, or as to the production of such papers as I have just referred to. Later on, last fall, similar controversies are said to have occurred upon the occasion of the distribution of medals and decorations bestowed by the Crown upon the Canadian subjects. The ministers are said to have claimed the right of advising His Majesty's representative as to the bestowal of such rewards. That such a doctrine is a sound one I firmly believe. We have been told that His Excellency, using a prerogative which the King himself does not dare arrogate to himself in his own kingdom, and relying upon his dual responsibility, did exercise the right of awarding decorations to whomsoever he pleased. In the matter of decorations, whether medals or titles or other knick-knacks of the same kind, I confess that I remain perfectly indifferent.

But here, what is at stake is the production of papers which would materially help us to understand whether, in this matter of sending out troops to South Africa, and of enlisting volunteers, two years ago, and again last fall, the advisers of His Excellency did really take action with proper freedom ; whether His Excellency did consult them on all those points, or whether, His Excellency thought it expedient—always assuming that dual personality referred to above—to act now the rôle of a representative of the Crown, now the part of a representative of Downing Street ; seeking above all to safeguard the interests of the mother land and leaving it to his advisers to watch over the interests of the colony. Such is the question which now confronts us. And while I call for this return, I should like the right hon. the Prime Minister to throw some light on a point which affects very materially his constitutional position, as also the relations which should exist between the Governor General and his advisers, and the broader relations which should exist between Great Britain and her colonies.

I often heard the right hon. Prime Minister claim as his leader—Sir Louis Hypolite Lafontaine, and I may say that whenever he referred in such eloquent terms to that political fathership, I cheered him to the echo. Now, Mr. Speaker, Lafontaine did not hesitate to provoke a ministerial crisis, even at the risk of bringing Canada to the verge of rebellion, and why, Sir ? It was in order to have it settled once for all, whether the people of Canada, like the English people, were free to manage their own affairs without any foreign power having the right of interfering with their domestic policy.

The debate which culminated into the breach between Lord Metcalfe and Lafontaine grew out of a very trivial circumstance: namely, the appointment of a deputy-sheriff for the county of Carleton. But, to quote Lafontaine's words, the question was as to whether the Governor was to be advised by his ministers or not ; the question was as to whether the people of Canada were free to

manage their own affairs, reserving to the sovereign the allegiance which is the bounded duty of every portion of the British empire, without the Governor having the right to assume when it pleases him the functions of an agent of the Colonial Office and to exercise a dual personality.

I am led to think, Mr. Speaker, that the question was discussed by His Excellency and his advisers, from the fact that in the first despatch from Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Minto, dated March 20th, 1900, the following occurs :

'The Secretary of State far War offers four Royal Artillery eight infantry commissions to students Royal Military College, Kingston, recommended by Commandant as in every way suitable, ten Royal Artillery twenty infantry to gentlemen selected by your coming Imperial Officer Commanding local forces.'

So, as the House will see, Mr. Chamberlain pointed out that those commissions were to be given to gentlemen recommended by the commandant of the militia.

In another despatch sent by Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Minto, on the 9th of April, in reply to that despatch of the 6th April, which is missing from the return, I read what follows :

'Referring to your telegram of April 6th re the selection of candidates for commissions, the candidates should be recommended by you after consulting with your Ministers and Imperial Officers.

"You should communicate to your Ministers suggestion contained in your confidential despatch of 24th ult. as to Board for wise selection of candidates, and list should be submitted to you through your Ministers with their recommendations. Responsibility for the final selection remaining with you."

(Signed) CHAMBERLAIN.

What happened between March 20th and April 9 ? Whether there was controversy between His Excellency and his constitutional advisers is more than I can say. But I incline to the belief that the matter was discussed between them, and that His Excellency then wrote to Mr. Chamberlain for his opinion, and that the Colonial Secretary thought it wiser to split the difference. The selection of the officers he left to the ministers, or rather, he advised the Governor General to invite the opinion of his advisers on this point, adding that responsibility for the final selection remained with the Governor General. Neither can it be questioned, from the tone of the first despatch of Mr. Chamberlain, that His Excellency was free to take action after asking the sole advice of the officer commanding the Canadian militia.

A constitutional question is at stake here of the utmost importance. To ascertain on what point the controversy then turned is the question. It is desirable that the issue should be clearly defined as between His Excellency and his advisers.

After a debate, the first and last landmarks of which we have, but the intermediate stakes of which are missing, as showing the route travelled over, it stands to reason that there was a difference of opinion ; for, otherwise, how are we to account for what, apparently, has transpired ? What is the position which the government occupies towards the representative of Downing Street ? That Canada is a nation, enjoying the full privileges of self-government is a boast we are now familiar with. But the question which is now being raised is one that bears upon the relations existing between the irresponsible representative of the Crown and his constitutional advisers. The question which now confronts us is this : whenever there arises a question as to which the interests of the Canadian people and the interests of the English people clash, ought not the Governor General to refer the matter to the cabinet, which is the sole medium of communication between His Excellency and the will of the people, and should he not act upon the advice of his ministers ?

This doctrine Australia for one, upholds. What happened, last fall, in that colony ? Bills concerning immigration, trade and navigation were brought up and carried through parliament. The bill on immigration had been framed on the lines of the bill carried through the legislature of British Columbia in connection with Mongolian labour and immigration. Mr. Chamberlain wrote to Mr. Barton, the Prime Minister of Australia, asking him to commit himself to have this Act amended, so as not to create bad blood in Japan, a country with which Great Britain was seeking to make a treaty. In the same despatch, it was recommended that the Act respecting trade and navigation should be amended, so as not to interfere with the interests of the great British companies which were engaged in trade with Australia. Mr. Barton replied through the Governor General, Lord Hopetoun, simply promising that he would do his best to comply with the wishes expressed by Mr. Chamberlain. The Australian parliament was called together, and the first debate that was raised in the House at the beginning of the session, turned on the very question whether the Prime Minister had been warranted in writing to Mr. Chamberlain that he would endeavour to have the Act modified, which was mentioned in the despatch referred to, so as to make it tally with the interests of the mother country. The opposition leader, Mr. Reid, strongly criticised the government because the premier had assumed upon himself to send an answer to Mr. Chamberlain's despatch before first ascertaining the views of parliament. From Mr. Reid's firm attitude, Mr. Barton was frightened into notifying Mr. Chamberlain that he could not comply with his wishes.

What happened in Canada ? Following in the footsteps of Australia, British Columbia had passed a bill regarding Mongolian la-

bour and immigration. Into the merits or demerits of that legislation I do not wish to go. Let it suffice to say that the provincial legislature, in passing that measure into law, acted within their constitutional jurisdiction. And this measure it was at the demand of Mr. Chamberlain that it was set aside by a Liberal government, a government the members of which formerly stood up here and championed provincial rights. The Dominion government did not hesitate to blot out from the statute-books of a province of Canada an Act passed by the legislature of that province, in the full exercise of their constitutional prerogatives.

On the floor of the Australian parliament, Mr. Reid has laid down this principle, that no prime minister of a British colony, enjoying free institutions, has the right to enter into relations with the Colonial Office and to communicate to the same his policy, whether actual or contemplated, before having first secured the assent of his parliament. To quote Mr. Reid's own words : 'The prime minister of Australia is responsible to the people and the parliament of Australia, but he is neither responsible to the Colonial Secretary nor to the British parliament.'

It was not my intention to have gone into the matter in all these details, nor to have spoken at such great length, but this I am bound to say, that after having been in waiting four mortal months for this correspondence, and after having received but a garbled correspondence, while, as I have pointed out, the Governor General's answers to despatches have been withheld, I think I am warranted in hoping that more light will be shed on the matter by the government bringing down the documents which have been withheld, so that our doubts may be cleared up as to the relations which ought to exist between the Governor General and his advisers.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There can be no objection to this motion passing, and I will make my best efforts to have the papers brought down as quickly as possible—for many reasons, first and not the least, because I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) will find how much he has been led astray in some of his surmises.

Mr. BOURASSA. I will be very happy.

The PRIME MINISTER. I don't know about that ; I do not think my hon. friend will be as happy as he pretends to be. I may say to my hon. friend that so far as concerns any subject which has been concluded, which is no longer pending, such for instance as the one now under discussion concerning the granting of commissions in the British army to Canadian officers, which subject is concluded, there is no reason whatever why every document which we have in our possession should not be brought down. I may say in the meantime that there are some classes of subjects in respect of which it is not possible to comply with all his wishes. Last year my hon. friend laid great stress upon the fact that a dispatch of the Colonial Office to the Governor General of Canada, of the 24th of March, had not been brought down. I refreshed my memory this morning upon the debate which took place last year, and I gave my attention to this dispatch of the 24th of March, 1900, which had not been brought down. I took occasion also this very morning to look over that dispatch, and I find it is a confidential dispatch, nor is it in my power to disclose its contents. I will say to my hon. friend that there may be cases in which it would not be advisable, indeed it would be a great breach of public duty, to lay the dispatches on the Table of the House. For instance, let us suppose that one of these dispatches referred to the arbitration which was at that moment going on between Russia and Great Britain regarding certain seizures of our vessels which were made a few years ago by the Russian authorities. That is a subject the last of which we have not heard yet. We have an arbitration going on, and until that is disposed of my hon. friend will agree with me that it is not advisable to bring down the dispatches relating to it. Then let us suppose another matter, let us suppose there was another dispatch of the nature, for instance, of a confidential communication between the Canadian and the British governments with regard to fortifications, either at Halifax, or Esquimalt, or some other strategetical point. My hon. friend will agree that it would not be in the public interest to bring down such a document and place it on the Table of the House, giving it publicity, making it possible for the foreign press to publish it, and giving away secrets of a military character which in their very nature ought to be treated as confidential. Therefore my hon. friend, I trust, will realize that there are certain communications confidential in their nature which cannot be brought down. But I am free to lay down the principle that whenever a subject has been completed, which subject is not of a foreign nature, which is not of a confidential character, a subject regarding the relations of the Canadian government or any official of the Canadian government with an Imperial officer, upon a subject which is completed and is no longer at issue, in that case my hon. friend is entitled to have all the information which is at our disposal, and that information he shall have. I have only to add that perhaps he will have an opportunity then to change his mind, and to offer us some apology for the bad opinion he has entertained of some of his friends.

Mr. F. D. MONK. (Translation.) Before this motion carries, I wish to offer one or two remarks. Does the hon. member for

Labelle mean to stand up on the floor of this House as the champion of popular rights ? Can he say with the French poet :

'Je suis venu trop tard dans un monde trop vieux.'

Or, again, has the hon. gentleman mastered the elementary principles of the British constitution ? Had he been conversant with the principles by which our parliament is guided, as well as all other parliaments in which a constitution obtains which is based on constitutional principles similar to ours, he could, to say the least, have dispensed with going at such great length into a review of an uncontested right, and one which no member of this House who is conversant with the principles of our constitution, would even dream of questioning. The hon. gentleman no doubt forgot in addressing the House that on both sides, and even among his friends and colleagues, are to be found, men who are acquainted with these principles as well as I am, and who, being his elders know better than he does what those principles mean. After all this is a motion to which, according to British parliamentary rules, no objection could be raised.

It refers to militia matters ; it refers to the commissions granted to Canadians in the British army. The hon. gentleman in dealing with this matter, indulged in much hair-splitting. To his mind, His Excellency the Governor General now represents the Crown, now represents something else. The Governor General represents the King, and, at the same time, he is the servant of the people of Canada. Then, the hon. gentleman, launched out, with great flourishes, into a recital of our long-continued struggles for the conquest of our rights. That the Governor General in Canada represents the Crown ; that he discharges a dual function, namely, as the representative of the Crown on the one hand, and as an official of the English government on the other hand, everybody here is aware. But no matter how you may look at the question, can there be any doubt, or has any one ever questioned our rights to control our own domestic affairs ?

A mere glance at the constitutional history of England is sufficient to satisfy us that there is no room for the least doubt in the matter. Only to such people as are not conversant with that history can it occur that we are without the right of self-government here. But, for our part, we know that history, and I would advise my young friend from Labelle to peruse the three volumes written by Mr. de Franqueville on the British constitution, and he will find there that we are enjoying the right of self-government. Does the hon. gentleman wish to pose in this House as the champion of our blood-bought liberties, within the last centuries ? This motion refers to military matters. Now, these matters come under the direct control of the British parliament, and the same applies here. This control was secured long ago, with the abolition of the 'Mutiny Act.' In the Middle Ages charters, it is expressly provided, that the people of England, through their parliament, shall have the control of all military matters. Under the 'Bill of Rights' and the 'Act of Settlement' of 1701, all military matters are placed under the control of parliament. This was a recognized right from the reign of William of Orange. For many years, the 'Mutiny Act' had to be resorted to, in order to give a further sanction to the principle that parliament which appropriated the public moneys, also had the sole control of military matters. But the 'Mutiny Act' is a thing of the past. And the hon. gentleman laboured to no purpose, when reviewing the conduct of Governor Metcalfe and the history of those times.

Should any one dream of re-enacting now the 'Mutiny Act,' well might he compare with Rip Van Winkle who slept for twenty years, and never knew what had transpired within that lapse of time. A motion such as the one proposed by the hon. gentleman, would carry without any objection being raised to it, in the British House of Commons. In that House it would not even be debated, there being so many useful and practical questions which come up for discussion, and owing also to the fact that this right of control of parliament is so uncontested a right that nobody would ever dream of calling it in question.

DISMISSALS FOR POLITICAL REASONS.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou) moved for :

Return showing the number of employees of the Departments of Public Works, Railways and Canals, Post Office, Marine and Fisheries, Customs and Inland Revenue, who have been dismissed between July 12th, 1896, and January 1st, 1902; also, how many of these dismissals have been made for political reasons.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) that a return was brought down giving this information down to March, 1901. If the hon. gentleman would amend this resolution so as to cover the dismissals since that time, he will have all the information he desires, and it will be possible to have the returns on very short notice.

Mr. BELL. Does it cover all these points?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot speak for all the departments. There is no desire to deny the hon. gentleman any information he wishes, but it will facilitate matters if he will amend his motion so as to make it cover the facts since the last return.

Mr. BELL. The motion then might be amended to make it read 'since the last return' ?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the words 'not already brought down' were added, that would cover the point.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then, I would move that the motion be amended in that way.

Motion (Mr. Bell), amended as proposed, agreed to.

TABLE OF PRECEDENCE FOR CANADA.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria) moved :

That in the opinion of this House the 'Table of Precedence for Canada,' as set forth in the Statutes of Canada and 'Canada Gazette,' should be amended either by omitting section 11, 'Archbishops and Bishops according to seniority,' or by giving a place in said section 11 'to the clergymen of religious denominations other than those having' "archbishops and bishops," the word 'seniority' to be interpreted by 'territorial' area, or in some other appropriate manner, and in other ways.

He said : In making this motion I will state briefly that in doing so I have no bias whatever. We find in the Dominion of Canada, where there is no union of church and state, that last autumn as well as on a former occasion of considerable political importance to this country, precedence was given to the members of certain churches over equally prominent, equally cultured, equally good and equally noble minded men of other churches in this country, although, as I say, there is no union of church and state here. I do not need to make any apology for introducing this question. The custom of recognizing the clergy in the table of precedence is undoubtedly a relic of old times, of former days, when there was a union between church and state. It is a relic which possibly does no harm and which, so far as Canada is concerned, may be allowed to continue, only I maintain that all the great denominations in this country should be equally recognized. It has been stated that my motion is not in the right form, that I should have moved that a humble petition be sent to His Majesty and to the Imperial Executive. I do not think that is the proper course at all in this connection. I have taken the course of presenting the facts to the House, of presenting my views to the House, of bringing the subject before the House, and if it meets with the approval of the House, as I am satisfied it will meet with the approval of this country, then it becomes the duty of the Prime Minister to lay the matter by petition before the Imperial authorities, asking them to make a change.

It has been stated that this is a personal matter with His Majesty the King. I need not tell an intelligent legislative body such as this that His Majesty the King has no personal authority in such matters whatever. A great many people are under the misapprehension that His Majesty, or His Excellency the Governor General, in his individual capacity, has certain prerogatives in certain circumstances. They have none. When the question of purchase of commissions in the British army was done away with, people were told that it was one of Her Majesty's own personal prerogatives that was exercised. But she exercised that prerogative with the advice of her responsible ministers. The Sovereign, or His Excellency the Governor General, have no prerogative other than as they are advised by the Prime Minister in Great Britain or in this country. The statement that the sovereign, being the sole fountain of honour, has absolute control of this matter is not borne out by either law or custom under the British or Canadian constitutions. These tables have been changed from time to time on petition, possibly not in this colony, although I believe that in this colony they have been changed. On representation from the people in the various colonies concerned they have been changed, and they may be changed, and should be changed again. I shall not discuss the question at any length further than to reiterate that if the government of this country sees fit they can petition the Imperial authorities to have the table of precedence changed in order to include the leading ministers of other churches, gentlemen equally prominent, equally cultured, equally noble, equally good. I make no reflection on those of any church that is now recognized. I say if the government make a proper request to the Imperial authorities there is no doubt that the request will be acceded to, and we will find that the various non-prelatical churches will be recognized in the table of precedence along with those already recognized. I need not say that the table as at present constituted is offensive to many of the denominations that are recognized on account of their desire to see all parties recognized. It is offensive in the fact that it gives some churches prominence while it does not recognize others. I shall conclude the few remarks that I purpose making upon this question by reading one of many letters which I received from prominent clergymen and others throughout the country. I read this one because it is a copy of a letter which was forwarded to the Prime Minister some time ago by a very prominent ecclesiastic. It is as follows —

Montreal, October 28, 1901.

The Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.,
Premier of the Dominion of Canada,

Dear Sir,—In the matter of ecclesiastical precedence at state functions in Canada, permit me to approach you in a spirit of candour without narrowness and with a desire to avoid religious agitation by public discussion. I wish to present this matter in the same broad minded spirit with which I have tried to consider any public question in which I have been interested. As a resident of this province where I have spent most

of my life and where I am now honoured with being appointed to the chief official position in Protestant education under the government, I desire to state this matter without any sectarian bias, all the more because of my pleasant and friendly relation to members both of the Roman Catholic and Anglican hierarchy.

I therefore respectfully submit to you the following facts :—

1. The present order of precedence is a glaring insult to the non-prelatical churches. It chooses out for special favour two denominations, one of them the largest and the other only the fourth largest simply because of their Episcopal polity, a consideration which should have no more weight in Canada than a preference for churches with steeples in opposition to churches without steeples. According to the census of 1891 these denominations numbered respectively 1,992,017 and 646,059 as against 2,395,163 of other denominations. In the name of common sense, in the name of the freedom and equality of which we boast, why should there be any such unjust discrimination as the Imperial order requires ?

Thousands of intelligent men of the larger Protestant denominations feel the insult but are averse to creating agitation about it, but you can well understand that in their silence there is the deepest resentment and in many a heart there is prudentially concealed much natural bitterness of feeling at so glaring an insult to some of the largest denominations of our Dominion. I will not condescend to make any invidious comparison between the denominations so favoured and others, but this I will say that the denominations so slighted are everywhere distinguished by intelligence, thrift and loyalty and should not be exposed to this perpetual insult.

2. This order is repugnant to the spirit of Canadian political institutions at least the past 60 years. It is the sole surviving remnant of the intolerable policy of ecclesiastical discrimination which that great man, the Rev. Dr. Ryerson, did so much to terminate. It is contrary to the statutory principle stated in the preamble of the Act of 1854 for the settlement of the Clergy Reserve Fund question, viz.: 'It is desirable in Canada to remove all semblance of connection between church and state.' It is specially contrary to the traditional and historical position of the great Liberal party of which you are so distinguished and worthy a representative. Let me say briefly that in this communication I have in my mind no reference whatever to the privileges guaranteed to the Roman Catholic Church by the Treaty of Paris of 1763.

3. It is a mere truism that there should be some order of precedence in state functions. The demand made in some quarters that the order be altogether rescinded instead of being amended, would I fear lead to most unfortunate confusion, that is if the clergy participate at all.

4. For this order I admit your government is, of course, in no way responsible. I am convinced, however, that on your representations the Imperial government would readily change it to meet the views and feelings of the majority of the Canadian people.

What remedy then can be suggested ? I can well believe that you are ready to say, instead of useless ecclesiastical resolutions and newspaper agitation, have some just and practicable method of settling the matter and it will be fairly considered. In answering this important question, difficulties will necessarily arise. If the people of Canada are to be considered, certainly the present order must be changed and no better time for this can arise than now, after the visit to our country of the Heir to the Throne of our Empire, on which occasion I assure you a painful affront has been silently borne by the majority of our people owing to this odious order.

Some suggest the order of seniority of ecclesiastical officers either in age or office. This is as unwise as to propose that it should be based on relative physical height or weight and might result in the representative of the most obscure and the smallest sect being elevated to the highest place.

Some would say let the precedence be by historical priority. But in the case of the church of England most Protestants and all Roman Catholics locate its origin at the Reformation and later than that of the Lutherans, if not also of the Presbyterians, and what government would undertake, officially, to settle this question as to its claims ? Again of all Protestant denominations the Lutheran would take precedence on this ground though almost the smallest of all religious bodies in Canada.

I now freely suggest the following. 1. That the Order in Council be based on the relative strength of denominations in the previous census. 2. That in the case of non-prelatical churches the governments, federal and provincial, should be officially informed by them of the names and addresses of their chief officers, that is of their representative officer in each case, seeing that in most instances these are likely to be unknown to the executive, owing to frequent change of office. Several smaller bodies would probably be indifferent about the matter and would omit to send such notice. I submit that this plan is fair and reasonable and practicable and best suits the spirit of our political institutions. Can any better be suggested ?

Let us see how it would work. Under it in federal state functions, according to the census of 1891, the order of leading denominations would be Roman Catholics, Methodist, Presbyterian, Anglican. In Quebec it would be Roman Catholic, Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist. In Ontario it would be Methodist, Presbyterian, Anglican, Roman Catholic. In Nova Scotia, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Baptist, Anglican, Methodist, and so on in different provinces. How absurd and unjust the present order is in Ontario, will appear from the fact that the Anglicans and Roman Catholics are each only $\frac{1}{3}$ of the entire population and the remaining $\frac{2}{3}$ are most unjustly ignored. There are almost as many Methodists in Ontario as Roman Catholics and Anglicans together and more Presbyterians than either of these denominations.

Please be assured again of my desire in this matter to avoid religious prejudice as much as possible.

Trusting my proposal may commend itself to you and your colleagues and so terminate a long standing grievance, as old as the 'Family Compact.'

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) WILLIAM J. SHAW.

It is marked as an open letter and I have therefore read it. I need not again state

that it is useless to tell this House or the country that the table of precedence is a personal matter with His Majesty the Sovereign King of England. His Majesty the King of England has no prerogative other than as he is advised by his ministers. His Majesty and his ministers would be only too willing in case of a large colony like the Dominion of Canada through its Prime Minister making a sensible suggestion and asking that these other denominations may be recognized in this table of precedence to grant the request. I am satisfied that the executive-in-council, or the Crown, which, of course, represents the sovereign acting upon the advice of his ministers, will, without a moment's hesitation, accede to the request of the Prime Minister of this country. It is useless to say that in state functions His Excellency is the sole arbiter of what the order of precedence shall be. His Excellency has no authority in these matters other than by following the rules laid down in matters appertaining to state occasions, and as he is advised by his Imperial masters and further as he is advised by the Prime Minister of this country. Therefore, if the matter meets with the approval of the Prime Minister of this country it is settled. If it does not, it cannot be settled. I have nothing further to say on the subject other than to express the hope that the Prime Minister will be good enough to allow the motion to pass. I do not desire to present a petition, but I hope he will take such steps towards the framing of such a petition as will do no injury to any one but as will do the justice we ask to those large and important denominations which have furnished so many of the finest men in this country and which have done so much to uphold the Dominion of Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot complain of the manner in which the question has been brought before the House by my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria). The question itself is not of very great importance, but unfortunately it is one of those questions which have created a good deal of friction at different times in the history of confederation. I must take issue at once with the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes), that the government of Canada—whatever government may have been in power—is responsible for the present condition of things. As a matter of fact the authority which is responsible for the present table of precedence is not in Canada, but in England, and it is His Majesty the King. The Governor General is not a free agent in this matter, I may say. It is not permitted to him to follow his own inclinations as to what degree of honour he shall give to those whom he invites to his table, but he is instructed from England as to how he shall proceed in all state ceremonies, and as to how he shall seat those who are his guests. The present table of precedence is, I believe, as old as confederation, although modified since in a very slight degree. Before confederation the instructions as to precedence went back as far as the union. For my part I am of opinion that the dissenting churches have good reason to feel aggrieved at the manner in which they have been treated in this respect, the feeling became more acute at the time of the visit of the Prince of Wales. I believe, however, that the churches are somewhat to blame if they find themselves placed in that position. For thirty years or more, the bishops and archbishops of the Episcopal churches—in this country the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England—have alone been recognized in the table of precedence. I would not offer my own interpretation of history in this matter, but if I have correctly interpreted history, my impression is that in former times the dissenting churches did not seek any such recognition as is now sought by the motion of the hon. gentleman. Whether they were right or wrong it matters not, because if at the present time the Dissenting churches wish to be recognized in this country they ought to be recognized. There can be no doubt as to that. I would point out that the difference in this respect between Canada and Great Britain is all to the advantage of Canada. In Great Britain the Church of England is alone recognized.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think so.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Roman Catholic bishops are also recognized.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the Roman Catholic bishops are recognized in Great Britain, it is I think by tolerance and not by established rule. But whether or not the Roman Catholic Church is recognized there, I think I am safe in saying that the dissenting churches are not recognized in the table of precedence. There is a reason for that. In England they have a state church, and in Canada all churches are on a footing of equality. I have no hesitation at all in stating my convictions; convictions which are not mine alone, but which I share with, I am sure, every member of this House. I must say to the hon. gentleman that the task of framing a table of precedence which will give proper recognition to all churches is very difficult and is surrounded with serious intricacies. For instance, the question arises: Which church shall be given precedence over the other. The letter which was addressed to me some months ago by the Rev. Dr. Shaw, of Montreal, would indicate, if I understood aright the reverend gentleman, that precedence would be given to the Lutherans, because he said that if you look upon it from the point of view of antiquity, the Lutherans should come first. The Lutherans are a small body in Canada, and although I do

not know that the Rev. Dr. Shaw meant they should get precedence, at all events it was a suggestion which he submitted for our consideration. In the Roman Catholic Church and in the Church of England the dignitaries of these churches are permanent officials, but when you come to the Presbyterian Church, or the Methodist Church, or the Baptist Church, the difficulty is to recognize who are the proper dignitaries. Dignitaries in that sense they have none; they do not admit the term I believe, but they have certain officials. The Presbyterian Church has a moderator, which if he does not change annually at all events changes frequently. Who shall be placed on the table of precedence as representing the Presbyterian Church? Should it be the moderator, whose tenure of office is comparatively brief. I understand that the Methodist body have certain functionaries who are also elected for a fixed term. As to the Baptists, I understand that their organization is absolutely democratic, that they recognize no such rule of precedence amongst themselves, and that they have no functionaries corresponding to those in the other churches. It would, therefore, be very difficult to place the representative of the Baptist Church upon the table of precedence.

I may say to my hon. friend that all these difficulties have been looked into by the government. At the time of the visit of the Prince of Wales we knew there were very serious complaints from some eminent divines of the disseneting churches in this and other cities. They complained very strongly that they had been ignored and had not been extended the courtesy which was extended to the dignitaries of the other churches. The government was not callous to such representations. A sub-committee of the council has been appointed to look into this matter and to prepare a report. It is now under investigation. I repeat to my hon. friend, that when we come to the point of framing a table of precedence such as we should have, the difficulty is almost insurmountable in finding a way to give precedence to those entitled to it. We are doing our best at the present time to overcome the difficulty. I would be very much obliged indeed if the members of this House would give us the benefit of their views as to what table of precedence we should recommend to His Majesty the King. At the present time we are very much in the dark, and we have not been able to arrive at a solution which we would like to recommend to the Imperial authorities. The matter shall not be forgotten by us. I hope, before this subject is dismissed, that members of the House, especially members who belong to the Dissenting churches will give us the benefit of their views on this subject so that we may be enabled to make representations to the proper authorities. I agree with my hon. friend that the moment the parliament of Canada, represented by the government, makes proper representations to the Imperial authorities, these representations will be immediately acceded to.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). If it be the case, as I understood the premier to say, that the Governor General received instructions as to precedence from the Imperial authorities, I have no doubt whatever that representation on the subject from any colonial authority would be received with attention, and that any wise suggestions coming from the Dominion of Canada or any other colony for overcoming the difficulty, would receive due weight. There is no doubt, from the information given us and from what we know, that this is a difficult question to settle and a delicate one to handle, especially in a country like ours, where many large dissenting denominations see other religious bodies given precedence over them. How would it do, in a democratic country like ours, to do away with all precedence in connection with these functions—to give no church any precedence over another, and thus do away with all ground for complaint? That suggests itself to my mind as one way of overcoming the difficulty without doing injustice to anybody. The other suggestion made by the Rev. Mr. Shaw appears to have a good deal of merit in it, but there are objections to it which might be raised. I have no doubt that if it were known to the country that the government desired to consider this question, they would receive many suggestions from quarters from which they have not yet heard, and that after due consideration they would be able to evolve some scheme to meet the difficulty, which at present is a grievance, if not an offense, to some churches which are very numerous in certain sections of the country.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). So far as I am concerned, I am rather democratic on this subject. In the first place, I wish to say, in reply to what the premier has said, that the office of moderator of the Presbyterian Church is continuous, just as the office of premier is, though the man who holds the office may change. For example, the man who is moderator this year may give place to another man next year, but the office is eternal, and will be. For myself, if I had my own way, I would not have any precedence at all, either ecclesiastical or otherwise. There are of course certain persons, such as members of the government and members of parliament who represent the people, and if there is any distinction, and I do not ask for any, I can understand that it would only be right and just that places should be assigned to them, not as a matter of precedence, but simply to enable them to get their proper places. But in this democratic country I do not think we

want much of that kind of thing. I think there are about thirty orders in the table of precedence. I have not looked over it lately, and do not intend to look at it again.

An hon. MEMBER. Twenty-six.

Mr. FRASER. Just imagine that in a democratic country—twenty-five personages or representatives of various communities who are ahead of you. I am not claiming the twenty-sixth place or the twenty-third, or any place; but I say it is absurd in a country like this. Personally I do not think the clergy need be recognized at all more than others. What I mean is this: I think they could be better employed in preparing men to be good citizens than in struggling for precedence over each other, and I think the democratic church to which I am attached is not making much of a cry about this matter. There is a way of settling the question which might not occur to the clergy, and that is the way they settled it in the British Columbia legislature the other day. But, seriously, I think the churches should not say much on this subject. I can understand those who have dignitaries in their churches—Roman Catholics and Episcopalians—being interested in it; but if I might make a suggestion, I would say let the clergy imitate the men they represent, the humble fishermen of Galilee, and say: 'We are not after it at all.' If they did that, they would show the greatest lesson of tolerance to the people of this country. My view is that we should become more democratic in this matter, and I would suggest to the premier that when the negotiations are on, he might strike off more than 33⅓ per cent. If that is done, in a very few years we shall hear very little more about precedence in this country. If I remember rightly, Dr. Shaw proposes that precedence be given according to population. That is all nonsense. There are small bodies of people in this country who have shown themselves to be just as good citizens and as high in the scale as are the best. If you divide people in that way, you simply make precedence a question of majorities, and you shut out real merit and degrade the smaller denominations. Then, you would find this difficulty, that in one province precedence would be given to a man belonging to one denomination, and in another province to a man belonging to another. My suggestion to the premier is to recognize in this country very few of these positions at state functions. Let us all go to pay our respects, as we did when the Prince of Wales was here, feeling that character, and character alone, entitles a man to be there. Let us not be so anxious to set a man up in a high position just because he belongs to a particular church. These are my democratic views. Before I sit down, let me say, that I think this motion should not pass. It says: 'the word "seniority" to be interpreted by "territorial" area, or in some other appropriate manner, and in other ways.' That would make it worse that it is at present.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Did I understand from the right hon. Prime Minister that the matter is now under the consideration of a sub-committee of the Privy Council?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps my hon. friend would let the motion stand for the present, having the right to renew it at a future time.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have asked my hon. friend to withdraw his motion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish only to remark that my hon. friend from Guysborough, in claiming for the members of this House a more exalted position than they possess at present, hardly exhibits that humble spirit of the Galilee fishermen which he commends to the clergy.

Mr. FRASER. I do not want a high position, but if I did, I think the twenty-fifth or twenty-sixth place for the leader of the opposition would not be according to his dignity.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not going to raise that question, although I suppose I should be very much obliged to my hon. friend for raising it for me. I can well understand the difficulties that present themselves to the Committee of the Privy Council in dealing with this matter; and when the Prime Minister tells us that the government are dealing with it, I think it would perhaps be inadvisable for us to pass any motion in the House with regard to it at the present time. As the right hon. gentleman tells us that his government are dealing with it, it would be better not to pass any motion now on the subject. After the government have dealt with it, this House can, by means of an address or motion, express its opinion on the conclusions arrived at.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In rising to withdraw this motion at the request of the Prime Minister, I may say that I am somewhat surprised that my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser)—a gentleman learned in the law as well as in the academies—should seem unable to understand the English language. If he will read the last phrase attentively, he will find that it does not refer to ecclesiastical precedence, but to the very point which he himself has brought up, namely, to the place occupied by members of parliament in the general table of precedence. I trust therefore that my hon. friend will brush up his English grammer, and he will then probably revise his conclusions. Of course one can readily understand why the hon. gentleman should wish the table of precedence abolished, for if there were no such table there would be no resisting his weight in the scramble for a front place. The right hon. the First

Minister certainly misunderstood what I said if he thought I said the Governor General had anything to do with establishing the table of precedence. That table, as are all the sources of honour, is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Sovereign himself, and I merely mentioned the Governor General, in order to meet the argument advanced, that this is a matter entirely within his purview. He has nothing to do with any matter except as advised by the Prime Minister of this country. I understand that in the past a claim for jurisdiction in this matter has been made upon behalf of one of our Governor Generals, and I understand that within a very recent period, a Governor General claimed the right to appoint his aide de camp as a personal matter. This claim, however, was entirely unconstitutional, and in any case it has but a remote bearing on the subject before the House. I have no doubt that if the right hon. the Prime Minister will consult the parties interested, he will arrive at a solution of the difficulty and be able to establish a proper basis of precedence. It has been suggested by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that this whole table of precedence should be done away with. But I am satisfied that neither the Prime Minister nor the British government would request the Imperial authorities to withdraw precedence from those who now enjoy it. One of the Australia colonies once petitioned the British government to abolish the precedence given the clergy, and Her Majesty's government replied that such precedence could not be taken away from those who already held it. All the bishops then in existence should retain their precedence although it might not be continued to those subsequently appointed. Acting on the request of the First Minister and in view of the fact that this motion is receiving the consideration of a special committee of the Privy Council, I have much pleasure, with the permission of the House, in withdrawing it.

Motion withdrawn.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman to see that a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee is called at the earliest possible moment. We had a good deal of difficulty in obtaining regular meetings last session. There will be considerable work for this committee to do this session, and if it be desired that we shall not have a protracted session, it would be advisable to see that the chairman of that committee holds a regular meeting every week. It might be desirable to hold two or three meetings each week in order to expedite business. Last session we had some difficulty on account of the occasional absence of the chairman, and I would suggest that some gentleman should be selected to replace him when he is unavoidably absent.

Mr. FRASER. I was only absent one day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend may be right. I recollect that there was once some difficulty, and I thought it occurred more than once. If he is likely to be absent again, he might arrange to have some one take his place for the time being.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee is here and will no doubt give effect to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. As to whether the committee will meet once or twice a week, that is a matter for the committee itself to decide at its first meeting.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not suggesting that the House should deal with it, but was merely making suggestion to the chairman.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing the total number of officials and employees, temporary and permanent, of the Intercolonial Railway, and the total amount of salaries and wages payable to them on June 30th, 1886, and on December 31st, 1891.—Mr. Bell.

Return showing amount of the rebate paid on agricultural implements exported from Canada for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1901, specifying amount paid to each firm.—Mr. Roche (Marquette), by Mr. Henderson.

Return showing the amount of money voted each year, including the present fiscal year, for the contemplated improvements of St. Andrews Rapids, Manitoba ; the amount spent so far out of these votes, and what for in each year ; reports of government engineers as to work done, delays, if any, and cause of the same ; copy of correspondence between engineers and contractors, and of both with the Department of Public Works in reference to the work done or to be done ; and a copy of contract entered into with the contractor or contractors.—Mr. LaRivière.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 5.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 27, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron) presented the first report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of

the Debates of the House. He moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

VALUATION FOR CUSTOMS.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

What valuation has been placed on a McCormick binder on which duty is paid when imported into Canada ; by the single binder and by the car load ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). I beg to say to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Roche (Marquette), not with a desire to evade his question, that it is not usual to disclose the prices at which goods are admitted to customs entry, the valuation at which goods are entered at the customs-house being usually treated as confidential in its nature. This is the rule that prevails in the department necessarily. The hon. gentleman will understand the spirit in which I give him the answer.

AMERICAN TUGS IN CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Were any tugs of American register permitted to ply between Canadian ports during the season of navigation of 1901 ?
2. If so, what tugs were so employed, and who were the owners of the same ?
3. If such permission was so granted, is it intended to allow a similar indulgence to be exercised during the coming year ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The answer furnished me by the department, Mr. Speaker, is as follows :—

The government is not aware that permission has been given to any tugs of American register to ply between Canadian ports during the season of navigation of 1901.

I may say that I think that answer is substantially correct, but lest there should be a misunderstanding of my utterance, I would say that I think special permission was given, not to a tug, but to a boat which had a pumping apparatus on board for loading gravel to take a load of gravel from a Canadian port to where a factory was being erected. Substantially the answer is correct.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked :

Has the attention of the government been drawn to the following resolution, moved on the 21st February last, in the legislature of the province of Quebec :—

'Resolved, That in the opinion of this House, the revenues allowed the provinces by the British North America Act, are insufficient to enable them to meet the requirements of the public service, and at the same time to afford the necessary aid to colonization, to agriculture, the development of our industries and the amelioration of our educational system ;

'That the interpretation given to various clauses of the constitution has endangered the existence of our local institutions ; and

That the government of Canada and those of the other provinces, should be invited to unite with the government of the province of Quebec, to request the parliament of the United Kingdom to so modify the Federal Act as to change the basis on which the federal subsidy is calculated ; to secure to the provinces the exclusive control of their public properties and of the railways within their limits, and to permit them to impose exportation dues on the products of their forests and their mines, and to confer on the government of Great Britain the power of disallowing the provincial laws, now exercised by that of Canada.'

2. Does the government propose to co-operate with the provinces in the sense indicated by this resolution ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government have no official information upon this subject. We are aware, as everybody else, that such a resolution has been introduced into the local legislature, but we do not know what has become of it.

SUPERIOR COURT, QUEBEC.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked :

1. How many writs have been issued, and how many judgments have been rendered in the Supreme Court, in the different judicial districts of the province of Quebec, during the years 1900 and 1901 ?
2. How many writs have been issued and judgments rendered in the judicial district of Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. C. Fitzpatrick). I will have to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) to apply to the persons who are in control of the statistics he requires. They are not under the control of the federal government at all.

KEEPER OF RED HORSE SHOAL LIGHT.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Has Mr. William Jackson, lighthouse-keeper of Red Horse shoal light, just west of Gananoque, been superannuated ?
2. What salary was he paid as light-keeper ?
3. Was he also paid a salary for setting out, taking up and caring for a number of buoys ?
4. What salary was he paid for both services ?
5. How many years was he in the service ?
6. What superannuation does Mr. Jackson receive ?
7. Was his superannuation allowance as fixed based on the salary he received for both services ?
8. Was a letter received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries purporting to be signed by Mr. Jackson, asking to be superannuated ?
9. Was he notified that his services as light-keeper were dispensed with, and that a Mr. Robert Chadwick had been appointed light-

keeper in his place, and requesting him to deliver up the lights to Mr. Chadwick ?

10. Was Mr. Chadwick notified that he was appointed lighthouse-keeper and given instructions to call on Mr. Jackson and get the keys used and possession ?

11. Did Mr. Jackson refuse to give up the light and notify the Department of Marine and Fisheries that he had not written any letter asking to be superannuated ?

12. If so, what action did the government take to ascertain who forged the letter written to the department purporting to be signed by Mr. Jackson asking to be superannuated ?

13. Has a Mr. Landon since been appointed as lighthouse-keeper to said light ?

14. Was Mr. Chadwick notified that his appointment was cancelled ?

15. If so, what were the reasons given ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes, on June 3, 1901. He was 71.
2. $400 per year.
3. He was allowed $50 per year for boat, fuel and buoy service (4 buoys).
4. $450.
5. 21 years.
6. He receives a pension of $168 per year.
7. His allowance was based on his salary of $400 per year as light-keeper.
8. No such letter was received.
9. Yes, on June 8 last. Letter mis-carried and was returned to the department. Remailed to correct address June 28.
10. Yes, on June 8.
11. No. Mr. Jackson wrote acknowledging receipt of letter of June 8 and asking to be allowed to remain until August 15, in order to take care of a garden he had planted.
12. No forged letter was received.
13. Yes, appointed on November 27, 1901, and took charge January 1, 1902 ; Mr. Jackson was retained and paid up to December 31 last.
14. Yes, on December 5 last.
15. No reasons were given—he was simply notified.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—BOARD OF VISITORS.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. Is the report of the Board of Visitors to the Royal Military College for the past year published ?

2. If so, will the government lay it upon the Table of the House ?

3. If not published, will the government have it published and distributed ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden) :

1. and 2. No. It is not customary for the department to print this report.

3. There is no objection to lay a copy of it on the Table of the House if requested, after which it can be printed by order of the House, as has sometimes been done.

Mr. TAYLOR.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION—REPORT OF COMMISSION.

Mr. MORRISON asked :

1. Has the commission appointed last year to investigate matters touching Oriental immigration yet finished their labours and reported to the government ?

2. If so, when will their report be printed and distributed ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The first part of the report of the commissioners concerning Chinese immigration has been received, and I will now place it on the Table of the House. The second part has not been received.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PURCHASE OF TIES AND SLEEPERS.

Mr. BARKER asked :

1. How many railway ties or sleepers were purchased for the Intercolonial Railway in the autumn of 1900 and in the winter of 1901, between Metapedia and Moncton ?

2. What proportion of such ties or sleepers were spruce, fir and poplar, respectively ?

3. What prices were paid for each such description of tie or sleeper ?

4. Were such ties or sleepers required to be in accordance with any and what specifications as to size, quality or otherwise ?

5. Were tenders called for, if so, what notice by advertisement or otherwise was given to the public with respect thereto ?

6. What amount was paid out by Inspector McMannus or other persons on behalf of the government or of the Intercolonial Railway for railway ties or sleepers during the month preceding the 7th day of November, 1900 ?

7. (a.) Who were the contractors who supplied the railway ties or sleepers in the autumn of 1900 and the winter of 1901 between the points above mentioned ?

(b.) Did each of them have the privilege of delivering a percentage of spruce, fir and poplar, and if so, what percentage ? or was this privilege given to some only, and if so, to whom ?

(c.) If this privilege was given to some only, and was not general, why was it not granted to all contractors ?

8. (a.) Were such railway ties or sleepers paid for in cash or by cheque ?

(b.) What proportion was paid for by cheque and what proportion was paid for in cash ?

(c.) Is it the usual custom to pay for such supplies by cheque upon voucher, and if so, why was this custom departed from ?

9. (a.) What special privileges, if any, were given to Mr. F. Curren in connection with contracts for supplying railway ties and sleepers in 1900 and 1901 ?

(b.) Were the same privileges extended to all other persons tendering for the supplying of railway ties or sleepers ?

10. What amount of railway ties or sleepers purchased in 1900 and 1901, respectively, still remain on hand, and what proportion of each, respectively, have been used ?

11. Of the ties and sleepers so purchased in the autumn of 1900 and the winter of 1901, what proportion were fir, spruce and poplar, respectively, and what proportion of each have been used, and what proportion still remain on hand ?

12. Has the Department of Railways and

Canals a report on the quality and durability or value of spruce, fir and poplar ties respectively; if so, by whom was such report made, and when was it made ?

13. Has any allegation or charge been made against Contractor McMannus in connection with the surveying of such ties or sleepers or any of them, and if so, has the same been investigated, and with what result ?

14. Has any reinspection or examination of the said railway ties or sleepers been made during the summer of 1901, or at any other time, and if so, by whom and with what result, and have any and what proportion of such ties and sleepers been found to be under-sized or other wise unsuitable ?

15. If any such reinspection has been made, when and by whom was it made, and at what cost has it been completed, and if it has not been completed, is it still in progress, and if it is not in progress, why has it been discontinued ?

16. If any of such ties or sleepers have been found to be below the required size or otherwise unsuitable, or not in accordance with the specification, if any, what steps have been taken to recover the value thereof from the contractor?

17. Has any track foreman between Newcastle and Moncton reported that railway ties or sleepers delivered to him for use on the Intercolonial Railway were under size or otherwise unsuitable, and has he sent any specimen thereof to the chief engineer at Moncton for inspection ?

18. What is the usual practice of the department with respect to the paying for ties or sleepers, and was this practice in any way departed from by payment in cash instead of by cheque or otherwise during the autumn of 1900 and the winter of 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). I think my hon. friend ought to move for a return in a matter of this kind. However, the information has been asked for, and as soon as it has been received from Moncton it will be given. Nevertheless it would be far better to move for a return. The question will be allowed to stand if the hon. gentleman wishes.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. BARKER asked :

1. Were the locomotives attached to trains 25, 26, 33 and 34, running between Halifax and Montreal, and mentioned in the official letter of the 14th January, 1902, from the manager to the superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, of poor construction and poor steaming qualities, as there stated by the manager ?

2. How long have those locomotives been in service, from whom, where and when were they bought, and at what price ?

3. Were they constructed for the government ? If so, were the specifications prepared by the Railway Department ?

4. Were the locomotives bought ready-made ? If so, upon whose recommendation, and under what inspection ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). The same answer may be given to that as to the last question.

PAPERS IN THE HUTTON-HUGHES MATTER.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. Why was the Order of the House of last session for the production of certain named papers in the Hutton-Hughes matter not obeyed?

2. Will the government bring down the papers at an early date this session ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). The order of the House referred to seems to have never reached the Department of Militia and Defence. I have a letter here from the Deputy Minister of Militia, in which he states that the Secretary of State never sent the order forward and that he is informed by the Department of the Secretary of State that the order was never received there. Now that attention has been called to it, I will see that the order is carried out.

THE PETERS TARGET AND THE MORRIS TUBE.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. Has the government the report of a board of officers assembled at camp 'Carling's Heights,' London, Ontario, on the 24th day of June, 1901, by order of Lt.-Col. J. Peters, A.D.C., commanding second brigade, for the purpose of examining and reporting upon the working of the Peters' target ?

2. What is the cost of one of the Peters' target ?

3. How does the cost of the Peters' target compare with those used usually for the Morris tube ?

4. What is the comparative cost of marking for each system ?

5. How does the Peters' system compare for (a) rapidity of fire ; (b) absence of doubt re position of hits ; and (c) safety of markers, with the system for some time in use with the Morris tube ?

6. Is the new style of ammunition for practicing target shooting found to be satisfactory ? What is the cost ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden) :

1. Yes.

2. Eight dollars.

3. The targets generally used for Morris tubes cost 25 cents a piece.

4. Under the Peters target system no markers are used, the whole target vanishing if hit and no record is kept of the shots that fail to strike the target. Under the ordinary system markers are employed to mark whether the shots go high or low or left or right, thus enabling the firer to correct his aim and adjust his sights. The protection for the markers is obtained by means of iron shields which cost about $20 a piece; they are of a permanent nature and give complete safety to the markers when used under proper supervision.

5. (a) The Peters' system is more rapid. (b) The Peters' system does not show the position of the hits, as the whole target disappears and stays down until released

by a spring manipulated from the firing point, it is impossible to tell when using it whether a shot is high or low or left or right. The only way to obviate this would be by supplying a back ground with a marker to point out the hits. (c) Under proper supervision when the firing points are properly measured off there is no danger whatever.

6. The manufacture of the new ammunition has only been proceeded with in the last ten days. Preliminary experiments show that it is a much more satisfactory ammunition than the Morris tube with its ammunition. It is probable that minor defects may be discovered in it which will no doubt be remedied when discovered. The cost is about $1 per thousand.

MAIL CARRIER AT STE. HENEDINE.

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. Has Joseph Coté, mail carrier between the railway station of the Quebec central and the post office at Ste. Henedine, been replaced ?
2. If so, by whom ?
3. Were tenders called for before the renewal of the said contract ?
4. If so, how many tenders did the department receive, and what are their respective amounts ?
5. What sum does the new contractor receive ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). The present contractor for carrying the mails between the railway station of the Quebec Central and the post office at Ste. Henedine is Joseph Corriveau, at the sum of $55 per annum. This service was let by public tender in 1897 and the contract awarded to Mr. Côté at $55 per annum, he being the lowest tenderer. The contract expired on the 30th September, 1901. The amount thereof being $55 per year, the Postmaster General is authorized by the statute to let the contract without inviting tenders, and a new contract was entered into with Mr. Joseph Corriveau at the sum named, being the amount of the lowest tender for the preceding four years.

CANADIAN MAILS VIA UNITED STATES PORTS.

Mr. KEMP asked :

What proportion of Canadian transatlantic mails are received and sent via United States ports ?

What arrangements are there for receiving and transferring same through United States territory, and the cost of such service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. Proportion sent : About seven times as much mail matter is sent via the United States to the United Kingdom as is sent via Canada. The number of pounds during the six months ending the 30th November, 1901, being : Via Canadian ports, 30,418; via United States, 209,659. Proportion received is not recorded in this department.

2. The arrangement for receiving and transferring Canadian mails through United States territory is in accordance with article 4 of the Universal Postal Union Convention signed at Washington, 15th June, 1897.

The cost of territorial conveyance is 2 francs per kilogram of letters and postcards, and 25 centimes per kilogram of other articles.

The Washington convention provides that transit charges should continue to be based on the statistics taken in May, 1896, and in accordance with this condition the following sums were paid for mails for the calendar year ending 31st December, 1900 :

—	Weight.	Territorial Transit Charges.	Maritime Transit Charges.
	Lbs.	$ cts.	$ cts.
To Great Britain ..	213,520	10,718 94	24,892 97
France.....	5,579	265 98	614 19

This department has no record of the weights or charges on matter despatched from transatlantic ports via the United States to Canada.

INVESTIGATION INTO RAILWAY FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. KEMP asked :

Is the report of Professor Maclean, who was engaged by the Department of Railways and Canals for the purpose of investigating the question of freight rates, &c., complete ? If so, when will it be placed on the Table of the House ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). Mr. Maclean has made his report, and it will be laid on the Table at an early date.

SUBSIDIES PAID TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. What railway subsidies, if any, have been paid since 30th June, 1901 ?
2. To what railways have such subsidies, if any, been paid, and what amount has been paid to each such railway ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). The following railways have been paid subsidies since 30th June, 1901 :

1. $1,895,747.

2. Quebec Bridge Company, $167,430; Canadian Northern, $939,891 ; Atlantic and Lake Superior, $14,800; Montreal and Province Line, $58,560; York and Carleton, $18,336; Thousand Islands, $5,440; Canadian Pacific—Pipestone Branch, $67,200; Canadian Pacific—Crow's Nest Pass, $22,946; Inver-

ness and Richmond, $36,000; Algoma Central, $240,624; Lake Erie and Detroit River, $137,120; Atlantic and North-west (annual subsidy), $186,600. Total, $1,895,747.

EMPLOYMENT OF MR. SHEWEN, ST. JOHN, N. B.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

1. Does Mr. Shewen, St. John, N.B., hold the position of resident engineer to the Department of Public Works ?
2. If so, has he held that position continuously up to date ?
3. If not, when was he displaced, and for what cause, and the date of his reappointment ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte) :

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Mr. Shewen's services were dispensed with on the 15th of October. He was reappointed at the beginning of this month. The reason his services were dispensed with and the reason he was appointed again was to promote and maintain efficiency in the public service.

THE GRIEVANCES OF FISH CANNERS.

Mr. BELAND asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been called to an article which appeared in the Victoria 'Colonist' on the 9th February, 1902, part of which reads as follows :—

'In speaking of the grievances of the canners, Professor Prince, Commissioner of Fisheries, said there were no doubt many grievances, many matters to set right, and if they had been set right long ago, it would have been better for the government ; but the government have not had a minister who could form a resolution and act on it since the days of Sir Hibbert Tupper.'

2. Is it the intention of the government to have an investigation as to whether Professor Prince expressed himself as above reported ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). I may say that copies of the paper referred to have been received at the department. If the hon. gentleman will allow the question to stand, I will have answers made.

BELLEVILLE BOARD OF HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. PORTER asked :

1. Have any resignations, dismissals, appointments, or reappointments been made during the two years prior to 1st February, 1902, in the Board of Harbour Commissioners for the city of Belleville ?
2. What person or persons have so resigned, been dismissed, appointed, or reappointed, with dates of such resignation, dismissal, appointment or reappointment ?
3. What reason or reasons existed for such resignations, dismissals, appointments or reappointments ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes.
2. Mr. Thomas Hanley resigned his position to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the 10th January, 1901, and the appointment of Mr. George Wallbridge was cancelled on the 19th April, 1901, by Order in Council.

Mr. E. G. Sills, of Belleville, was appointed a harbour commissioner for Belleville on the 19th April, 1901, and Mr. T. S. Carman was also appointed a commissioner for said harbour on the same date.

3. It was considered advisable in the interests of the harbour to cancel the appointment of Mr. Wallbridge and appoint another commissioner in his place, two commissioners having resigned, because they were dissatisfied with Mr. Wallbridge, and the difficulty there was in getting others to fill the vacancies while he remained commissioner.

Mr. T. S. Carman was appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Hanley, and Mr. E. G. Sills was appointed in the room of Mr. Wallbridge.

INSPECTION OF GRAIN AT MONTREAL.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. Who inspects the grain arriving at Montreal ?
2. Why is not the certificate of the western inspector accepted ?
3. Is the government aware that dissatisfaction exists over the rulings, or rather overrulings, of other inspection by the Montreal Warehouse Company's inspector ?
4. Has the government control of the Montreal inspector ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) :

1. The official grain inspector at Montreal is Hospice Labelle, who has several deputy inspectors under him. The official inspection is done by one or other of them. There is also a chief inspector, under the terms of the Act passed at last session, Mr. E. F. Craig, to whom matters can be referred in dispute, and whose decision is final under the terms of the Act.
2. The certificate of the western inspector is accepted, unless a reinspection is called for by the owner of the grain. European buyers sometimes insist upon seaboard inspection, and in such cases the owners usually ask for reinspection at Montreal.
3. The government has no knowledge of dissatisfaction with reference to inspection by the Montreal Warehouse Company's inspector. The Montreal Warehouse Company's inspector, if such inspector exists, is not a government inspector. That warehouse is a private institution and cannot and does not inspect grain under the terms of the Inspection Act.
4. Yes.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

First part of the report of the commission appointed to investigate the question of

Chinese immigration.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

The report of the Secretary of State for the year 1901.—Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. WILSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to ask for some returns. One is the correspondence between Mr. Devlin and the Department of the Interior, and the other is with reference to immigration. These are two returns which I would like to have, and I do not think it would be difficult to prepare them.

CATTLE GUARDS ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln) moved second reading of Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act. He said: I may say at the outset that this is neither a new question in the country nor does my amendment seek to create an entirely new state of the law. The history of the legislation in regard to cattle guards and fences on highway crossings is shortly this. Until the year 1888 the liability to erect and maintain cattle-guards and fences at highway crossings rested on the railway companies absolutely. In that year the Railway Act was consolidated, and this matter was dealt with in the consolidation, and dealt with in such a way that the liability was not only made not absolute, but was disposed of in such a way as to leave practically no liability at all. The enacting portion of the section of the Railway Act which was in force until 1888 was as follows:

> The company shall erect and maintain cattle-guards at all highway crossings suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the railway.

Those who consider the question at all will know that these words constituted an absolute liability. In the consolidation of the Railway Act in 1888, this section was changed by adding the following subsection:

> Until such fences and cattle-guards are duly made and completed, and if after they are so made and completed they are duly maintained, the company shall be liable for all damages done by its trains and engines to cattle, horses and other animals, not wrongfully on the railway, and having got there in consequence of the omission to make, complete and maintain such fences and cattle-guards as aforesaid.

As soon as that was passed our courts began to decide that no company was liable because of the qualified liability expressed in that section, because any cattle that were wrongfully on the railway would be cattle that had no right to be on the highway—in other words, what are known as animals running at large. In the year 1890 the subsection which I have just read was struck out, and the following subsection substituted:

> If the company omits to erect and complete as aforesaid any fence or cattle-guard, or if, after it is completed, the company neglects to maintain the same as aforesaid, and if, in consequence of such omission or neglect, any animal gets upon the railway from an adjoining place where, under the circumstances, it might properly be, then the company shall be liable to the owner of every such animal for all damages in respect of it caused by any of the company's trains or engines; and no animal allowed by law to run at large shall be held to be improperly on a place adjoining the railway merely for the reason that the owner or occupant of such place has not permitted it to be there.

This provision has the same effect on the farmers or other inhabitants of the country as the amendment of 1888, and our courts have been obliged to decide that an animal is not in a place where it might properly be if it is running at large and therefore gets on the railway. It at once strikes anybody who gives any consideration to the matter that there is no need of a cattle-guard at all if the animal is not running at large, because if it is in the control of a human being it will not get on the railway, even if there is no cattle-guards there, unless there is contributory negligence on the part of the person in charge of the animal. The question is a very simple one. Why are cattle-guards required? Not to prevent human beings from driving their cattle or allowing their cattle to get on to a line of railway, but to prevent cattle, which are not within immediate control, from doing so. No cattle-guards would be required were the animals always under control. Until 1888 the law stood as I am trying to make it now. Until 1888 railway companies were obliged to provide and maintain these cattle-guards, and it is only since all the larger railway companies secured their charters, under the law as it stood in 1888, and as I seek to make it now, that they got this amendment passed, first in 1888 and then in 1890, taking away the rights our people enjoyed when the railways were built. We often hear the plea put forth, especially by railway companies, that we must not do anything to interfere with vested rights. Well, Mr. Speaker, this happens to be a case in which the farmer clearly has been deprived of a vested right. The condition of affairs which existed, when our farmers were compelled, sometimes against their will, to give up portions of their land, to allow their farms to be cut up and dangerous conditions established, for the benefit of railway companies, has since been changed, and changed without their consent, and it is only right that this old condition of things should be restored. All the petitions that are flooding this House this session, although the session is still very young, show clearly that the farmers never gave their consent to this protection being taken away from them which existed in 1888. Innumerable petitions have been laid on the Table asking us to amend the

law and put it back where it was, as I am now seeking to do.

It is an essential principle of every law that it should be effective, that it should accomplish something which requires to be accomplished. Otherwise it is merely a travesty. I would like any hon. member to explain what common sense there is in an Act which provides that a railway company or anybody else must do a certain thing and then fails to provide a penalty for not doing it, except in the event of certain conditions which could not possibly apply.

The only reason that can be urged against the amendment I propose is that perhaps it is hard on the railway companies. I submit that there is nothing in that contention, but that I am simply putting things back as they were in 1888 when these railway companies constructed their lines.

Another argument used is that if this amendment were to pass, the farmers would allow their animals to run at large in order to get compensation, in case of accident, from the railway companies. But that is a very poor and a very unfounded opinion of the whole of our farming community. Our farmers do not want their animals to run at large, but in spite of every precaution they will sometimes get beyond control. A fence may be blown down by the wind or some stranger may leave a gate open or something else may be done, for which the farmer cannot be held responsible, and an animal get out on to the highway. On such a case it is only fair to oblige the railway companies to take the precautions against these cattle straying on to their lines, which they were obliged to do some twelve or thirteen years ago. Besides there is a section of the Railway Act which I am not touching, and which prevents a farmer recovering damages for the injury or destruction of any animal that occurs on the highway where it is crossed by a railway. If an animal is killed or injured at the point of intersection, its owner cannot recover any damages, and I submit that while we retain that section in our law, every farmer will be interested in seeing that his stock do not escape on to the highway, lest they might meet with an accident at these points of intersection.

The argument that to allow the owners of cattle to recover damages from the railway companies will be an inducement to our farmers to let their stock run loose, answers itself. If you pass the Bill which I now urge upon you, you prevent animals from meeting the train except at the point of intersection of the railway and the highway. For, the effect would be to make it necessary for the railway company to make proper cattle-guards. It may be said this is enacted in the present law. But there is no use in enacting that the railway shall do a given thing, if you do not punish them for not doing it. The only way to compel them to put cattle-guards at the highway crossing is to hold them liable in the case of injury to cattle that had strayed upon their track from the highway, no matter how they got across the cattle-guard. If this Act is passed and railways provide guards which the cattle cannot cross from the highway, the only place at which an animal could be upon the track would be at the point of intersection of the track with the highway. If you give effect to the argument of the railways that under such a law as I propose farmers may grow careless and allow their animals to run on a highway, thus causing the risk of the trains being thrown off the track, you must also allow for the fact that under this Bill, the only point at which a train would meet an animal would be at the point of intersection. On the contrary, as things are at present, the train is liable to meet that animal at any point of the road from terminus to terminus. Thus, the very argument advanced in behalf of the railways, if it be advanced in this House answers itself, and the fact is emphasized that the railways would be protected by this amendment in the very way they want to be protected. Now, the law of this country on this subject is very different from that of any other country where the circumstances are at all similar. All the states of the Union, so far as I have been able to ascertain—and I have learned about a majority of them—have laws, which, though worded more or less differently are, in effect, the same as our law was before 1888, and as I am now seeking to make it. Obviously, the reason is just what I have already said, that, if you do not make the liability absolute you cannot expect that cattle-guards will be provided that will afford proper protection. Now, to state a case—innumerable cases have occurred—let us suppose that an animal goes away without the consent of the owner and gets upon the highway. The law being what it is, we might assume that the railway company has not provided proper cattle-guards. Railway companies do not do anything they are not obliged to do unless there is some clear advantage to be gained, and I think it would be fair to assume that proper cattle-guards have not been made. But let us suppose that there are effective cattle-guards. The animal goes upon the highway until it reaches the railway. But, the cattle-guards being there, it will be discouraged from seeking to move along the track. It is in danger while it is at the point of intersection, but it is encouraged to continue on the highway where there is no danger. That is the only risk the owner of the animal ought to run. Of course, under municipal law, the owner is liable to have the animal impounded, and all the steps taken that are necessary for the protection of the inhabitants of the locality. But, so far as the railway is concerned, I submit that the only risk that the owner ought to

run is, if the animal though encouraged to remain on the highway is injured while it is on the track. But if the proper cattle-guards are not provided, the animal is induced to turn upon the track, which, to the animal does not appear more dangerous than the highway. The owner ought not to be called upon to bear that risk. Therefore, I submit, that the Bill which I have proposed is one which ought to meet with the approval of the House. Now, it has been said in the country, during the discussion of this subject within the last year, that such a law as I propose might have the effect of reducing the rate of speed of trains, that, with cattle-guards constructed at the intersection of every highway the speed of trains could not be maintained. In the first place, I do not think that the fact that a train may be prevented from travelling as fast as it did five or six years ago ought, of itself, to be a reason why an injustice should be done to the inhabitants of the country who are obliged, in carrying on their affairs, to keep animals that may go upon the railway tracks if there are no cattle-guards. But, in the second place, from inquiries I have made, I find that this is after all, merely a question of expense. I understand that a cattle-guard can be made that will prevent cattle straying upon the railway and still will not interfere with the solidity of the track, if there is a little masonry about it. We know that the railways have to use a good deal of masonry in their works all over their lines, for culverts, bridges, and so on. If it be true that the railway must run its trains a little slower, or else put a little more expense in the construction of cattle-guards, I submit that that ought not to be regarded as an effective objection to the amendment I propose. The railways ought to bear that additional expense in order that the people of the country may be properly protected. I do not wish to trouble the House at greater length or to repeat in other forms what I have already said. I understand that several other gentlemen wish to speak on the Bill. But, in closing, I submit that in the true interests of the country this amendment ought to pass, and these provisions be restored to the place in the statute law which they had in 1888, in order that the people may have the protection which I have endeavoured in my humble way to explain, and to which they are entitled.

Mr. PHILIPPE DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster), who has just spoken, upon his initiative and perseverance. Although last year, the efforts of the hon. member were not rewarded with success, still this year, again, he comes forward with the same Bill. But happily for him, this question comes up before the House instead of before the Railway Committee. Owing to the several petitions that have been presented in support of the contemplated legislation, it will be no hard task for the House to take a decision. As remarked by the hon. gentleman, it is not the intention to impose new obligations upon railway companies, but merely to come back to the state of things that existed up to the year 1888, and was amended by the statute of 1890. The change brought about by the amendment of 1890 was quite radical ; for, up to that date, railway companies were held responsible by the courts, whenever cattle wandered and loitered on the highway, near the railway tracks, which were not then provided with cattle-guards. After that amendment had been passed, legislation changed very rapidly, in the several provinces of the Dominion ; but in the province of Quebec, notwithstanding this amendment of 1890, the Court of Appeal decided that railway companies were responsible for all damages to cattle wandering upon the railway tracks, through neglect of providing proper cattle guards. Later on though, in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company *vs.* Cross, the Court of Appeal adopted the jurisprudence of the other provinces, so that at this moment, railway companies are perfectly free not to comply with the laws of the land. They are incurring no risks ; for, when, I ask, are those companies to be held responsible to the public, if not in cases where, through their neglect of providing proper cattle-guards, cattle will wander on the railway tracks, causing thereby damages ? It is the only case which might occur, and railway companies are not responsible.

So, that since 1890, we have a law on the matter, which serves no useful purpose. There is no question of saddling railway companies with new obligations, but merely of giving a fresh sanction to the law already existing. I do not believe that railway companies would suffer from this Bill.

In the constituency which I represent here, several farmers have suffered from accidents to their cattle, which were due to the absence of cattle-guards. When appealed to, the railway companies have haughtily declined remedying grievances. They would simply laugh at the petitions sent by several municipal councils, requesting them to erect cattle-guards.

Accidents will occur, so long as we shall not have placed a sanction upon the obligation which has always existed for railway companies to maintain cattle-guards at railway crossings. The House, I hope, will adopt the legislation proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), and will thus give sanction to a law meant to protect the interests of farmers, which would be greatly imperilled were we to reject the Bill now before us.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). The Bill introduced by my hon. friend is a very important one, and interests a large section of the people of this country. At the same time we know from experience that the question is a complicated one, and requires a good deal of consideration before we venture on an amendment. I do not see any objection to allowing the second reading of this Bill and referring it to the committee, so that it may be carefully considered, and that we may hear the parties interested. You will admit, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the House will agree with me, that one is scarcely able to form an opinion with regard to the different points involved in this matter from the speeches that are made on the floor of the House; one is much better able to form such an opinion when he hears the matter discussed before a committee, and has an opportunity of asking questions and getting information with regard to the various points that have been, I admit, very ably dealt with by the hon. gentleman who has spoken on the Bill to-day. So far as I am personally concerned I will agree to the second reading of the Bill, with the understanding that it be referred to the Railway Committee for consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. While the usual custom has been to refer railway and telegraph Bills to the Railway Committee, and no doubt the minister who has made that proposal is in harmony with that custom, still I do not see any strong grounds for referring this Bill to the Railway Committee. It is an ordinary public Bill, and as ordinary public Bills, after their second reading, are usually dealt with in this House by being referred to the Committee of the Whole House, and as this is only a commonplace Bill of one clause, therefore I think the best place to consider it is in Committee of this Whole House. There is one reason why I would object to refer it to the Railway Committee, and that is the history of what has taken place in that Railway Committee. I do not desire to reflect in any way on that committee, yet I cannot refrain from thinking over a large number of important Bills that go to that Railway Committee and are killed there, and never find their way back to this House, Bills that are usually in the public interest. It seems to be the graveyard of very many important Bills that are in the interest of the public.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will my hon. friend allow me ? I think perhaps there is a good deal in the statement that many Bills are killed in the Railway Committee, but I do not think there are nearly so many as are killed in this House when they are considered in Committee of the Whole. I know that many amendments of great importance have been carried through the House after having been reported by the committee, but in my experience of twenty-two years in parliament I cannot remember any Bill having been introduced by a private member and become law without having been considered by a committee of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking with reference to ordinary Bills.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am speaking of public Bills.

Mr. SPROULE. Bills promoted by private corporations come back from the committee all right, but public Bills relating to the rights of individuals as against railways——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Public Bills I mean.

Mr. SPROULE. My experience has been that these Bills sent to the committee rarely if ever come back to this House reported from that committee. Therefore, I am opposed to the reference on that ground. Under the old law people knew what their rights were in the event of any accident occurring through defective cattle-guards, but under new law those rights were taken away. The history of railways in this country has been a constant infringement upon those rights. But as soon as the law was amended, new conditions were introduced, and now it is something that every person is not conversant with. If there were a great deal of intricate legislation about this Bill that it requires an expert to understand, there might be a strong reason for sending it to the Railway Committee. But I do not think there is any good reason for sending this Bill to the Railway Committee.

Now arguments have been suggested and facts presented to show that one reason why this amendment to the law was made was because the old cattle-guards were dangerous. When this Bill was being considered I asked the question : Will the hon. member who holds that contention give us any data of the number of accidents which have taken place on account of these excavations for cattle-guards, and no cases were given, and I believe it was never attempted to prove to the House or to the committee that any considerable number of accidents occurred on account of these excavations for the old kind of cattle-guards. Therefore, if that be so, and I believe it is, I do not think the argument should hold good or be of any value. It is a fact that every farmer in the country knows, that where there is a railway crossing his farm the cattle-guard is of no value whatever as regards keeping cattle off the railway track. They will walk over it winter or summer as unconcernedly as if there was no cattle-guard there at all. They are only pieces of bent iron put so closely together that cattle can walk over them almost as on a floor. Well, the railway companies do not care, because there is a law which prevents cattle run-

ning at large within half a mile of a railway, and if the farmer suffers loss from his cattle running on the public highways within half a mile, he is liable to be prosecuted by law for allowing them to do so. If his cattle get off on the railway and are killed, he has no redress whatever, and has to sustain all the loss. I do not think it was ever intended that should be so, and in my judgment it is very unfair. There was very little discussion when this amendment was made to the law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does this propose to remedy that defect, so that when cattle on a railway crossing are killed the owner shall have indemnity ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by a railway crossing.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where the highway crosses a railway.

Mr. SPROULE. No, not at all, it is not intended that this is of any value to the farmer as enabling him to get compensation for cattle killed on the highway, that is his own lookout; but it is when cattle-guards are so defective as to allow cattle to travel over them and get on the railway ground or tracks. That is all the Bill is intended to do, that is what the old law did do, and that is what the farmers are deprived of to-day. When their cattle travel as they do right over the cattle-guards on to the railway grounds and are killed, they have no redress whatever, and have to sustain the entire loss. I was going on to say that when this law was amended there was very little discussion on it. In fact it was explained by an expert railway lawyer, I think very adroitly, and information was kept in the dark which, if that committee had possessed, they never would have allowed that amendment to pass. But they did not see the aim of it, and they innocently allowed the amendment to pass, believing that it was for some good purpose. But when they found out afterwards that the cattle-guards were of no value in keeping the cattle off the track, and that when the cattle went over these guards and got killed the owner had no redress, and when a case came to be decided in the courts, then they saw where the law was defective and very naturally a clamour arose for an amendment. Once or twice before an amendment was introduced to put the law back to where it was before, but through adverse influences the Bill did not become law, it was killed. It was sent first to the Railway Committee and then to a sub-committee of the Railway Committee, and through some accident or otherwise—I do not know what it was—it was killed. I, as one member of that sub-committee, know that a notice of the meeting of that sub-committee did not reach me until after the sub-committee had considered the Bill and reported it back to the main committee, reporting against the Bill. But whether that was the result of accident or design I am not prepared to say. At any rate, the Bill did not come back to the Railway Committee as having received its support, and consequently it was lost.

Now, we want to discuss it in this House for two reasons. The first reason is to let the country know what the representatives of the people are doing or what they are disposed to do to protect the innocent farmer whose property was expropriated from him in the first instance in addition to which the dangers were increased on his own property by virtue of the operations of the railway corporations, although they placed these cattle-guards on their line. If it were publicly known throughout the country that the representatives of the people are opposed to this, I think they would be reminded of it when they went back for re-election. Therefore, we want to discuss the measure as generally as possible. We want to ascertain the sentiment of the House on the question so as to see whether hon. gentlemen think that they are in duty bound to do what is right towards the farmers of the country, or whether they consider it to be their duty to look after the interests of the railway corporations.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), be good enough to explain the difference between the law as it now stands in relation to the farmer and the Bill as proposed ?

Mr. SPROULE. Under the old law, if the railway company did not keep up an efficient railway guard, sufficient to keep cattle from getting on the track, and cattle went on the track and were killed, the railway company were liable for damages. To-day, all they are obliged to do is to keep up cattle-guards, not necessarily efficient ones, not ones to prevent cattle from getting on the track, and if a farmer allows his cattle to run and they get on the track and are killed he has no redress because the railway company have maintained the cattle-guard, whether an efficient one or not. Under the proposed amendment to the law if the railway company maintain an inefficient guard they are not liable for damages and the farmer has to suffer. Under the old law if the cattle-guard was not an efficient one the railway company were liable. We desire to discuss this question as generally as possible and if there are any reasonable objections against the Bill we wish to know them so as we may consider them. As the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) said, the farmer had the first rights in the country, his property was expropriated from him against his will, and if you expropriate property, as a principle, it is held that you must give compensation. Although you have given moderately fair compensation for the property, there are other rights which

the farmer should enjoy. A corporation to which the country has given the right to invade the right of domain of the private individual should not be allowed to bring about other conditions which make it more onerous for the farmer to carry on his daily work, more expensive, or more dangerous or more likely to incur loss to him. Now, if a railway corporation expropriate property they should not be allowed to run their railway over a farm and allow it to remain in such a way that the farmer's stock can at any time get on the track and be destroyed and he have no redress from the railway company. Unless they take every reasonable precaution to prevent the destruction of stock as a result of getting on the track, a railway company ought to be held responsible for the damage and be obliged to pay it. Therefore, this Bill, in my judgment, ought to become law, and I am most strongly opposed to sending it to the Railway Committee. I want to say one word in regard to another amendment made to the law a few years ago. That was an amendment which made the farmer liable if he allowed his cattle to run at large on the highway within half a mile of a railway. I always thought that a very unfair provision of the law and a very unreasonable one, and I hold that opinion still. In many parts of the country the farmers find their very best grazing ground on the highway. A farmer should not be deprived of the advantage of grazing his cattle on the highway, where there is better pasture perhaps than in his own fields. In Vermont he has the right to the use of the highway to the centre of the highway. Our law is somewhat different here, but still, by common consent, farmers have been allowed to take advantage of the highways and to graze their cattle on them, but, if a farmer allows his cattle to graze on the highway within half a mile of a railway he is liable to have them impounded and to be mulcted in damages. I think this wrong and I hold that such a law should be amended.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Mr. Speaker, I understood the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) to say that he would move that this Bill be referred to the Railway Committee of this Chamber, and when he does so I propose to support that motion. I feel it due to myself to give the House my reason for so-doing. I represent an almost purely agricultural riding, and there I practice my profession of the law, so that I think I am in some position to take an intelligent interest in the discussion now before the House. I wish to say that I have come to the conclusion that the farmers have in this matter a most substantial grievance and I believe that I voice the opinion of the majority of the members of this House when I say that before this session is over a substantial remedy they must have for that substantial grievance. Now, the point between the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Sutherland) is as to where this matter shall be fought out. It would seem to me undoubtedly a better course to fight it out in the Railway Committee than to deal with it here. Now, Sir, my reason for saying that will be apparent to almost every hon. member of this House even before I state it. Our chief functions are undoubtedly legislative, but in order to enact good laws there should be thorough previous investigation, and we have in the committee a chance of examining witnesses, of hearing experts on both sides and of gaining the best information possible. It is for this reason that I would like to see the matter investigated in the Railway Committee. As I have said before I am heartily in sympathy with the farmers in this matter and should it go to the committee I shall use every endeavour in my power to see that this Bill does not have one more tombstone put up to it in that committee, which has been called the graveyard. It seems to me that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has, to use a common phrase, been playing somewhat to the gallery in this matter. He has talked so much about wanting to go on record on the floor of this House. The insinuation is patent that we want to sneak off to a committee where there is no 'Hansard' reporter in order that we may do there what we would be ashamed to do on the floor of this House. I resent any such insinuation as that. I believe that the average member of this House is an intelligent man and that he is equally willing to do his duty in the committee or in the House. The hon. gentleman said that we must discuss the Bill here so that we might put ourselves on record. We have to discuss it here when it is reported from the Railway Committee, so that it seems to me that we can put ourselves on record by referring the Bill just as well as we can now by discussing it.

Mr. SPROULE. It may never be reported from the Railway Committee. That is the trouble.

Mr. THOMPSON. The chances are this year that when this matter goes to the committee, owing to the sentiment in regard to it in the House, it will come back and we will have an opportunity of going on record. I know very well that 'trimmer' is a name that no man would like to have forced upon him, but in my honest opinion compromise is in many cases honourable, and in the best interests of this country. We have not only the farmers to consider but also the travelling public, and let me say to my hon. friend from East Grey that the farmers form a very large per cent of the travelling public. Let us go to the committee and find out what is best to be

done and then as honourable men do it. In conclusion may I be allowed to quote a very apt French proverb: 'Il faut mettre de l'eau dans son vin.'

Mr. JOSEPH BRUNET (St. James, Montreal). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment moved by the hon. member is in several respects, similar to the Railway Act in force in the province of Quebec. Should there be any amendments required, then I think it would be better to refer the Bill to the Railway Committee, for further consideration.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis). There are three parties interested in the subject matter of this Bill. One is the farmer, another the railway company, and the third is the travelling public.

Mr. COWAN. What about the cow?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WADE. We will leave the cow with the hon. member. As between the farmer and the railway company my sympathy is entirely with the farmer, but we have to consider the interests of the travelling public as well as the interests of the other parties, and we should be very careful before we make any changes in the provisions of the law as it exists to-day. There is a mistaken idea in the minds of many hon. gentlemen here with regard to this law. I think it can be demonstrated beyond peradventure that the law as it exists to-day is really the law that has been in force in Canada since 1857. It is all very well to work up our sympathies in favour of the farmer—and of the cow as one hon. gentleman suggests—and I dare say that some hon. gentlemen may sympathize with the railway company, but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the welfare of the travelling public should have our sympathy also. The object of the present law has been—and it has been so declared by the decisions of our courts—to impose a mutual burden upon the railways and upon the farmers whose cattle must be kept off the track in order that no danger may arise to the passengers and employees on railway trains. That is the object of the law, and that principle we must keep in view when we are discussing this question. It is in my opinion a question which ought to go before the Railway Committee, and there be thoroughly discussed. The provisions of this Bill with regard to cattle-guards is one of very great importance. To-day, upon the continent of America, there are not two railways which are using the same kind of cattle-guard; in fact upon different divisions of the same railway in Canada, different kinds of guards are used. The old pit-guard has been put aside and every imaginable device has been tried by the different railways in order to protect their line. It is as much in the interest of the railway company as it is in the interest of the general public that the very best and most effective kind of cattle-guard should be adopted. It does seem to me that it would be highly proper that a commission should be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into and deciding upon what is the most effective cattle-guard, and having decided authoritatively on that, we should put the law in force and see that it is used on every railway. If that were done good would be accomplished, but I doubt if any good can be achieved by our saying that an effective cattle-guard should be used, in view of the fact that different kinds of guards, all supposed to be effective, are being used now throughout the Dominion. Some of these guards which are the most effectual for the purpose of keeping cattle off the railway are the guards which are most complained of by the farmers because they are liable to injure the cattle. I therefore think that it is most desirable that this whole question should be discussed before the Railway Committee, notwithstanding the remarks made against that body by the hon. gentleman for Grey (Mr. Sproule). If some valuable recommendation could be made to this House, I believe the government would be only too glad to adopt the suggestion and to take such steps as will enable them to decide which is the best kind of cattle-guard that should be used throughout Canada.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). There is another very important interest that has not been referred to in this case. We have heard of the interests of the lawyers, the farmers, the general public, the railway companies and the cattle, but nobody seems to have thought of mentioning the necessity for protecting the lives of the men engaged in operating the trains. I have been at the burial of too many of the engineers and firemen and brakesmen of the town in which I live, to let a Bill of this kind pass without seeing that the interests of this body are properly safeguarded. I have as much sympathy with the farmer as any man in this House, but I could give you instance after instance where train hands were killed on account of some careless people allowing their cattle to roam on the track at night.

An hon. MEMBER. Not farmers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You rarely find a farmer's cow running at large. It is usually the cow of some poor loafer around the village which is let loose to get some pasture at night, and the next thing you know is that the fireman and the engineer are piled up in the debris and hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property destroyed. I am anxious that every railway company should be compelled to maintain the very best kind of cattle-guard, but I believe also that there should be safeguards provided for the men who are obliged to travel on the railways, and who are at the

mercy of some careless fellow who turns his cow loose at night.

Mr. G. A. STEPHENS (Kent). In the interest of the farmer, in the interest of the travelling public and in the interest of all concerned, I believe that the pit-guard is the only proper guard to use. I believe that the pit-guard would be entirely used by the railway companies but for the expense that it entails upon them. It is certainly the safest guard for a train to pass over if it is properly built, and it is certainly the best guard for keeping cattle and other stock off the track. I also believe that the floor of this House is the proper place to argue this Bill out.

Mr. M. AVERY (Addington). I have had the honour to receive a petition from my riding praying that some legislation be passed by this House in reference to this question. We have three railways in the riding of Addington, and there is a universal demand in the district for improvement in the railway culverts. If it be in the interest of railways to make better guards I would like to know why the railway companies have not done so. In the district which I represent a great many cattle have been killed on the railways, and the farmers have had no redress. I will give you an instance. A drover was taking cattle to the railway station to be shipped, and in spite of his efforts the cattle got on the track because the cattle-guard was not sufficient to keep them back. A train came along and killed half of the cattle, but the poor man had no recourse in law against the company, because the law said that the cattle-guard was a safe one. It is neither just nor right to allow the railway companies to build such cattle-guards which are not safe for the farmers, and not safe for the people using the highway or travelling on the railroad. I was on a train myself one day when cattle got on the track and nearly the whole train was ditched, but fortunately no one was killed. I would point out to the House that what is protection for the travelling public is protection for the railway companies and also for the farmers. The sooner we pass a law here forcing the railways to build proper cattle guards, the better satisfied will be the people of the country. Canada has helped railroads enough to ask them to make this small return towards the protection of our people, and I trust that a measure calculated to safeguard the rights of the public in this regard will soon become law.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). I do not propose to discuss the principle of this Bill, but I wish to correct some statements which have been made in this House with reference to the Railway Committee. Some hon. gentlemen made remarks in reference to the Railway Committee which were both uncalled for and unjustified. I can remember all the changes in the Railway Act since it was consolidated in 1888. I remember that in 1888 when the Hon. Mr. Pope was Minister of Railways, some two or three weeks were given to a careful consideration of the Act in the Railway Committee, and afterwards a very thorough discussion on the Bill took place in this House. After that the only important railway Bills which I remember were the one introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln, and a drainage measure which indirectly affected the railways. With these two exceptions all the Bills relating to railways went to the Railway Committee and were considered by that committee. I wish to make this correction, because when an hon. gentleman assumes the responsibility of reflecting upon the Railway Committee, he should inform himself of the true action of that committee. This matter is one of importance to the farmers, and I also represent an agricultural constituency, and it is not fair to the other members of the Railway Committee that the hon. gentleman should speak of it as a dangerous place to which to send any important Bill. I say that the Railway Committee, irrespective of which party is in power, is a most competent, faithful, honest and wise tribunal. I have been a member of that committee for fifteen years. I have taken a great deal of pride in it, and I am glad to say that I know of no tribunal in the world which I would rather trust than that committee. It is not pleasant for me to have to say some of these things, but I do not propose to allow these reflections on the Railway Committee to go on the journals of this House without making my protest against them. I want to congratulate the acting Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) on having to-day pursued the policy which has always been pursued by the most illustrious leaders on both sides of the House. I want to congratulate him, because since his party has been in power, I have sometimes had to find fault with the minister. I have always contended that so long as we have a Railway Act, the responsible minister should always take charge of such matters and see that fair play is given to all parties; and the acting Minister of Railways to-day, in my opinion took the proper course, and ought to be supported in it. With regard to the grievance which has been mentioned, there is certainly a strong desire to agree upon some methods for meeting a very complicated case, where important and conflicting interests are concerned; and I am satisfied that it is desired on both sides of the House to deal with the matter in all seriousness. I do not approve of sending a Bill of this kind to a sub-committee. I opposed doing so last year although I sat on the special committee. I think we should send it to a committee that will give the time and patience necessary to understand the case, and then the House will accept its decision.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. member what became of the Bills for the protection of railway employees that went to that committee and never came back, the Bill respecting ditches and water courses, which also went there and never came back, and the cattle-guard Bill ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The Bill relating to railway employees is not of the same character as this, though not less important, and I have no doubt it received due consideration. I understand that the matter it dealt with was adjusted by some arrangement brought about by the government between the railway employees and the companies.

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the very discussion which has taken place, and which is only in its incipient stages, shows the wisdom of referring this Bill to the Railway Committee. There is apparently as much diversity of opinion on this question as there is on the question of prohibition. The Bill is important, affecting as it does several interests. There is a strong grievance on the side of the farmers, and there may be questions of rights on the side of the railways and the public. In legislation of this kind it has always seemed to me that the wise course to pursue is to refer it to the committee which is supposed to deal with such matters. Therefore, I think this Bill should go before the Railway Committee. While I agree with some of its provisions, there is something to be said on both sides, and it should be threshed out there.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). A Bill similar to the one now before the House was introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) last session, and was sent to the Railway Committee. The Railway Committee referred it to a sub-committee, and, if I remember rightly, the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) was on that committee, but did not put in an appearance, or if he did he voted against the Bill.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I was at every meeting of that committee.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Well, that sub-committee took no action in the matter, and the present Bill may be treated in the same way. This is a very important question. The farmers have rights, and we are bound to make the railways and all other classes respect those rights, and I think it is time that this very important question was decided upon. This House has been flooded with resolutions asking it to take action, and if you were to have all the committees you please, you would not be any better informed on the question than you are to-day. Every man in this House knows all about a cattle-guard. I do not think any more light can be thrown upon the question than we all have this evening; and, I for one, think the question should be brought before this House here and now.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I rise to say, in the first place, that I am opposed to the suggestion that this measure should be referred to any committee other than the Committee of the Whole House, the representatives of the people. I do not think we can get any better light upon it than can be shed by the experience and knowledge of the various members of this House. It is not a new question, nor is the amendment a new one. It was brought to the attention of the House last session, and I think I am right in assuming that every hon. member of this House has given it careful attention in the meantime. Now, I hardly anticipated that I should find the hon. member from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) and the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) together on any question. I regret that the hon. member for Victoria is not in the good company we usually find him. The argument of these two hon. gentlemen is the same : The object of the law is the safety of the public and the safety of the railway employees. Why, Mr. Speaker, these hon. gentlemen cannot have been giving careful consideration to the amendment which has been proposed or the speeches which have been made this afternoon, or else they would know that it is for the greater safety of railway employees and the greater safety of the public as well as the protection of the farmer that the amendment of the hon. member for Lincoln is introduced.

The Bill does not propose to deal with the danger of a collision at the intersection of a highway and a railway, but we have the additional danger that along every mile of a railway, where proper cattle-guards do not exist, there is the probability that cattle may be encountered at any point, and it is that danger this Bill is intended to guard against. Can it be said that parliament has fairly and intelligently sought to protect the safety of the public, when during twelve or fourteen years, although there is a law on the statute-books requiring railways to provide cattle-guards and proper fences to keep cattle from going on their tracks, these companies have been allowed to systematically disregard that law, with the result that all over the country we have had disasters to cattle and the owners of the cattle have had to bear the loss ?

The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has spoken out in a manner that does him credit. He spoke of the stand he was taking to have justice done our farming community, but judging from what passed last session I have not much hope for this measure should the course, which he recommends, be pursued this year. He

says we can go to a special committee and get the evidence. But what better evidence can we get than that of our senses? What witnesses do we want to call? Is it not evident that if this is to be a short session and this Bill is referred to a committee, it will not get beyond that committee. Justice delayed, Mr. Speaker, is injustice, and surely justice has been long enough delayed in this matter. If I understand the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) aright, he made a suggestion in the same line. He said that all parties interested could be heard before the committee. Well, I submit that all the parties interested can be heard when we deliberate the question in this House. What are we but the representatives, not alone of the farmers and the railway companies, but of the entire people of Canada; and the representatives of the people on the floor of this House can just as well, as honesty, and as faithfully represent the various interests concerned as could any witnesses before a committee.

I think I am right in saying that although the two great parties in this Dominion have vied with each other in professing their readiness to protect the interests of the farmers, the discussion this afternoon has shown that some hon. members at least have not paid that attention to what is actually before the House in the agricultural interests which we would expect from their utterances on the public platform.

This point requires to be kept clearly in mind that the law which requires that cattle shall not be allowed to run at large within half a mile of the intersections of the railway track with the public highway, is not interfered with in any way by the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Lincoln. The courts have pointed out that the object of this provision was to make it in the interests of the farmers to keep their cattle at home. Under it if an animal is killed or injured, which has violated that section, the owner cannot recover damages, and hon. gentlemen may advance that as an argument against the amendment of the hon. member for Lincoln. I submit, however, that every argument which has been used by the legislature and the public to have the public interests safeguarded should be exerted in favour of this amendment. If we have truly the interests of the travelling public at heart, we should enact some measure similar to the one now before the House. Why so? Because if you take the point of intersection between a highway and a railway alone, you will find that there is no temptation for cattle to loiter at that spot, though of course it is not impossible that an animal might by chance stray to that point and get caught there. But if that is possible, it would only happen at very long intervals. But when the law provides that the railway companies shall put up cattle-guards and fences along their lines sufficient to keep cattle from straying on to the track and when we find this law completely disregarded—when we find a nice green sward along the railway lines offering tempting pastures to cattle—we have there not only a danger to the cattle but also a danger to the travelling public, which danger is vastly increased by practically allowing the railways to dispense with cattle-guards at the points of intersection, since they are not liable to any penalty for accidents to animals occurring at these points.

The hon. member's amendment does not deal with the difficult question as to what kind of cattle-guards there should be, because that would lead to endless litigation and difficulty, but seeks a straight declaration that where cattle stray on to a railway track from the highway, by reason of the omission or neglect of the company to maintain cattle-guards or fences at the highway crossing, the company shall be responsible. The courts have decided that if an animal strays from the highway to the railway track, although there may be no cattle-guard or no fence at the intersection between the highway and the railway, yet the owner of the animal must bear the loss, and we wish to make it the interest of the railway companies to guard against such accidents, which it is not their interest to do now. At present they insist on breaking the law by not putting up cattle-guards, simply because the courts have held that they are not responsible. Well, we can remedy that difficulty. We are all-powerful here. Do hon. gentlemen of the House of Commons think it fair that, because a farmer's cattle accidentally break out of their pasture during a wind storm, stray upon the highway and are thence tempted upon the railway and destroyed, it may be, a mile or a mile and half from the point of intersection, there shall be no compensation for the farmer? Is it fair that by being given freedom from responsibility the railway company shall be tempted to disregard its plain duty? If we say that the paramount consideration is the protection of railway passengers, I submit that it is in the interests of these very people that the proposition of the hon. member for Lincoln should pass. I submit also that it is not in the interests of the people that this Bill should go to a committee again, having regard to the experience we had last session.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Peter Macdonald, East Huron). A large number of farmers throughout the length and breadth of this country have suffered heavy losses through the defective condition of the cattle-guards on railways. The old pit-guard was much more effective in preventing cattle wandering upon the railway than those that are now in use in some parts of the country. In fact, if the railway cattle-guards in other sections are built as they are in my riding then, there are no cattle-guards but

are absolutely useless. A number of my constituents have lost their valuable cattle and horses through there being, practically speaking no obstruction placed in the way of the animals wandering upon the track. The difficulty does not always arise, in fact it does not frequently arise, through cattle being driven along the highway and across the railway track. But, sometimes, as every hon. gentleman knows, cattle are pasturing in a field adjoining a side line. During a windy night the fence may blow down, or the cattle may find a panel which falls without much resistance, and thus they wander down the side line to the track. If it is in the middle of summer, and the feed is better on the railway than on the highway, as it often is, the cattle naturally wander along the railway and so are liable to be killed by passing trains. If there were efficient obstructions, the cattle would continue on the highway and would thus avoid danger. Let me quote one instance to show the absolute uselessness for the purpose intended of the cattle-guards. One evening a number of cattle, owned by one of my constitutents about four miles from the town in which I live, broke down some fences and wandered down to the side line till they came to the crossing. The feed being better on the railway, they wandered upon the track. The train passed, I think in the night, and killed four head of cattle. The carcasses were thrown from the track to the side of the road. The owner had to take them from where they lay to bury them in another place. He hitched up his horse to a wagon and actually drove over the cattle-guard with his horse and wagon to the place where the carcasses were, and then drove back, without difficulty, over the cattle-guard. This shows that there was no obstruction thrown in the way of the cattle wandering on the railway. In this way, large numbers of cattle and horses are killed. Two other constituents of mine lost valuable horses in the same way, and still another lost three or four head of cattle. When we consider the number of valuable animals killed in this way, we see that this is an exceedingly serious and important question. It is for us to consider the best means to be adopted to secure better protection for the owners of cattle. I do not say that this Bill will accomplish all that is necessary; nor do I say that the railways are guilty of neglect. But, if proper cattle-guards cannot be constructed now, some railway men ought to apply their wits to the inventing of a cattle-guard which will prevent animals wandering on the railway. The old pit-guards were the ones in use in our neighbourhood some years ago. But all these guards have been filled up solid to the top, and a few longitudinous strips, triangular in form, have been placed where the pit formerly was. But sheep and cattle can pass over them without any difficulty whatever. It is the duty of parliament to consider this question, not from a party standpoint—for there is no partyism in it—and do the best we can to secure safety for cattle and horses that wander on the highway through no fault of the owner. Whether it is considered in Committee of the Whole or in the Railway Committee matters not, if we do our duty. I rose merely to tell the House of the state of affairs in my own neighbourhood and to show the ineffectiveness of the cattle-guards in use there.

Mr. D. K. ERB (South Perth). I understand, that this Bill, if enacted, would make the railway corporations liable for loss through cattle being killed on the railway track, if those cattle stray upon the railway from the highway. That being the case, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the Bill. I believe, that, if such a Bill were enacted, the railway companies would soon devise some means by which the cattle would be prevented from straying on the track from the highway, yet which would not interfere with them running a train. Some years ago, a law was passed prohibiting cattle roaming at large within half a mile of the railway track. Was that law passed in the interests of the farmers? Was there any great demand on the part of the farmers for such a law? If cattle got out and got on the railway track and were killed, farmers had no compensation before that law was passed and they have had no compensation since. The argument used at that time was that the law was necessary for the protection of railways as cattle going upon the track might be the means of derailing trains and so causing expense to the railway company. If that is the object to be attained, I think the railway companies should have no objection whatever to the Bill now before us. If there is danger of trains being derailed at the highway crossings by cattle going upon the track, that danger must be greatly increased, if the cattle go, as they do now, on the property of the railway, and are free to wander upon the track where they will. It would be in the interest of the railway, as it would be in the interest of the railway employees and of the general travelling public, to pass such a law as is here proposed. If this law were passed, efficient cattle-guards would be provided, and danger of this kind would be restricted to the points where the railways and the highways cross.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I would not rise to discuss the merits of this Bill were it not that we may be called upon to vote as to whether the Bill should be sent to the Railway Committee or not. I am one of those who desire to weigh carefully the interests of the farmers as to how this Bill may affect them; but I am not blind to the fact that this country is an agricultural country, and that our railways may be more patronized by agriculturists

than perhaps by any other class of the community. That being the case, while I recognize that the farmers located along the lines of railway may suffer to some extent through accidents caused by the railways. I also remember that the greater portion of the agriculturists of this country are not located on a railway, but are travellers over railways; and we have to consider whether we may not do an injustice to the greater number of farmers by legislating so as to make our roadbeds perhaps insecure or unsafe to the travelling public, and by that means perhaps causing a greater sacrifice of life on our railways than takes place at present. Now, I remember that on the old organized railways of this country, they had the kind of cattle-guard that was built when the railways were first constructed, known as the pit cattle-guard. The hon. gentleman who moved this Bill to-day, throughout his speech, spoke as if that was the kind of cattle-guard he suggested, and the only difference is that he requires it to be constructed of masonry instead of square timber, as it had been by the old organized railways.

Now what has been the history of the railway companies with respect to cattle-guards, wooden culverts and wooden bridges in this country? At first they were wooden culverts built across the railways; but the railway companies, finding they had to compete with those of the United States found it necessary to introduce engines of greater power and of greater speed in order to compete with American railways, and for that purpose they filled up the culverts, the cattle guards, and rebuilt their wooden bridges with iron. I remember distinctly, by practical experience, that the cattle-guards in those days did not prevent stock from passing on the railways, frequently stock was killed by passing over the cattle-guards on to the railways. When my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that the railway companies do not care when stock passes over the railway, it is idle rot to talk like that. The hon. gentleman regretted very much that cattle were not allowed to run on the highway. Then my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) who, according to the 'Farmer's Sun,' has paid a great deal of attention to this Bill, and who ought to be prepared, if any man in this House can be, to enlighten us on the subject of this legislation, makes an erroneous statement. He says that cattle do not linger around the intersection of a railway crossing. Well, I want to tell my hon. friend as a practical railway man that if there is one place more than another where stock running at large are likely to linger, it is at the intersection of a railway crossing. There is no question about it, and every practical railway man will tell you so. Then again it has been suggested by one hon. member in this House that the pit is a proper guard to have. The hon. gentleman has never had any experience; he does not know.

I am prepared to say, perhaps having had as much experience in the matter as any other hon. gentleman in this House, that I am not in a position to say to-day that this Bill should be referred to a Committee of the Whole House. I have not the information in my possession which would justify me in voting against the Bill, or which would justify me in voting for it. But I do not want to leave myself open to the charge by any man who chooses to come into my constituency and tell the farming community that simply because I voted against this Bill being considered in Committee of the Whole I am therefore opposed to legislation of this character. I do not want to put myself in such a position, and I believe many other hon. gentlemen in this House wish to avoid putting themselves in that position. I go further, and say that railway companies in this country are just as eager as any hon. gentleman in this House to prevent loss of life on the railways and to prevent loss of stock to the farmers on the railways. Until we have an opportunity of sending for witnesses and securing statistics which would justify us in amending this legislation, I say it becomes us to go slowly. Now when this Bill was before the House last session there were no petitions asking us to pass this legislation. Since then a strong agitation has sprung up throughout the country, and many petitions have been sent to this parliament. Hon. gentlemen are well aware that the public are alive to this question. That being the case, is it not our duty, in the interest of the public and in the interest of all parties, carefully to weigh this question? The only way we can do so is by securing statistics to ascertain whether more stock is killed in winter or more stock is killed in summer, and what are the causes of these accidents. My hon. friend from Huron said that stock may break out through fences. Why, Sir, will the hon. gentleman pretend to say that it is only when they break through fences that cattle get on railway crossings over the intersections with the highway? That is rarely the case. Frequently in the dry season of summer the fences are burnt by reason of sparks from the engine setting the grass on fire along the railway, and frequently this allows the stock to get out on the railway. Will any one pretend to say that you require a cattle-guard wherever cattle break out through the fences alongside the railway? Certainly not. No legislation we can pass in this House will prevent accidents occurring on railways by reason of broken fences caused in the way I have described.

Now, farmers are interested in more ways than one in this question. They are interested as travellers and they are interest-

ed as owners of stock, and we ought to weigh these separate interests carefully. When my hon. friend, my colleague from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), says that we are bound to consider the interest of the farmer, I say we are bound to consider his interests both as a traveller and as an owner of stock. I have just as much right to consider his interest as a traveller as I have to consider his interest as an owner of stock that may be killed through carelessness, or perhaps by accident. When this Bill comes up before the Railway Committee, if it ever does, I shall be glad to do my best to give it full consideration, and to procure information that will enable us to come to a right decision. I may add that if it comes to a question in this House as to whether we shall send this Bill to the Railway Committee, I have no hesitation in saying that I will support the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who has proposed to send it to that committee.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY (North Simcoe). I have just one word to say as to the aspect which this debate has taken. No matter how much we may be in favour of the Bill of the hon. member for Lincoln, it now seems to me that each member of the Railway Committee who sits in this House must consider whether he is prepared to vote want of confidence in himself. The discussion has been going on and arguments have been advanced to show that we ought to consider this Bill in Committee of the Whole House because the Railway Committee would not treat it fairly. The man who takes that view must be prepared to support a resolution which says that the Railway Committee does not do its duty. Are we, members of this House who are members of that committee, going to stigmatize ourselves by voting that this Bill should be considered now because we will not give it proper consideration when it is sent before us in the Railway Committee in the ordinary course. That is the first proposition that presented itself to me, but these hon. gentlemen who think that it should be considered now as a safeguard to the farming community seem to forget, while perhaps they will be earning a certain amount of eclat before the public by making it appear that they are protecting the interests of the public, that in future a fashion may be created which I am sure every hon. gentleman will condemn. If it is to be said that a Bill may be more easily put through in this way, shall we not have every day persons representing different interests in the community coming here and saying : This is a very important Bill; it will not receive proper consideration before the Railway Committee and therefore we want it considered now. I have always thought, and I think the members of this House will agree with me, that the more important a Bill is the more important it is that it should be sent to the Railway Committee in order that all the matters connected with it may be discussed and all views heard. Therefore, I am prepared to support the resolution of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), sending it to the Railway Committee, in order that we may have a full and free discussion there by the representatives of all parties, and further than that, I am not prepared to vote a want of confidence in myself as a member of that committee.

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that there is no better place in which to thresh out this measure than right here in Committee of the Whole. This Bill has been before the Railway Committee on several former occasions. I remember that for four or five years back there is not a county in our section of the country that has not petitioned this government regarding cattle-guards. This is not a new thing, and I am of the opinion that every hon. member here, representing a county, is a good judge as to whether the county which he represents desires a change in the law relating to cattle-guards or not. It is not for us as members of the House of Commons to dictate to the railway companies as to what kind of cattle-guards they should adopt. I do not think they would pay any attention to us if we did dictate to them on this point. It seems to me that a cattle-guard should be sufficient to keep stock off the tracks. It is for the railway companies, in my opinion, to settle for themselves as to what sort of cattle-guards they should build, and not for us to dictate to them, provided that they adopt a safe cattle-guard. I was surprised at the speech of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes). He tried to make it appear that there was more danger to the travelling public by having a good cattle-guard to prevent cattle from getting on the track than by having a poor cattle-guard that would permit cattle to get on the track. That is his argument. There are four rods of the highway clear between the fences where cattle may get upon the railway track, but if there is an insufficient cattle-guard cattle might occupy the track for the two or three miles that intervenes between the two guards. I can only say that I have had the honour of being a member of the county council for some years and that every year they have petitioned this government asking for more protection in the shape of better cattle-guards.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, before this question is put, I desire to say a few more words in regard to this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) cannot speak a second time. He has already exhausted his time.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is my motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He might speak in a discussion but not on the Orders of the Day.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland) moved that the Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways and Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put, I desire to say a few words, and with all due respect to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Sutherland), to contend in this House that we are not doing the right thing by sending this Bill to any committee other than the Committee of the Whole House. I have listened very earnestly and very carefully to all that has been said as to the reasons of hon. gentlemen for desiring this Bill to go to the Railway Committee, and I have been struck most forcibly by one thing. The hon. gentlemen who want this Bill to go to the Railway Committee, not always for the same reason, but for some reason or other, seem to have doubts as to whether the Bill is a proper one to pass—not putting it any stronger than that, not contending that the amendment which I have been seeking to bring into force is a bad one or one that should not be passed, and paying that compliment to those hon. gentlemen who have spoken in favour of the Bill, and who are not prepared to say that it is not a good measure, but at the same time there may be reasons which may come out in the Railway Committee. I have asked hon. gentlemen in this House to tell me whether the Railway Committee of this House is the body that is entrusted with the enactment of public laws or whether the whole House is the body that is so trusted by the people. I would ask hon. gentlemen like the hon. member from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), who says that he does not want to be placed in the position of voting against this Bill or voting for it in the House, to ask himself whether he did not put himself in that position when he accepted the nomination and was elected to serve the people in parliament.

Mr. INGRAM. May I be permitted to answer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) ? If this Bill is referred to the Railway Committee, the Railway Committee deals with it, and if this House is dissatisfied with the report of the Railway Committee, this House has the power to change it.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then, I say, still speaking of the hon. member for East Elgin, that he is deputing to the Railway Committee the duty which was placed upon him and not upon the Railway Committee when he accepted a position of trust as a member of parliament. The members of the Railway Committee do not constitute all the members of the House of Commons. It is the duty of every member of the House of Commons to pass upon the general laws of the country and if they are going to pass upon the general laws they cannot properly pass upon them unless they have an opportunity of discussing them. Why should we exclude any member of the House of Commons from the discussion of a Bill relating to the general public laws of the Dominion ? The position that these hon. gentlemen place themselves in seems to me to be nothing else than that they are willing to have a committee of perhaps half the House of Commons—not exactly but perhaps not more than half—to pass upon a general matter that is to be discussed, upon all the details and then the members of the House of Commons who are not members of the Railway Committee are to come in upon the third reading of the Bill and ask themselves whether the judgment of the Railway Committee was right or wrong. How can they reasonably do so if they are not members of the Railway Committee ? Therefore, the members of the whole House of Commons must pass upon the Bill themselves and judge whether it is a right and proper law to pass. In regard to what was also said about the kind of cattle-guards, I have found out—perhaps every hon. member of the House has not—but they can easily find out that the people's railway, the railway the people undertake to operate, provides proper cattle-guards.

When we find on the Peoples' Railway, the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway—that proper cattle-guards are constructed, the other railway companies have a very poor case when they come to parliament to ask for any less liability to be placed upon them. During my trip through the maritime provinces last summer—which I do not pretend to say I took solely for the purpose of investigating cattle-guards—I did not forget my duties to my constituency nor to the whole of Canada, so far as I have a duty to the whole of Canada, and I made particular inquiries as to the kind of cattle-guards on the Peoples' Railway and as to the effect of them. I was told by the trainmen on the Intercolonial Railway that they did not know of a case where a cow had been on that railway between the highway crossings. That I think disposes of the matter pretty effectively. These crossings where the highway and the railway intersect will have more or less cattle collected about them ; but the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has forgotten that the amendment I am seeking to incorporate in the law will prevent these cattle from being killed anywhere else but on the highway crossings, and will not permit of them getting anywhere else than on the part of the line which is both a railway and a highway. I shall not detain the House longer, but I do say to the minister (Hon. Mr. Sutherland)

that I regret exceedingly that I am not able to agree to refer this matter again to the Railway Committee. We had our experience last year of the Railway Committee, and at last we could only get together twelve members to consider this Bill. Reference has been made to-day by some members to this Bill getting a full discussion last year. Why, the committee was only half an hour in session, and the reason was that the House and other committees were meeting at the same time and the members had to attend to other duties. No special committee that this House can appoint, nor could the Railway Committee itself give one-quarter the attention to this Bill that the House has given to it to-day. We have to-day discussed it pro and con, and having considered what is right and what is wrong, we will not be able to accomplish anything more in the interests of justice than we are able to accomplish at this very time and in this House. Having a sincere desire to do nothing but what is just; having no idea of trying to prevent railways from getting justice, but having a strong idea that the farmers should be protected against injustice, I feel it my duty, with all respect to the minister (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), to ask the House to vote down the suggestion that it should go to a committee and to say that the Bill shall be disposed of in the House. I really believe that if the Bill is referred to a committee it will never again come back to the House this session, and we shall have to begin all over again next session.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, The question now before us is not so complicated as has been contended by many of the hon. gentlemen who have taken part in the debate. What we have to decide is, whether we are going, by an amendment to allow the courts to alter their decisions. We are asked to give by an amendment to the law, our sanction to a provision which is already on our statute book. Under these statutes railway companies have to erect cattle guards at railway crossings; but through an amendment introduced in 1890, the law was changed and railway companies are no longer responsible before the courts when cattle are permitted to be at large upon any highway.

The question before us, is whether we are going to amend the law, and whether we are to allow the courts to condemn railway companies which do not comply with the law. That is the whole question in a nutshell. The question is not whether cattle guards are to be built in such or such a way; but whether a company which does not construct any such cattle guards or does build them in a defective way—which comes to the same thing—will be held liable for damages. Is it a question which requires to be submitted to the consideration of the railway committee? By no means. It is a most simple question. I would have voted this year for the motion of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Sutherland) as I did last year, had I not been since educated upon all the quibbles and technicalities of parliamentary procedure. Last year this question was referred to a railway committee and no more was heard about it. I wish to wash my hands of the whole affair, and I decline to assume any responsibility in connection with any change that the Act may have to undergo this year.

House divided on the motion (Hon. Mr. Sutherland):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Angers,	Lavergne,
Baker,	LeBlanc,
Beith,	Lemieux,
Béland,	Lewis,
Brock,	Logan,
Brunet,	Macdonald,
Calvert,	Mackie,
Carbonneau,	McCarthy,
Champagne,	McColl,
Christie,	McCool,
Copp,	McCreary,
Costigan,	McEwen,
Cowan,	McGugan,
Delisle,	McIsaac,
Demers (Lévis),	McLennan,
Dugas,	Madore,
Dyment,	Malouin,
Earle,	Marcil (Bagot),
Erb,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Fielding,	Matheson,
Fitzpatrick,	Maxwell,
Flint,	Morrison,
Fortier,	Mulock,
Fraser,	Oliver,
Galliher,	Osler,
Gauvreau,	Paterson,
Geoffrion,	Proulx,
German,	Reid (Restigouche),
Gibson,	Riley,
Gilmour,	Rosamond,
Girard,	Ross (Ontario),
Gould	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Guthrie,	Rousseau,
Haggart,	Russell,
Harwood,	Schell,
Heyd,	Sutherland (Essex),
Holmes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Horsey,	Talbot,
Hughes(King's,P.E.I.),	Tarte,
Hyman,	Thompson,
Ingram,	Tisdale,
Johnston (Lambton),	Tolmie,
Kendall,	Wade,
Lang,	Wilmot,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wright.—90.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lennox,
Avery,	Léonard,
Bell,	McCormick,
Blain,	McGowan,
Borden (Halifax),	McIntosh,
Boyd,	McLeod,
Broder,	Monk,
Bruce,	Morin,

Calvin,	Porter,
Carscallen,	Puttee,
Clancy,	Richardson,
Clare,	Robinson (Elgin),
Cochrane,	Roche (Marquette),
Culbert,	Ross (Rimouski),
Demers (St. John),	Sherritt,
Ganong,	Simmons,
Hackett,	Smith (Wentworth),
Halliday,	Sproule,
Henderson,	Stephens,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Taylor,
Kendrey,	Tolton,
Kidd,	Turgeon,
Lancaster,	Vrooman,
Lavell,	Ward,
Legris,	Wilson.—50.

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE COMMISSION.

Mr. J. E. LEONARD (Laval). (Translation) moves for an Order of the House for a statement showing in detail :—

1. The total amount of revenue received by the Montreal Turnpike Commissioners during the year 1901.
2. The total amount of the expenditure of said Commissioners during the same year.
3. The amount spent by said Commissioners for the maintenance of the toll-gates during the same year.
4. The amount paid to each Commissioner, under any heading whatsoever, during the same year.
5. The amount of each contract and the name of each contractor during the same year.
6. If each one of the said contracts was awarded by public tender, and in what newspapers and in what manner was such publicity secured.
7. The exact amount, in capital as well as in interest, actually due, on debentures, to the government, as well as the amounts paid out by the said Commissioners of 1896.
8. A detailed statement of the assets of said Commission.

My first object, Mr. Speaker, in asking for a return of the detailed accounts of the Montreal Turnpike Trust is to call the attention of the government to the very bad state of the roads under the control of that commission. Within the last few years, that is to say since the coming into power of the Liberal party, the majority of the members of this commission have been appointed by the government. The commissioners did not hesitate for a moment to raise the tolls which farmers residing in the vicinity of Montreal have to pay. Those farmers have to go to the market twice a week. On account of the little space afforded them on the Bonsecours market, they are obliged, in order to get a good place to pay under the new tariff a toll of ten cents in the evening and ten cents when they come back next day. When the Turnpike Trust thus raised the tolls, we hoped that they would at least take the means to improve the roads in the vicinity of the commercial metropolis of Canada, Montreal. On the contrary, the Turnpike Trust did nothing of the kind, as is well known by all those who live in the vicinity of Montreal and use these roads. I, for one, know something about it, as every day in the year, I have occasion to judge how these roads are kept, and I am able to state that they are in a state that defies description, so much so that newspapers took the matter in hand. For instance 'La Presse' on the 22nd February instant, published the following lines :

> The toll roads on the island of Montreal are under the control of three companies : The Turnpike Commission, the St. Michel Roads Company, and the Dorval Roads Company.
>
> The roads of the two last named companies are in a fairly good state ; those of the Turnpike Trust, in which the people of Montreal are more directly interested, are in a deplorable state, summer and winter.
>
> At present these roads are impassable, they are dangerous ; accidents are numerous, and a cabman is never sure to get out of these roads safely and with his rig intact. Those of our readers who have not seen these roads will be able to form an estimate of them by the cut we publish on page 13 of our paper.

'La Presse' had in fact, a very comical picture of those roads.

> And yet, the tolls are high enough to ensure the maintenance of these roads, and the authorities should force the Turnpike Trust to fulfil their obligations towards the people.
>
> Its members are appointed by the government, and the public hold the government responsible for all the vexations and losses caused by the fact that these roads are the worst of all the district.

The above is from 'La Presse,' and every one knows that this paper has no desire to create trouble for the Liberal government.

On the other hand 'La Patrie' published last Monday an article showing that these roads are impassable. Here is the article of 'La Patrie.'

> We draw the attention of Mr. Galibert to the bad state of the road, particularly between Montreal and La Longue Pointe.
>
> The Turnpike Trust must not only collect tolls ; they are obliged also to keep in good condition the roads under their control. They have an inspector who must have forgotten to make his tour of inspection, and it is high time his attention were called to the complaints that are heard from the public. Now, the road between Montreal and La Longue Pointe is only a single track road and it is in an awful state. The public have a right, however, to insist upon a double track road and one that is properly maintained. We are sure Mr. Galibert will give stringent orders to the inspector of the Turnpike Trust.

As I said a little while ago, the government who appoints the members of that commision and to whom there is due a very high amount on which no interest has been paid for many many years back, the government, I say, has a right to inquire thorough-

ly into the management of the affairs of the Turnpike Trust. Not only the government, but the public, who are paying the piper, have the right to know what is going on in this trust. Let me tell you that presently no one has the right or if that right exists, we are prevented from exercising it, and no one, as I have said, is allowed to see what is going on.

My object, in moving for the return, is to give publicity to the affairs of that trust, to call the attention of the government to their management, and after that to ask the ministers if they could not see their way clear to lighten the heavy burden under which the farming community is being crushed. The farmers in the counties of Terrebonne, L'Assomption, Two Mountains, Jacques Cartier and Laval, which latter county I have the honour to represent in this House, are obliged to pass twice a week through these toll-gates, where they have to pay a very high toll and also upon the bridges in the vicinity of Montreal. If a farmer crosses the toll-gate at half-past eleven at night he has to pay ten cents and he comes back after midnight, say forty minutes later, he is obliged to pay another ten cents. I was told by a farmer that he had paid $75 in tolls upon the bridges, and passing through the toll-gates.

The farmers in the vicinity of Montreal sell all their products on the markets of that city. They are not exporters and they also have the right—whether they sent here Conservative members or Liberal members—to ask the government to look into the management of the affairs of that trust composed of parties appointed by the Dominion and Provincial governments.

In concluding these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this government at the hands of whom the farmers of Canada have already received so much protection, will not be less generous to those residing around Montreal in the counties of Jacques Cartier, Laval, L'Assomption and Terrebonne, and that they will come to their assistance.

I move this motion, seconded by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Are we going to get no statement from the government in regard to this matter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I thought my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) was going to address the House or otherwise I would have risen to say that so far as the motion is concerned there can be no objection to it. Any papers in the hands of the government or which can be reasonably obtained will be brought down. I think there is some misapprehension as to the position of the government in this matter. It will be readily understood that under ordinary circumstances it is not the business of the Dominion government to maintain roads in any part of the country. That is a municipal or provincial matter as the case may be. The only interest the government of Canada has in this is as the holders of certain bonds. If my hon. friend (Mr. Leonard) is under the impression that the government is getting revenue from these bonds and thus oppressing the people, I am able to assure him that he is mistaken. We hold these bonds in consequence of transactions of older times. Under an arrangement made some years ago, this debt was reduced and a basis of adjustment was reached which the government of the day were led to believe would enable the Turnpike trust to pay interest on the reduced sum. For a year or so some interest was paid but later on no interest was paid. Whether or not this is the fault of the commissioners is a proper subject for inquiry, and if any representations on that question are made it will be our duty to look into the matter very carefully. All I can at present say is, that the government are receiving no revenue. We have a large amount of Dominion money invested, and though a reduction was made some years ago in the hope of receiving some satisfactory settlement, we are not now receiving any interest. If that arises from the fault of the commissioners of course it is a matter for which the government should be called to account, but if it arises because the traffic is not large enough to maintain the road and pay the interest, I suppose it is like a good many bad debts and we shall have to make the best of it under the circumstances.

Mr. MONK. It is very easy to see that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) took no very active interest in the recent by-election which was held in the county so ably represented by my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Leonard). But it is a little discouraging to us to see that the right hon. leader of the House, who came into the county, who knows what a deep interest we have in this question, who I think referred to it on nomination day—does not, now that the election is over, see fit to give us some assurance as to the things which his friends throughout the county during the election, pledged the government to accomplish. They were very sanguine during the election and they strongly urged the electors to vote for the opponent of my hon. friend (Mr. Leonard) because he was the only one that could get from the government the action which was necessary to relieve the people of Laval and the adjoining counties. But the day of the election is over. We have the spectacle of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, not uttering a single word on this, to us, most important question, and we have the Minister of Finance informing us that the government derives no revenue from these bonds. I can tell my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) not only that the government derives no revenue from these bonds, but that they will never receive a cent of the capital. He ought to be aware of that fact, and not being aware of that fact,

it is the duty of the government to come to the relief of the farmers of the counties mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Leonard) and to do something to put a stop to the abuses which exist there, and which are the fault of these gentlemen opposite to so large an extent. Let me briefly explain to this House——

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, although the question of the Montreal Turnpike Trust was much discussed during the last election, and although the right hon. prime minister referred to it at the meeting on nomination day eight days before the election, yet the government could not give us any satisfactory assurance that some redress would be granted for the grievances which formed the subject of continual debate during the election. Let me acquaint the members of this House as briefly as possible with the nature of those grievances, and the remedy which it is in the power of the Dominion government to provide for them.

The Montreal Turnpike Trust, which controls all the great avenues into the city of Montreal from the surrounding municipalities is an old corporation, an administrative body, organized at the beginning of the last century, and replete with those faults which characterized every administrative body in this country before the great municipal reforms took place which have brought about the changes which you see to-day in every other corporate body. Thus, to give you an example, although it is an administrative body, charged with the administration of the public roads around the city of Montreal, and consequently a body whose work and deliberations interest every citizen of Montreal and every farmer who has access to Montreal from the surrounding parishes, still the law declares that no outsider has a right to attend the deliberations of this body. Our municipal councils are open to the public, and every other public body holds its sessions in public. Here in this parliament modern progress has required that the public shall be admitted to our deliberations. But the Montreal Turnpike Trust is the only exception to that general rule that I know of in this country. In that sense and in every other sense it is a close corporation.

Another short-coming of that corporation, in regard to which the people of Laval and the people of my own constituency complain very bitterly, is that its work is not done in the way in which public works are now done throughout the country, that is, by tender and contract. The Montreal Turnpike Trust has yearly deficits. The roads around the city of Montreal, as is well known to all who have occasion to pass along them, are in a deplorable condition both summer and winter. My hon. friend from Laval has cited some of the utterances of the press of the city of Montreal in regard to those roads, and from year to year, since 1896, for some reason or other, these roads have been kept in worse and worse order every succeeding season, until this winter it has been a subject of comment, not only in the newspapers of Montreal, but in the whole surrounding country, that our winter roads under the administration of this Turnpike Trust are in a disgraceful condition. The work not being done by tender and contract, we do not get the worth of our money. The contracts are given to friends, to men who have agreeable relations with the members of the Trust, very often to incompetent men who sublet the work ; and the result is that for the large amount of money that is expended yearly on these roads we have not an adequate return. In that respect, again, the law requires to be altered, so that the trustees shall be required to solicit public tenders for all works of importance, and to give the contract to the lowest responsible tenderer.

Under the charter which governs that corporation it is impossible for those who are interested in the proper administration of the Trust to see how the money has been expended. Here, in Ottawa, the expenditures of the government are subject to strict scrutiny. We have a yearly audit, and we are fully acquainted with what is done with the money which goes into the public treasury. The same thing obtains in the different provinces, as well as in all the municipalities in our province, and I have no doubt everywhere else. The banks themselves, which in a certain sense are private corporations, give a yearly account of what is done with their funds. But there is no such law applicable to this corporation, and as a consequence one is obliged every year to move, here or in the provincial legislature, in order to obtain some idea of what has been done with the very considerable revenue which this corporation derives from the taxpayers and from those who use the roads. That, again, was a point frequently adverted to in the last election, and candidates on both sides and their friends pledged themselves that they would insist, with this government as well as with the provincial government, that that great defect in the law should be cured, and that we should have yearly returns from this corporation in order that we might know how our funds are administered.

The consequence of the present system is that we have bad roads. This corporation controls all the great avenues into the city of Montreal, and their control goes so far that it prevents the proper development of the great suburban municipalities which surround the city. If any municipality or any private individual opens a road in order to facilitate access to the city for the public,

and that road happens to intersect one of the great avenues which are under the control of this body, what do they do ? They place a toll gate at the intersection, and the man who is merely crossing their road for the purpose of following some new municipal highway or some road which has been opened by a private individual who wishes to sell lots and thus increase the development of the city of Montreal, he has to pay toll to the Montreal Turnpike Trust. The result is that it checks the opening up of new roads which are rendered necessary by the subdivision into lots of farms surrounding the city and the building on those lots, and absolutely paralyses the development of the city of Montreal. If on that point the law were altered, and it were declared that the mere intersecting of one of the turnpike roads by some municipal or private road would not necessitate the payment of tolls, that would be some remedy for what is to-day a crying grievance. The Montreal Turnpike Trust, owing to this frequent intersecting of their roads, have been obliged to add very considerably to the number of their toll bars.

We have arrived at this result, that on a revenue of $60,000 or $65,000 a year from these toll gates, they are obliged to expend at present over $18,000 a year merely for the maintenance of these gates which, in the proper course of things and which with judicious legislation, could no doubt be made to disappear, as they have disappeared in the neighbourhood of every large city upon the continent of America.

The hon. the Minister of Finance has stated that this corporation was the creation of the provincial legislature, and that the government of the Dominion derived no revenue from the $200,000 of bonds which it held in this corporation and were powerless to interfere. Let me point out why it is considered in the counties of Jacques Cartier, Laval and the others surrounding Montreal, that the key of the situation is in the hands of the Dominion government. Under the law, this government, being a creditor of that corporation to the extent of over $200,000, is entitled to representation on the board of directors. There are, if I mistake not, three representatives of this government on that board, and they are the majority. The other two commissioners are appointed by the provincial government.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are seven, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him, and the provincial government has a majority.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is mistaken. There are five trustees in all—two named by the provincial government—which has created this body and to a certain extent controls it, which has the right to legislate with regard to it—and three named by the Dominion government, which is the only creditor of the Montreal Turnpike Trust. The control is therefore in the hands of the Domionion government, and any legislation which the trustees named by the provincial government might wish to obtain in the Quebec legislature may be vetoed by the three trustees who represent the Dominion. And as a matter of fact, a year or two ago, when a member of the provincial legislature sought to obtain by positive enactment a remedy to one of the numerous grievances which we complain of, he failed to succeed because the Dominion government, through the Minister of Finance, interfered to oppose that legislation and obtained its rejection upon the ground that the legislation proposed might have the effect of diminishing the revenues of this Dominion, although I may say the interest on the bonds have not been paid since 1896, We claim therefore that the Dominion government, by its yearly election of these three commissioners, has the control of the Montreal Turnpike Trust and is the power behind the throne which can control legislation and obtain for us the reforms that are absolutely needed.

Let me tell you, Sir, what this question was which was agitated in the Quebec legislature. As my hon. friend from Gaspe (Mr. Lemieux) knows—and I am glad to see he is taking an interest in this question and very sorry to see that the other members from the counties around the city of Montreal, who have an equal interest with myself in this important question, are not here to defend their rights—as my hon. friend from Gaspe knows, we have in the city of Montreal absolutely inadequate accommodation for our public markets. The farmers from the counties of Terrebonne, Two Mountains, Laval and from Chambly, Laprairie and Jacques Cartier are, in consequence of that want of accommodation, obliged to leave their farms generally at eight or ten o'clock in the evening in order to secure some kind of a place upon the Bonsecour Market, the following day. Leaving their homes early in the evening, they pass the toll bars before midnight, and as they cannot return on the same day, midnight intervening, they are obliged to pay toll again on their return the following day. Under the Conservative rule that injustice was recognized, and the keeper of the toll-gate was authorized to issue tickets to the farmers, good for forty-eight hours. But no sooner had the trustees of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance entered upon the board than that permission was revoked, and the member of my own constituency, who represents me in the local legislature, endeavoured to obtain the passage of a law obliging the Montreal Turnpike Trust to give to farmers tickets good for forty-eight hours. Thanks to the interference of the Dominion government that measure was blocked, and our farmers to-day, on account of the failure of the city of Mont-

real to give them adequate accommodation upon the central market, have been since 1896 obliged to pay double toll. It would be very easy to remedy that state of things. It could be done either by the passage of a law or by the Montreal Turnpike commissioners passing an ordinance or a by-law to make the toll five cents going and five cents returning. But this government appears to be so completely oblivious of the interests of the farmers and so forgetful of the pledges made by its partisans during the last election, that nothing whatever is done to remedy this injustice. What we want has been indicated by the hon. member from Laval. And it is in the power of this government very easily to obtain for the people what they want and give them satisfaction. We want public sessions of the Turnpike Commissioners. The body has not a representative character, but it should have that character. The mayors of the parishes in the counties interested ought to have the right, not by claiming permission, but the right by law, to go to the sessions of the Montreal Turnpike Trust, to witness what takes place there and to make necessary suggestions. It is for this government to determine whether it will use its influence in order to obtain them that right. The fact is that the body is not constituted as it should be. A body that is entrusted with the administration of such important interests as the proper keeping of the roads in the vicinity of Montreal, should have a representative character. The men who administer the great avenues approaching the city of Montreal should be elected. That is our contention; and a system could easily be devised, if these hon. gentlemen would only show us a little good will, by which, if not the whole body, at least a part of it, would be elected. The people would then feel that they have on that board somebody chosen by themselves to look after their interests in regard to these roads, which are so very important to them. Farmers generally come in three or four times a week from their homes to the city of Montreal, bringing heavy loads of their produce; and it is positively disgraceful to see the way in which the roads by which they must travel are now kept. Not only should we have representatives of the people in these bodies, but the sessions of the body should be made public. And we should have yearly returns of the financial operations of the Montreal Turnpike Trust, in order that we may see exactly what is done with our money. We should have the power which is demanded by everybody upon the Island of Montreal—the power to intersect these great public highways with our municipal roads, our private roads—all roads opened in order to facilitate the development of that great city without being witnesses of such atrocious abuses as we see at present, the Montreal Turnpike Trust placing a toll-gate at the intersection of these roads and charging every one full toll for simply crossing their road. That is a crying injustice, and it can be removed by legislation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) does not mean that we have the power to legislate on the matter in this parliament ?

Mr. MONK. The Dominion government, in making its yearly election of three trustees, can impose upon these trustees—who control the body—any conditions it chooses. If, when that election takes place, and it takes place every year, the trustees named by my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding), for it is he himself who names them by sending down, I think, the Deputy Minister of Finance, to cast the annual vote, though it is to be cast in favour of these trustees—can give them any instructions necessary. He can instruct them that these reforms must be brought about by legislation. And, Mr. Speaker, we should have the forty-eight-hour ticket restored to us. My hon. friend from Laval knows how that question, small as it may appear to my colleagues here, was discussed during the last election. He pledged himself that, the first time he opened his lips in parliament, it would be to demand from the government the redress of these grievances. He has carried out his pledge; and now it is for members of the government and their friends who gave similar pledges during the election, to show similar sincerity by advocating—and seeing to it that what they advocate is carried out—a complete reform of the system. What is preventing progress is that the Dominion government is a creditor to that trust to the enormous sum of, I think, about $200,000. I have told the House before, and the hon. Minister of Finance admitted it last session, that the existence of that great claim obliged him to oppose the passage of salutary legislation in the provincial legislature. What I suggested last year to the Minister of Finance, and what I suggest again, is this : There is no doubt whatever that not one cent of that indebtedness will ever be discharged. My hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) knows perfectly well that, with the increasing wants of the trustees in order to maintain the roads in good order, with the yearly increase of the charge to maintain toll-gates multiplying them every year, it is impossible to conceive any circumstances under which any part of that capital will be repaid. The House knows that, since 1896, not one cent of the interest has been paid. And the hon. Minister of Finance, if he takes the trouble to inquire, will receive ample assurance that the trust will never be able to pay one single copper of the interest. Under these circumstances, I suggested last year, and I suggest again to the government, that it should intimate to the local legislature, which has the power to legislate, and also to the trustees, the ma-

jority of whom are the nominees of this very government, that, as soon as the grievances of which the counties that I have already named complain, and complain with justice, shall have been removed by legislation, the government will be ready to forego its claim of $200,000—that claim being, as I have said, absolutely irrecoverable. And I venture to say here, without fear of contradiction from anybody who is acquainted with the subject, that on the day that that assurance has been given, and given in such a way as to insure the promise being carried out, the legislature of Quebec will have no more pressing matter before it than the reform of these abuses and the placing of the Montreal Turnpike Trust upon a reasonable basis, so that the rights of those who pay may be respected, as they ought to be. Let the government announce that as its policy. Let the government say to the trust that the remission of the debt is assured, if legislation approved of by this government is passed by the local authorities, and within a year of this date that vexed question—which, so long as it remains a question, will be agitated in every single election in the county—will be satisfactorily settled.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). This debate, so far as it has gone, will serve to illustrate once more the wisdom of the rule which requires that, when a demand is made for papers, the speech in support of the motion ought to be limited to merely describing what is required, and the debate on the main question ought to be deferred until such time as the House is placed in possession of the documents. Now, what are we called upon to deal with here? We are called upon to deal with the affairs of a corporation which is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the local legislature of Quebec. After having listened to my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, you would naturally be under the impression that this is a very substantial grievance that he has made known to the House to-night.

Now listen to the other side of this case. I have to admit that I am going to speak with imperfect information at my disposal, because this is not a matter that one looks after in advance of the production of the documents. My hon. friend says that in the county of Laval, the county of Jacques Cartier, and other counties in the vicinity of Montreal, they have very bad roads, and that because they have very bad roads this government ought to be brought to task for it. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the vicinity of every great city in this country all the rural municipalities should have roads, they are a necessary adjunct of our civilization, you cannot get on without them. But how are these roads created? How are they maintained? These roads are created by the municipalities for the uses of which they are intended, and they are maintained by these municipalities.

What did my hon. friend tell you? He says these roads we now speak of were created by the expenditure of the public money of Canada, of the old provinces of Canada. They never cost the inhabitants one farthing, and still we don't maintain them after having created them. That is their grievance.

Mr. MONK. We pay for their maintenance.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let me describe how they pay for them. These roads cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. At the present time the balance of capital, with the reduction that has been made in connection with the advances made on that portion which belongs to the Dominion of Canada, they still owe us. They cannot pay any interest even, there is $25,000 of accumulated interest on that indebtedness. Now if the ordinary business rule were applied by a government to a corporation indebted in the amount that I have described, they would first take care to see that the interest was paid.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are they doing with the toll money for the roads? Are the roads so bad they are not paying any interest on their bonds?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The toll money does not produce enough to maintain the roads and pay interest on the bonds. But the ordinance under which the money was expended provides that the riparian proprietor, the man whose property fronts on that road, should contribute his share to the construction of that road, and they have never done it.

Mr. MONK. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I do not think he can cite that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have not prepared a special brief for this case to-night, but as my hon. friend has done so, I refer him to the ordinance, I think 4th Victoria, that created the trust, and he will find in that ordinance the ordinary common sense rule that the riparian proprietor, the man whose property fronts on this road, should contribute to its maintenance.

Mr. MONK. That is not what the section says.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Please allow me. I have not prepared a brief, but I have had some experience in legislation in this country.

Mr. MONK. But I think it is only fair that I should deny it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman has a perfect right to make a denial. As I said, I am speaking from recollection, and my hon. friend has a prepared brief, and on a prepared brief he takes the responsibility of making the denial, and he should accept that responsibility.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend will allow me. We have no rights whatever in these roads, the roads themselves belong to the Montreal Turnpike commissioners, and the riparian proprietor is not, under the law as it stands to-day, obliged to do any work on the roads.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He is not obliged to maintain the road at all. But here is what the law of the province of Quebec, says that the riparian proprietor is primarily responsible for the maintenance of the road that passes across his property. That is the general rule, and when this ordinance 4th Victoria was passed it was the rule then, and in order to meet that case and to provide that the riparian proprietor should not be relieved of his common law obligation to maintain his front, it is provided that the commissioners shall have the right to ask from the man whose property fronts on the road to commute his obligation to maintain the road, and to pay a sum equivalent to that obligation to the trustees.

Mr. MONK. That is what I said. That is a very different thing. Has that been done ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That has not been done. My hon. friend had better remember that others have read the statutes besides himself. That is a statement I make, and he agrees with it. That has not been done, and if he wants these roads maintained let the riparian proprietors fulfil their legal obligation and they can easily maintain them.

Mr. MONK. I am glad to get that declaration from the government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend must bear in mind that in this case there are two parties to the dispute, there is the party of the proprietors in this part of the country that do not want to maintain their roads; there is the other side of the case, the ratepayers of the Dominion of Canada. The Dominion of Canada are creditors of these individuals, and we come to them and say : If you cannot pay us the capital at least pay us our interest.

Mr. COCHRANE. But they do not.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Exactly, and my hon. friend not only does not want them to continue paying the interest, but he wants improvements, additional burdens thrown upon us to maintain the roads, and to lose our interest besides. That is what we are asked to do. And not only does he ask us to do that, but he asks us to remit the balance of the capital. Now there is the grievance. It does not appear to me to be a very substantial grievance so far as these farmers are concerned, but it does seem to be a grievance on the part of the Dominion of Canada that they, as creditors of this corporation, should be asked to forego their claim for their capital and to forego their claim for their interest, and in addition to assume the further burden of continuing to maintain the roads at the expense of the people of Canada. That is what we are asked to do.

Now, my hon. friend said a moment ago, imagining probably that he was still continuing the contest in Laval, that under the Conservative administration a rule had been passed under which a man was allowed forty-eight hours to evade the law, he was allowed to go through the toll paying once provided he returned within the forty-eight hours. That may have been a convenient thing for my hon. friend to do, it may have been convenient for them to do, but they did not realize that the Dominion of Canada was paying for this little luxury that was being given to these gentlemen in Laval.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you did get something from them.

Mr. MONK. We got the interest, and we never got anything since. They paid the toll, but we didn't get any money.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend says they got interest at the time. I think if my hon. friend were to do as I asked him to do a minute ago, wait until the papers are brought down before expressing an opinion on this matter and he would find that the interest was not paid in those days, he would find that it was necessary that the capital should remain as it was, and the interest had accumulated to such an extent, and the burden had grown so large, that it was obligatory upon the government to reduce their claim even in those days, cut it practically in two, as the Minister of Finance tells me ; and notwithstanding that the claim has been cut in two, we are still asked to wipe out the balance of it. Now it does seem to me that we cannot very well afford to be so generous at the expense of the people of Canada. Besides, if we are going to do it for these people why not do it for my county ? Why not do it for all the rural municipalities represented here to-night ? Why should there be any distinction between them ? It seems to me that when in other parts of this country the ratepayers maintain their own roads, create and maintain them, these gentlemen should do likewise.

Mr. TAYLOR. You did not give them a chance to take off the tolls.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Take off the tolls and give them the roads. Take off the tolls, and what is going to become of our capital and interest ?

Mr. COCHRANE. What good is it now ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If my hon. friend had ever gone through those municipalities he would have found out what it is good for. If he had ever seen the roads which have been created by which these gentlemen have benefited all these years, he would realize that the ratepayers in those municipalities are as well able and better able to pay than the ratepayers of nine-tenths of the municipalities in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. McCREARY. How did it come about that the Dominion of Canada built roads in that particular portion of Canada ? It cannot be done in any other province.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Under the ordinance 4th Victoria, so far as my memory serves me—that was about 1840—two trusts were created, one in the vicinity of Quebec and the other in the vicinity of Montreal. These two trusts were created for the purpose of building roads in the neighbourhood of these cities. The trusts were unable to get the money necessary by the sale of debentures for the building of these roads. The debentures were offered to the public and the public lost what they put into the roads. The government took the balance. At the time of confederation these debentures that were held by the old province of Canada formed part of the assets of the Dominion and were distributed, one portion to what are now Ontario and Quebec, while another portion was assigned to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And the government guaranteed the interest.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, the government guaranteed the interest and paid interest, but that was not on these debentures. The issue now is as to whether the persons who benefited by the construction of these roads, that is to say, the riparian owners, are under an obligation to pay for the construction of these roads, which they have not done. My statement is that under the statute there is what they call a commutation clause ; that is, that the riparian proprietor commutes his obligation to maintain his front into a money payment and that money payment has not been made.

Mr. MONK. I understand the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) to say that there is an obligation on the part of the riparian proprietor to maintain the road ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is an obligation made expressly by law upon him to pay his commutation money, and he ought to be made to pay it.

Mr. COCHRANE. He had that to pay besides the tolls on the road.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. The thing is very simple; a man, or a farmer, for instance, might not have occasion to cross the toll bar; yet he has the use of the road and does not pay for it. Is that fair play, or justice, or common sense ?

Mr. GILMOUR. Who is at fault for not collecting this commutation money ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I consider the fault is on those who have allowed the commissioners all these years to go on without collecting it.

Mr. GILMOUR. Were they the municipalities, or who were they ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, the commissioners themselves. They ought to be made to pay it.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the government not the commissioners.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, this question of the Turnpike Trust is nothing but an election cry, so much so that when the Tory government was in power the Liberals, in the county of Laval, agitated the question. In 1888, Mr. Justice Fortin, the ex-member of the county of Laval, was a candidate for the local legislature. The main plank of his platform was this very question of the abolition of the Turnpike Trust. In 1890 he was again a candidate in that county. He was then opposed by the Hon. Mr. Leblanc, one of the friends of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), one of the most prominent Conservatives in Quebec, who stood by the Turnpike Trust, and who, speaking in Laval, to my recollection, said that the Federal government would never consent to remit the amount of $200,000 that was due. Now things have changed. We are on this side and my hon. friend is on the other side. He is asking this government to remit to the trust the sum of $195,000, because this is the amount due to the Federal government. I may say at once that the government has already been very generous, because some years ago the debt amounted to $400,000, and the then government remitted $200,000.

Mr. MONK. We will be satisfied if you do the same thing now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was then agreed that this amount was remitted in order to give the Turnpike Trust a chance to at least pay the interest on the balance; that is to say, on the sum of $200,000. They paid the interest for a few months, or a year or so, but later on we learned that the interest had been taken out of the capital. To-day the arrears of interest amount to $28,000. Now, I am very glad that this question has been brought up before the House by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, because, during the last campaign in Laval, where, fortunately for himself, he was successful where he placed a feather in his cap, my learned friend discussed that question on every hustings, but he has not given the government the benefit of his wisdom, he

has not told the government what was the remedy for the situation created by the Turnpike Trust in the surroundings of Montreal. He now prays the government to remit $195,000. But what will happen after that ? There are some other interested parties. The local government of Quebec is also a creditor, and there are some private individuals who are creditors. Shall they remit the amount or shall only the Federal government remit $195,000, and will the Turnpike trust do better than it has done in the past ?

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) allow me to ask him, what the indebtedness of the local government is ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am not positive as to that, but I know the local government is also a creditor, because the local government has had two representatives, or two trustees, on the commission. Suppose the Federal government remits that amount of $195,000, what will happen ? Will the roads be kept in a better state, because, I understand, that this is the main issue this evening ? My learned friend bases his complaint on the deplorable condition of the roads in the surroundings of Montreal. What will happen if the government remits this amount ? Will the other interested parties do likewise and will the roads be repaired and maintained by the municipalities ? Will the municipalities of the county of Jacques Cartier and the county of Laval, represented by my two hon. friends, take upon themselves to maintain these roads ? I would be very glad to have a declaration from my learned friend because if he would return to his electors at the next election with this result, I do not think he would get their votes as he got them last time. If this amount were remitted by the local government and by the other interested parties and by the Federal government, the roads would have to be maintained by the municipalities. Therefore, I contend that this is not the place to discuss this question. It belongs to the local government, or the local legislature of Quebec, and it falls within the purview of the Municipal Code.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I suppose that I live far enough away from the turnpike road to enable me to say that I am not interested in the tolls. What strikes me in this discussion is that the government of the day are acting, not as private individuals would act. There is a debt owed by a certain trust. If the trust is able to pay, it is the duty of the government to enforce it, not to enforce it perhaps with all the severity of the penalties that a private individual would enforce a debt, but if the people are able to pay they should pay. We must not go back to ancient histor and say that because the Conservative government in the past did not collect this money when it might have collected it, this government should not collect it. What has struck me in this discussion is that the question of this turnpike road and the remission or collection of the debt due has been used by the government as a political lever in every election. Surely this is a wrong thing on general principles for a government to enter into. I gather from the discussion that the right hon. Prime Minister of this country was one of those who took part in this election. I gather the question of the remission or collection of this debt was the subject of discussion between the different candidates. The supporters of the government candidate, among them the Prime Minister, let it be understood that if the electors should return their man the government would favourably consider the remission of this tax. That argument was used against the Conservative candidate. Well, fortunately for the county, Mr. Leonard, the Conservative candidate, was elected, and now evidently the government is going to do nothing. The Minister of Finance led the House to believe very squarely that this was one of the bad debts of the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. OSLER. Not directly, but I think you led us to infer it. You said that this would be probably like many others of bad debts and that it might be wiped out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said that under certain conditions it might be a bad debt.

Mr. OSLER. I inferred from what you said that you looked upon this as one of the bad debts of the Dominion and from the discussion which I have heard up to that time, I agreed with you. But it would appear now that probably this debt is collectable, and if it is collectable it is the duty of the government to collect it. If it is not collectable it is the duty of the government to make as fair an arrangement as possible and wipe it off and get rid of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do we always wipe off a debt because we cannot at once collect it ?

Mr. OSLER. You do not, but some gentlemen say that the proprietors can pay it and then the government should force them to pay it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) would not like that.

Mr. OSLER. Do not let us have all this discussion about a debt that is owed by a municipality to this government and do not let us have it as a sore point for years and years, and made a factor in every election that may take place. If it is a bad debt, wipe it off ; if it is a collectable debt, collect it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In reply to some of the remarks made, I refer the

House to 3 Vic., chap. 31, paragraph 15, which provides :

And be it further ordained and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that from and after the passing of this ordinance, each and every person and persons, body or bodies politic or corporate, who may be bound by any law of this province, or any procès verbal duly homologated, (and all such laws and procès verbaux, shall remain in full force, except in so far as they are hereby expressly derogated from) to repair or keep up, or to perform any service or labour, on or with regard to any portion of any road hereby placed under the control of the said trustees, shall and are hereby required to commute all such obligations with the said trustees for such sum of money as may be agreed upon by such parties respectively, and the said trustees, and such commutation money shall be payable annually, on the first day of March in each year.

And they have never paid a farthing.

Motion agreed to.

JUDGMENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL *RE* ROY *VS.* THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). (Translation) moves for :

An address to His Excellency the Governor General for a copy of the report from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, dated December 8, 1901, in the matter of an appeal from the Court of King's Bench for the province of Quebec (appeal side) between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, appellant, and Adrien Roy, respondent.

It is not my intention to go at any great length into a review of the facts relating to the motion I have just put before the House. Let me say, at the very outset, that I am happy to see the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in his seat, at a moment when I wish to call his attention to the disastrous consequences to the province of Quebec resulting from the recent decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England.

The hon. minister will, no doubt, realise the importance attaching to my motion, the more so as, more than any one else, he is able to represent here and voice the feeling of the province of Quebec, in so far as her laws are concerned. It is hardly necessary for me to remark that the hon. gentleman not only occupies a high standing among the members of the Bar of Quebec, but that his high legal reputation is acknowledged even beyond this wide Dominion of ours. As I remarked before, the hon. minister, I am sure, will realize the importance of the issue I am now bringing before the House.

The judgment of the Privy Council just referred to has caused a painful sensation throughout the province of Quebec. Let me briefly sketch out the controversy in question. In 1899, a settler, by the name of Adrien Roy, living in one of the townships to the north of Montreal, being the owner of a small timber limit, was the victim of a fire communicated to his property from the sparks of a locomotive belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Grounding his claim upon the law of our province and the jurisprudence sanctioned by our tribunals, he brought an action against the company, to recover the indemnity to which he was entitled. The case was heard before the Superior Court, presided over by one of our most eminent judges, Mr. Justice Langelier. After protracted pleadings, the company was sentenced, on December 5th, 1899, to pay to the defendant, as compensation, the sum of $300. Powerful as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is, it appealed from that judgment to the Court of King's Bench, presided over by five judges. The pleadings before that court were as protracted and as exhaustive as those that took place before the Superior Court. The Court of Appeal, without a dissentient voice, confirmed the judgment of the lower court.

As I said a little while ago, the amount of the litigation was but three hundred dollars, and under the Quebec Code of Civil Procedure, there could be no appeal to a higher tribunal. Let the House here allow me to call its attention to what in my view, is a most vicious practice, adopted by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Under the provisions of the code of civil procedure, the right of appeal is determined by the amount in litigation, or by contingent future rights. The code provides that there can be no appeal to the Privy Council of England, in cases where the amount at stake is under $2,000. But, in virtue of what may be called an 'appeal of grace,' the Privy Council sometimes allows litigants to be heard, even when the amount in litigation is below that sum. Such was the case in this instance, notwithstanding the formal prohibition enacted by the code. Therefore, the company, after ruining a poor settler, was condemned by our tribunals, but taking advantage of the privilege granted by the Lords of the Privy Council, they lodged a new appeal and succeeded in getting the unfortunate judgment I have just referred to, which reversed the whole jurisprudence sanctioned by a long series of decisions rendered by all the courts of the province of Quebec.

The Privy Council declared that, from the moment that a company was authorized by an Act of Parliament to run a railway, it could not be held liable for damages caused, when acting within the rights conferred by its charter.

The hon. gentleman will perhaps hear with surprise that such a doctrine was propounded by the Privy Council ; but, to clear up all doubts, let me quote from the 'dictum'—for there are no grounds whatever to be found in the judgment—of the Lord Chancellor of the Judicial Committee :—

But the ground upon which the immunity of a railway company for injury caused by the normal use of their line is based is that the legislature, which is supreme, has authorized the particular thing so done in the place and by the means contemplated by the legislature, and that cannot constitute an actionable wrong in England any more than it can constitute a fault by the Quebec code.

And further on :

And the whole case turns not upon what was the common law of either country, but what is the true construction of plain words authorizing the doing of the very thing complained of. The legislature is supreme, and if it has enacted that a thing is lawful, such a thing cannot be a fault or an actionable wrong.

As I said, a railway company, which is empowered under a charter granted by the Dominion Parliament, to operate a railway, cannot be held responsible for damages caused, when acting within the rights conferred by its charter ; because, as they say, the legislature is supreme, which did confer such exorbitant rights.

This doctrine, astounding as it is, may be conformable to English law ; but though it may prevail in the old country, let it be remarked that, after this judgment had been rendered, the London 'Times,' the most important organ of public opinion in the empire, denounced the very next day that doctrine, and suggested that it should be given up, as contrary to equity. Let me further say this, that quite recently, Mr. Jeffries, member for Basingstoke, brought down a Bill for making railway companies liable for fires caused by sparks from their locomotives. The Bill has reached its second reading; the principle of it has been approved of by a large majority of the House of Commons; and if it has not yet reached its third reading, it is owing to the fact that parliament was prorogued. The Bill will come up again at the next session of parliament.

But supposing such doctrine prevailed in England, could the Lords of the Privy Council plead ignorance of the fact that in the province of Quebec, corporate bodies are assimilated by law to individuals. Article 1053 of the Civil Code reads as follows :

Every person capable of discerning right from wrong is responsible for the damage caused by his fault to another, whether by positive act, imprudence, neglect or want of skill.

Article 356 enacts, among other things :

Civil corporations constituting, by the fact of their incorporation, ideal or artificial persons, are as such governed by the laws affecting individuals ; saving the privileges they enjoy and the disabilities they are subjected to.

So positive, so clear a text has never yet given rise to ambiguity before our tribunals. Moreover, our jurisprudence on that point has received the sanction even of the Supreme Court of Canada, the decisions of which, as a rule, are far from evincing any sympathy with our province.

In the case of Gareau *vs.* The Montreal Street Railway Company, Hon. Judge Girouard, of the Supreme Court, has given an opinion which tallies with the opinion of the Court of Appeal.

With your leave, Mr. Speaker, I shall quote from the judgment of the Court of Appeal, passing under silence the views expressed by Sir Alexander Lacoste, and by Judges Bossé and Blanchet, who are of French extraction. But what did Judge Hall say ? I experience all the more pleasure in quoting his opinion, as he is, as shown by his name, of British origin. But it is a well known fact that he is a warm admirer of the French laws of our province. Listen to what the honourable judge says :

The courts of this province have by a long series of decisions maintained the principle of responsibility for damage to a neighbour's property. Independently of the question of fault or negligence in the ordinary use of those words as well in cases of damage from fires set for clearing lands, as by sparks from chimneys of industrial establishments.

The hon. judge then goes on quoting a long list of judgments, and says :

Whatever our personal opinion might have been upon the question we would certainly have felt controlled by the well set jurisprudence of our provincial courts, but we may add that we entirely concur in the wisdom and equity of the rule which our courts have established. It is plain too, that in countries where a contrary rule is in force, many judges protest against its correctness and evade its effects where an opportunity presents. For instance, in Powell vs. Fall, in the Queen's Bench in England, the owner of a traction engine in use upon a highway, under the authority of the English locomotive Act, and constructed in strict compliance with the terms of that Act, were held liable for damage caused by sparks setting fire to an adjacent stack, and Justice Branswell, in delivering the judgment of the court, remarked that the arguments of appellant council had been ingenious, but that he need only say in reply, that they had hardened his conviction that Rex vs. Pease and Vaughan vs. Taff Vale Company were wrongly decided.

Such was, in the eyes of Mr. Justice Hall, the jurisprudence established by our own tribunals and such was also the jurisprudence which even in England will before long prevail. Therefore, corporations, in the matter of liability for damages, are governed by the provisions of the Civil Code, and not as the Lords of the Privy Council unhesitatingly declared, by English common law. Such a construction constitutes, to our mind, a violation of the spirit and letter of our law. A jurisprudence, so well set for many years, they have ignored. No wonder, then, that such a deplorable decision should have come as a shock to us. For, let it be well understood, patient as we have been in the past of encroachments by the Dominion Government, we, from the province of Quebec, strong partisans as we are of provincial autonomy, shall not allow the Imperial authorities to infringe upon our rights, without loudly protesting. Of all things which we hold dear and sacred, and

which we wish to bequeath unimpaired to our posterity, we prize above all our civil laws and the French law, the existence of which was guaranteed to us by the constitution. So, scarcely had the judgment of the Privy Council been published, when it was most severely criticised and commented upon by the most eminent jurisconsults of our province. On January 7th, there appeared in the Montreal 'Gazette,' an article on the question, signed by 'Lex.' If I am rightly informed, 'Lex' is no other personage than an English speaking judge, who is very well known in Montreal. Let me quote from that correspondence a few lines which need no comment :

To us, it appears that our law (as held by our courts) takes the only sensible logical position. Because the legislature grants a liberty to build and run a railway, it does not follow that the latter may set fire to my property and cause me damage without compensation. The law allows the road to run—so I, a proprietor on the line, cannot stop the running ; cannot obtain an injunction, although I may have well grounded fears of danger from fire. On the other hand the company can protect itself by adopting all the appliances which ingenuity can supply ; and by insuring against any loss which may occur.

'I say that our law so holds, rather it did so hold before the decision of the Privy Council above adverted to. In consequence of this decision, we shall now require the same legislation as they are asking for in England. They to get rid of their law as held by the courts, we, to get back to our law as our courts have held it to be.'

Another correspondent, who is one of the most eminent English speaking members of the Montreal Bar, writes as follows, to the 'Gazette,' in its issue of January 6th :

The judgment in Roy's case just rendered by the Privy Council strikes at the security, not only of every man's property, in this province within reach of fire from railway, but of every man's property that may be injured or burned by the operations of bodies carrying on any business authorized by their charters.

If railway companies, as their lordships hold, may with immunity burn people's properties along their lines, if they only use the latest fire screens, all other corporate bodies doing what they are authorized by their charters to do, are equally exempt from liability for their acts in destroying neighbouring properties.

It would be surprising if an effort is not made without delay, to place our law beyond question on this important subject, by legislation conformable to what our laws has always been as administered by our courts, and which every one feels is displaced by the Roy judgment in favour of a technical and inequitable rule of English law.'

If that judgment was severely commented upon by our English-speaking fellow-countrymen, I hesitate not to say that, among the French-speaking element, public opinion was thoroughly aroused. Hear what the 'Presse' has to say in an article which clearly betrays its trade-mark :

We have, so far, refrained from making any comment upon the judgment of the Privy Council *re* Roy *vs.* the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, before having before us the text itself, but now that our doubts are cleared up, it is our duty to speak our mind, and to tell the public the unvarnished truth. We had until now, deluded ourselves into the belief that the craze for imperialism would at least show due respect to that last bulwark of political justice and equity, our courts of justice ; but we were mistaken.

That the Privy Council Lords have undertaken to make jurisprudence uniform as to a point wherein colonial jurisprudence is at variance with English law, cannot be questioned. The noble Lords who have rendered this decision can hardly realise to what an extent they have injured their cause. They have just created a prejudice against an institution the real tendencies of which none ever dreamed to suspect, that it will take years and years to eradicate from the public mind. We had, so far, cheerfully accepted the decisions of the Privy Council, from a conviction that those judgments were rendered for Canada only and from the standpoint of our legislation ; but, now that the Privy Council seems to be prompted by a different feeling ; now that their judgments are framed in the light of a different legislation, it is quite another matter ; and an agitation is being, at this very moment, started into life, with a view to bringing about a change in the old procedure and for restricting those appeals, and, if need be, doing away with them altogether. Our legislatures have before them a heavy task.

I have said enough, Mr. Speaker, to show that this judgment of the Privy Council clearly inflicts a crying wrong upon the citizens of the province of Quebec who live under the authority of the Civil Code. That decision is a direct violation of our law, which nothing can atone for.

I make this motion in the hope that the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will see to it that the laws of this country are judiciously enforced.

The hon. Minister of Justice, now that he knows this decision, has a noble task before him. Let him amend, if need be, the Railway Act, and in drafting its clauses, let him use so clear a phraseology, that in the future, the Lords of the Privy Council may not be tempted into forgetting in this matter of responsibility and liability for damages, in fact that those great corporations are subject to the civil laws of the province of Quebec.

We are happy to belong to the empire ; but any imperialistic scheme tending to interfere with our rights and customs will find in us most irreconcilable opponents.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The report to which my hon. friend draws our attention is not one which is under the control of this House. It is a judgment rendered in a case between two private parties by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and is of course absolutely beyond our jurisdiction. No doubt my hon. friend knew this and made his motion simply for the purpose of criticising this judgment, and I am not here under any obligation to justify it at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have no right to do it. I think it would be extremely unseemly on my part to justify or approve of a judgment rendered by their lordships of the Judicial Committee. However, I must say that, in all fairness, we should present that judgment as it really was rendered. It is possible so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, that previous to this judgment our impression was that our law differed somewhat from what their lordships have found it to be. What did their lordships decide ? They decided that the law in the province of Quebec, as we have it in our Civil Code, had been wrongly interpreted up to that time by our courts. Their lordships' finding may be good or bad, but they are the highest court in the land and we have to take the law as they construe it. The Courts of Appeal are for the purpose, of interpreting the law, and this, the highest court of appeal, has contrued the law to be as I have said, namely, that in the province of Quebec the law applicable to cases, such as the one in question, is the same as it is in England and in the English provinces. What was the case ? It was one between an individual and a corporation, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, created by the federal parliament, authorized by the federal parliament to carry on its operations throughout the whole of Canada, and running its railway through a portion of the province of Quebec. Under the sanction of the Dominion parliament this corporation operates that railway and in all respects conforms to the requirements of the statute which brought it into existence. Having in all respects complied with the law, an accident happened and fire was communicated from the railway to a barn in its vicinity. The Privy Council held that there was no fault on the part of the company because it had complied with all the requirements of its charter. It was generally understood that that was the law of the whole Dominion except with respect to the province of Quebec, as it is the undoubted law in England ; but their lordships decided that that is also the civil law under the Quebec Civil Code just as it is the law in the other parts of the country. They do not say : We are going to apply to the province of Quebec a law that is in violation of the Quebec Civil Code. On the contrary they say : We construe the law laid down in the Quebec Civil Code to be the same as rules elsewhere. Their lordships may have misconstrued our code, but they have not sought in any way to interfere with our privileges. Without attempting in any way to justify their lordships' judgment, let me put this case to the House. If this is not the law, if this corporation, acting within the rights conferred upon it by its character, is to be liable for tort in the province of Quebec, according to the local law of that province, what becomes of the supremacy of this parliament ? It is a necessary incident of the supremacy of this parliament that it should have the right to confer upon the corporation it creates the right to operate throughout the whole Dominion, and that that right should not be made subject to the action of any local legislature. Otherwise this parliament ceases to be supreme. That seems to me self evident. There is the case and there is nothing more in it, and it seems to me, when we come to consider it, a great tempest in a teapot. I know that in our province we have special privileges. We have an old axiom : Chaque plaideur a quarante-huit heures pour maudire son juge. Every man who goes before the courts and loses has forty eight hours within which to curse his judge. That is our privilege and we use it, but we ought not to extend that privilege beyond the traditional forty-eight hours.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to government steamers, $200,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice there is an increase here of $40,000. How is that accounted for ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). There is an apparent increase of $40,000. But I find that last year there was a supplementary estimate of $36,000, and the total expenditure on this service was $202,289. Increased expenditure was caused by the winter mail service to Prince Edward Island, two steamers, the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto' being engaged in this service. The effect of the present vote is merely to put into the main estimates a total which was divided last year between the main estimates and the supplementary estimates. I may say also that looking over this matter with the officials of the department I find that, since the two boats were in use for the winter service to Prince Edward Island, this is the least amount for which this service of maintenance and repairs of government steamers can possibly be carried on.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that this ought to contain all that was in the main estimates and in the supplementary estimates last year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I agree with my hon. friend. I brought the matter to the attention of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. What repairs are contemplated, and on what vessels ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The repairs, of course, are an uncertain quantity, the only certain thing being that some repairs will be necessary every season. The principal expense, of course,

is in the maintenance. There are eight of these Dominion steamers, the 'Minto' and the 'Stanley' are engaged in the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The 'Lansdowne' has been used on the New Brunswick coast and the Bay of Fundy. The 'Aberdeen' is in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The 'Quadra' is in British Columbia, and the 'Brant,' a small steamer, is in the Prince Edward Island agency. The two boats chartered in place of the 'Druid' and 'Newfield,' are, one in the Quebec agency and one in Nova Scotia. These are to be replaced next season with two new boats purchased in the old country.

Mr. SPROULE. What has become of the 'Druid'?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She was condemned and I think sold for $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there not a boat chartered to take the place of the 'Newfield' last season?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. The other evening, when the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture were under discussion, the question came up as to whether the supplementary estimates of last year were included in the column of figures showing the estimates of last year for comparison with the present, and we were told they were so included. Now, in this item, we have an increase of $40,000, and the minister tells us that the estimates given for last year do not include the supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are always the later supplementaries in the following session, which are not included. Except for that the hon. gentleman is correct.

Mr. OSLER. But it is absolutely misleading if we have one minister saying that this includes supplementary estimates and the other saying that in the case of so large an item of $40,000, the supplementary estimates is not included. We want to know whether the figures we have of 1901-2 are correct figures as compared with the estimates of 1902-3, or whether they are incorrect, whether these are correct or whether there are some supplementaries that we do not know about?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The items at the left hand of the vote we have under consideration ought to represent the main estimates for the current year, and also the supplementary estimates, and if they do not in this case it is an error, and I must look into it. But that is what it is intended they should represent. Why they have not done so in this case, I cannot explain, but I will look into it.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford).

Mr. OSLER. Then do I understand that these estimates of 1901-2 may in every case not include the supplementary estimates?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They ought to include what I may call the main estimates and the first supplementary estimates for that year, all the votes of last session. My hon. friend knows that there is always a final winding up estimate brought down in the following session. It cannot include that, but it should include the others.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the minister tell us now how he purchases these supplies? Is it by tender, or just giving an order to merchants in the different ports?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My information is that prices are asked for by tender for the staple supplies from different parties, and when the prices are ascertained then the goods are ordered. Circulars are sent out to different houses, and prices are asked for in that way for all the staples used on the boats.

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend will turn up the Auditor General's Report, page 15, he will find the commencement of expenditures for Dominion steamers. The first item I draw to his attention is supplies for steamer 'Lansdowne,' 68 pounds of butter at 35 cents a pound, bought from one of the friends of the government. They purchased $408 worth of supplies, and that is a fair sample of the charges made. It must have been gilt-edged butter. So it is all through, there is no purchase of supplies by tender. This government, which purchases so vast an amount of supplies, ought to have a warehouse of their own, and draw from that warehouse all they require for the different departments, and buy the goods at wholesale prices. Last night I drew the attention of the House to the Department of the Minister of Agriculture, where we found 168 pounds of putty charged at 8 cents a pound. Turn to the Kingston Penitentiary accounts where everything is bought by tender, and you find putty is bought at $2.25 per 100 pounds. Here you are paying nearly 400 per cent more to one of the government's friends. The late minister, Sir Louis Davies, promised that he would have this matter investigated and have a new state of affairs brought about. But we find the same system continuing, the same men, the same prices charged for supplies all the way through on these steamers. If my hon. friend will turn to the last estimate brought in by the late government in 1895-6, he will find this service was then performed just as effectively as it is now for $166,000, as compared with $243,000 now, an increase of nearly $90,000 in this one item. That shows how the expenditure is creeping up from $37,000,000 to about $57,000,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In reply to my hon. friend I may say that the cost of this service is comparatively about the same as under the previous government. Two boats have been added since the figures that I have spoken of, and no change has been adopted in the system by the present government. Nor am I prepared to admit that one can buy any cheaper, or as cheap probably, in spending a lot of money in advertising for articles wanted on these boats as by asking prices from various well known houses in the different cities where the goods are wanted. I would remind my hon. friend, however, that in making a comparison there are two boats more, last season we had two boats on the route between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I want also to mention to the committee that during the short time at my disposal I find in looking into this matter that the cost of maintenance on these boats has averaged 22 cents per day per man. I hardly think my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) will say that 22 cents per day is an extravagant price for maintenance of officers as well as men employed on the boats. However, in view of the criticisms, I will be pleased, in asking for supplies for the coming year, to look into the matter and see whether or not any saving can be made under the system adopted.

Mr. BROCK. May I ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries a question? In looking at the item in the Auditor General's Report, I see that the vote last year was $196,000, and the expenditure $195,000. That is for Dominion steamers. I am not familiar yet with the way in which accounts are kept, but I suppose these Dominion steamers earn a certain amount of revenue. Where do we find the revenue earned, or is this expenditure over and above any receipts they have in the way of revenue?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The revenue for the year 1900-1901 was $19,421.68. If my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) will turn to page 4 of the Marine and Fisheries Report, he will find the full account of the revenue.

Mr. BROCK. If you earned $19,421.68 you expended $196,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, that is no comparison at all. There is only one of these boats in the service that has any revenue at all, and I was very much pleased, in looking into the returns, to see that the revenue was as large as it is on the 'Minto,' which has been engaged in the trade between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, It shows that there is a very good production of commodities on the island and that there is a considerable passenger service. The other boats have no revenue. They are used altogether for maintaining lights and buoys and other aids to navigation. I do not know that this is the place to discuss the question, but after looking into the matter, I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that, considering the importance of the transportation question and the lessening of insurance rates, which makes freight charges so high on the St. Lawrence route, it is desirable that more attention should be paid to the subject and that it will be of great advantage to the country that we should improve the aids to navigation, even if it should cost the country a small amount more. My hon. friend will see that the revenue from one boat plying between Prince Edward Island and the mainland was fairly satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Mr. Chairman, there is one service for which these steamers are employed which has been overlooked altogether, and that is the prevention of American fishermen from coming within the limits of Dominion waters. These steamers are used around the coast of Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton and Nova Scotia in the spring and fall of the year to prevent American seiners from coming within the three-mile limit. This is one of the most important services that these steamers perform. They have also been used during the last season for repairing and laying down telegraph cables where they were out of order and where new ones were extended, so that to my own knowledge these steamers are kept pretty busy from the opening to the closing of navigation.

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in connection with this question, that I think the amount asked for is not excessive. I am pretty well assured that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will economize in every way to save the people's money. I know that two of these steamers are plying at present between Prince Edward Island and the mainland for the purpose of keeping up communication, for the conveyance of mails, passengers and freight, in accordance with the terms of confederation entered into when Prince Edward Island became a part of the Dominion of Canada. Now, speaking of this increase, we know, as the hon. gentleman has said, that since 1896 the 'Minto' was constructed in England, brought out here and placed on the service. That boat cost a large amount of money. We have in addition to her the 'Brant,' another boat which is engaged supplying the lighthouses around Prince Edward Island and looking after the lobster fishery. These boats are expensive to maintain each year and we must have an increase in the expenditure. The government surely will not be bound down to a small sum of money, some $40,000 or $50,000 a year, if the service in the maritime provinces is to be fully kept up and maintained. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has gone into par-

ticulars in regard to supplies. I have been very exact in that respect and I have taken the precaution to look through the Auditor General's Report. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that supplies purchased for these steamers, in so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, are procured at as low a rate as you could buy the goods in any part of Canada. Whether you get them by tender, or whether you buy them through the captain, or through the agent, you get these supplies, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, as low as you can obtain similar goods for in any part of this country. I am pleased that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has placed the steamer 'Stanley' on the western route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. That boat is doing good service and this is a very important matter to the people of Prince Edward Island. The mail service has been fairly satisfactory this year, so far as I know, and I think there is no doubt that this service if properly managed will be successful. The hon. gentleman has been kind enough, when we represented the matter to him a few days ago, to send down the nautical adviser of the department, Capt. McElhinney to Cape Tormentine and Summerside for the purpose of seeing that the work was being properly carried out. While we have had Ministers of Marine and Fisheries from the island, while we have had the late Hon. J. C. Pope, who has gone to his reward, and while we have had Sir. Louis Davies, who has been promoted to the Supreme Court bench, I have not in my experience of twenty-five years found a gentleman more willing to carry out the requests of the people of Prince Edward Island than the hon. minister who is now in charge of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. As a general principle we have not been contending that the vote in the main is too large. That has not been our contention, but we have been asking for information to ascertain how this money has been spent. There are two ways of spending money and it is a well known fact that one way is usually considered preferable to the other in the event of requiring to spend a large amount of money; one is by purchasing by public tender and the other is by purchasing by private price lists. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hackett) felt sure that the goods which were bought were bought as cheaply in Prince Edward Island as in any part of Canada. I will not dispute that, because it seems to me on looking over the purchases that there have not been in the main unreasonable prices paid. But, I will give one instance. I will take the village of Westport, not far from Ottawa, where butter was purchased at 35 cents a pound. At what time in the present season has butter been sold, even gilt edged butter, in the city of Montreal for 35 cents a pound ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will find that Westport is a small port down near Yarmouth.

Mr. MATHESON. I may tell the hon. gentleman that there was any amount of butter sold in Cape Breton for 35 cents a pound last year.

Mr. SPROULE. If these prices prevail down there, all I can say is, that they are much higher than we get for butter in Montreal or Ontario. I speak from knowledge, because I am connected with a butter factory and I know that it was sold from the factory as low as 17½ cents or 18 cents, and that was gilt edge butter. However I did not rise to refer to that particularly. I wish to speak with regard to the system. We had considerable discussion last year and the minister told us that when there were any reasonable purchases to be made they would be made by tender and advertisement, if there was time to do so. I do not say that the bulk of these could be purchased by tender but undoubtedly a fair portion of them could be, and it is the best way to spend the public money. Some of these prices appear to be reasonable enough but some are certainly not. It may be said that when we come to advertise it causes expense. It does if you want to give patronage to the government papers all over the country. But if you pursue a businesslike course the expense of advertising will be comparatively small, and it is the safest thing to do in the public interest.

Mr. TAYLOR. As my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), is fresh in the department, I do not intend to criticise this system as severely as I would if his predecessor were here. I draw his attention to one item at P—42, Auditor General's Report, where Mr. Pelletier, of Quebec, was paid for supplying ginger beer, and ginger ale, and English soda water, and Appolinaris to quite a considerable extent, to one of the steamers. I do not notice any brandy or other strong drink among the items and therefore I do not severely criticise the vote if the stuff was used for a good purpose.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was a special case during the visit of the Governor General and his suite. I think they were very moderate in keeping to ginger ale and that sort of thing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Where were these two steamers purchased ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We advertised in the newspapers, both in Canada and Great Britain, and gave the contract to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the cost of these steamers and from whom were they purchased ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were purchased from Fleming & Ferguson, of Paisley, Scotland, one for $184,983 and the other is to cost $207,684. The tenders were received through Robert Reford & Co., agents. A large amount was voted last year for these steamers and there will be a supplementary vote asked to pay the balance.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it true that one of these steamers will require extensive repairs to fit it for its work ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Neither of these steamers has been delivered. It is expected they will arrive in Canada during the month of July next. The hon. gentleman is perhaps thinking of a steamer that was bought in Quebec, but she is for a different service.

Mr. SPROULE. From whom was the steamer hired to replace the 'Newfield' ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She was chartered for the season from Geo. E. Boak & Co., Halifax, at $1,500 per month.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that steamer properly equipped for that service ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She has been used on the service just as she was hired. There might be the ordinary repairs but nothing of any consequence.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice from the report that because the steamer was not properly equipped she was unable to do the work intended for her, and some loss was sustained in consequence, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know that there was any loss, but I am told by the officials that they were considerably handicapped by not having a boat well equipped. However it was the best steamer they could get at the time to supply the lighthouses and take care of the buoys.

Examination masters and mates, $5,000.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ascertain from the hon. minister if he has received a petition from the National Association of Marine Engineers asking for certain changes in the Steamboat Inspection Act. I have received some communications from the secretary of that organization, and in one of them he incloses a form of petition which I understand has been forwarded to the minister. I would like to know if the petition has been received, and if the minister has agreed to meet a deputation from that organization who are desirous to state the reasons why they wish certain changes in the law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I met a deputation from the Marine Engineers last night and they presented their petition. I went through the petition clause by clause with them and heard their side of the case as to why they wanted changes in the regulations. Some of them struck me as very reasonable, and with others of their requests I was not very well acquainted and so I made an appointment for the members of the deputation with the inspector at the head of the department, and they had an interview with him this morning. They explained what they had to say with regard to the matter and I made another engagement with the deputation to see them afterwards.

Mr. CLARKE. I am much obliged to the hon. minister for the information he has given me. I would not have troubled him at this particular stage of the estimates, had I not two communications from the association, and I was not aware that a deputation had already visited him. I understand now that he and his officers have been in communication with the deputation and have taken into consideration the representations they made.

Mr. ALCORN. I understand that the examiners of candidates for certificates as masters and mates generally hold other permanent positions in the service at various points throughout Canada, and the applicants pay their own expenses and somewhat high fees. How is it then that this large sum is payable to the examiners ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This vote does not cost the country anything, as the revenue last year was over $4,800. With regard to the other point my hon. friend brought up, if he would name any particular place or person I would be glad to see whether any abuse has taken place. The names of the examiners are : Gilpin, Bloomfield Douglas, D. Hunter, Morgan, at Sydney, N.S.; Murphy, at Yarmouth; Wolfe, at Lunenburg; Seaton, at Quebec; McIlwaine, at St. Catharines ; McCuaig, at Ottawa. Most of these men received a fee of $4 a day while attending the examinations. If the hon. gentleman has any name to give me, I will make inquiry.

Rewards for saving life including life saving stations, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this reduction of $1,000 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In making up the expenditure last year, we found that it was a little under $9,000, and we thought probably $10,000 would do for the coming year.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice an item for life saving in connection with one of the vessels on the upper lakes. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to the parties to whom awards were paid for life-saving ? I put this question because sometimes deserving cases are overlooked.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The following is the list, and it will be found on page 156 of the report :

Names and Designations of Persons.	Nature of Services rendered.	Date of Service rendered.	Description of Reward.
M. G. Nickerson, manager; J. E. Brown, captain; John Ernest, engineer; Joseph Brown, mate; Isaac Banks, cook; Isaac Hunt, deck-hand; S.G. Newell, purser; Everett Cleaveland, fireman; seamen of ss. *Gertrude M.*, of Clark's Harbour, N.S.	Services rendered in saving the lives of certain fishermen caught in the ice off Bon Portage.	Feb. 9, 1901.	To owner, $35; to captain and engineer, $2 each; mate, $2; cook, deck-hand, purser and fireman, $1.75 each.
Captain Albert E. Isserwood, of Port Francis, Ont.	Saving the lives of two men at Rainy River.	Mar. 23, 1900.	A life-saving medal.
Fred. C. Lahey, Robert Murray, William Scott, Edward Lahey, Richard Cline, Alfred Bennet, Robert Nicoll and Ed. Kelly, volunteer crew of the Life-boat at St. John, N.B.	Rescuing the master and crew of the American schooner *Hazel Dell*, wrecked near Government Pier, St. John, N.B.	Dec. 2, 1899.	A gold life-saving medal to each of the men by the President of the United States.
Robert Armstrong, resident of Lower Barney's River, Pictou Co., N.S.	Saving a person from drowning off the seashore at Barney's River, N.S.	Aug. 20, 1900.	A silver watch.
John Lawlor, Outer Basin, Quebec	Saving the fireman of ss. *Manchester City* from drowning, at Outer Basin, Quebec.	June 13, 1900.	A bronze medal.
Walter C. Hare, Henry Howler, Frederick C. Block, and Charles J. Peer, of Port Credit.	Bravery in the rescue of the crew of the schooner *Augusta*, near Port Credit, Ont.	Nov. 25, 1900.	A silver life-saving medal to each man.
John C. Webber, seaman, late of the ss. *Parklands*, of Hartlepool.	Saving the lives of three of the crew of the barque *Adu Barton*, of St. John, N.B.	Feb. 16, 1884.	$14.60 being the equivalent of £3 sterling, the amount of the award.
Capt. D. Doxrud, master; John Daddow, chief officer; E. Peterson, boatswain; H. Loronsen, quartermaster; Rudolph Kittleson, M. O'Keefe, seamen of Belgian steamer *Rhinland*.	Rescuing the crew of the brigantine *Ida Maud*, of Liverpool, N.S.	Oct. 6, 1899.	A binocular glass to master, a gold watch to chief officer, a silver watch to each: boatswain and quarter master, and $10 each to Messrs. Kettleson and O'Keefe.
A. E. Tweddel, P. Lafranc, L. Chouinard, and W. Soucy, of St. Octave de Métis, Quebec.	Rescued wrecked mariners at Pointe aux Senells.	Sept. 12, 1900.	A binocular glass to Mr. Tweddel, $10 to each of the others.

Mr. BLAIN. Were the silver medals presented to the men who saved life at Fort Credit, Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed that they were.

Mr. BLAIN. I have a letter saying they were not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no personal knowledge of the matter, but if the hon. gentleman will give me a memo. I will make inquiries.

Tidal service, including salary of assistant clerk beyond $400, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $7,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is this service carried on ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Principally down in the Gulf and Bay of Fundy. At headquarters here Robert Angus attends to the reports; the observer at St. John, N.B., is D. L. Hutchison; at Father Point, Que., J. McWilliams at Point Lévis, W. McDougall; at Yarmouth, N.S., J. E. Murphy.

Winter mail service, $8,500.

Mr. HACKETT. This refers, I suppose, to the old ice-boat service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I hope we shall not have to use any of this money. Having two steamers, I hope we shall be able to maintain navigation.

Mr. HACKETT. But you hold the ice-boats in reserve ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Marine Biological Station, $2,000.

Mr. HACKETT. How far has this work proceeded ? Where were the gentlemen engaged in this service working last summer ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may give the statement

furnished me by Professor Prince, under whose particular supervision this work is done. The station was towed from St. Andrews, N.B., to Canso, N.S. The research tables were fully occupied by the staff of scientific workers, which included Professor Ramsay Wright, Professor A. P. Knight, Professor A. B. Macallum, Professor Fowler, Dr. Joseph Stafford, Mr. C. McLean Fraser, Mr. George A. Cornish, and Dr. Linville, of New York.

Mr. HACKETT. This is the same staff with which you started ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. HACKETT. A year ago I brought this matter up in the House. Sir Louis Davies, who was then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, said that this biological survey, would come around to the coasts of Prince Edward Island into the Straits of Northumberland, to make researches into fish life in those waters. Now that the station is at Canso, at the point of coming into the vicinity of Prince Edward Island, is it the intention to bring it into the waters around the island next year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The committee is aware that this is a new service. As we receive the reports, we shall be able to judge better of their importance and of the value of the work. But it is the intention, if the survey is continued, to go to these different points. I have no report as to whether it is intended to go to Prince Edward Island this summer or not. But that is one place where scientific work in this line could be done to advantage.

Mr. GANONG. I understand that the report of the work done at St. Andrews is about ready to be issued.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have not received the report in shape to be printed yet.

Ocean and river service—salaries and expenses of cattle inspection, $2,800.

Mr. SPROULE. Would not this more properly come under quarantine ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This relates to the shipment of cattle. The main duties of these officials are to see that when the cattle are shipped, the boat is provided with proper accommodation for the cattle, to see that the ship is properly ventilated, that she is not overloaded, and so on. There are three officers, and their salaries take up this whole vote, except for small incidental expenses.

Lighthouse and coast service—salaries and allowances of lightkeepers, $228,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I see by the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the department has it in contemplation to provide many more lights between Montreal and Quebec and lower down the St. Lawrence. Last year we were told by Sir Louis Davies that about everything was done that could be done. But now considerable extensions are spoken of. Are these new services included in this vote ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, the increase is not included in this vote. Considerable improvement has been made in the lighting of this route, but from what I have been able to learn from those interested in the route, I must say that I am inclined to think that there is a good deal yet to be done. Perhaps the lighting between Montreal and Quebec could be considerably improved. That, perhaps, is not so pressing as improvements further down in the gulf. I had the advantage of listening, a few days ago, to what appeared to me a very intelligent and well informed representative of the British Marine Insurance Company and Lloyds. He impressed upon me the great importance of making some changes at various points. I also had the advantage of a long interview this forenoon, with representatives of the shipping interest, headed by Mr. H. Allan, and including the representative of the Refords, who, I understand, represent several lines. In consultation with the deputy and the engineer of the department, we took this matter up in detail. I am not prepared to make a recommendation at the moment either to my colleagues or to the House. But I am so impressed with the importance of the work and the great advantage it would be to this country if we can satisfy the marine insurance companies, that the matter shall certainly not be lost sight of. Fuller investigation will be made, and I hope to receive reports from those I think we can place confidence in, starting at one end and going over the whole route. I hope to learn what is really necessary to put these aids to navigation in first class state, so that they will be accepted by Lloyds and the best insurance companies. The route, I hope, will be made so free from danger to shipping, that we shall have the same rates of insurance that are now given on the American route. By so doing we will reduce the rate of freight especially on the produce of the country to such an extent that we will reap a reward for any reasonable amount of money that may be so expended. That is a matter that I will endeavour to consider within a week or two and come to some conclusion on it and make a report. If the scheme is agreed to, I will ask the House for the necessary grant of money. I do not find that the amount of money required to make the improvements even that are suggested by the captains of the various steamship lines that are continually using this route, would be so very great. I think that after some decided improvements made to the power of the lights, and perhaps placing sirens

instead of the ordinary fog whistles that we have now, no fault can be found by the insurance companies. But for a reasonable expenditure permanent improvement can be made at one or two points, I have almost come to the conclusion that I will be perfectly safe in making a report, and in asking this House to undertake the work that will be recommended by the officers of the department. I feel that there is a good deal of prejudice, a good deal of misunderstanding, as to what has been done and what is required, and if possible I would be inclined to ask a small vote for the next season, and ask the co-operation of the British Board of Trade, the representatives of the marine insurance companies and the parties most interested, to accompany the officers of the department to take a trip over that route and make a report. I think a report made by men, disinterested in one sense, but whose main interest would be to see that the aids to navigation were perfect, so that the companies could afford to reduce the rate of insurance, would create confidence and give great satisfaction to all parties, and would be of great benefit to Canada.

Mr. OSLER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in expressing himself as he has done, shows that he appreciates the importance of this service. I cannot speak as an expert, but from what I hear I believe that our lighthouse service is absolutely bad, is absolutely faulty ; that it is absolutely insufficient, I know. If you take a map of Lake Superior, of the Georgian Bay and our inland waters that are now becoming as important as the St. Lawrence, and if you look at the lighthouse service we have there, and compare it with the American lighthouse service, and when you consider that we are doing all we can to build up an inland marine, and see what risks our ships run in our channels, you must come to the conclusion that this service has been neglected very much by our government in the past. I think this is one of the most important questions this parliament has to deal with. Our shipping is increasing very rapidly on our northern lakes, and our trade is all being carried now by Canadian boats. I think it is due to the enterprise that is putting on new boats on these waters that the government should give us better lighting service on our coast, equal at least to the lighting that is done on the American coast. I hope the new Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who comes from an inland quarter, and can have no prejudice for the sea, or the lakes, will devote himself particularly to improving this particular branch of the service, which I think is all important if we are to increase our inland navigation as well as the navigation of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. GANONG. I feel myself that transportation is the greatest problem that we have before us, and the greatest factor in that problem is to make it possible for ships safely to carry our products after they have been put on board the vessel. I am not going to advertise any stock company in which I have any interest, but I desire to call the attention of the minister and of the committee to a new means that has been devised for protection of coastal waters. I had an opportunity the other day when in Boston, of examining a recently patented device, and I think that our deputy minister and our chief engineer also had the privilege of looking into this matter to some extent a year ago. However, it has been perfected very much since then. The United States government have felt so interested in it that they have placed at the disposal of the inventor one of their own vessels in order to test the matter in and around Boston harbour. It is not a Bell telephone, but it is a telephone from a bell. The system generally is that of submerging a bell which will be rung automatically. They have already tested this system 12 miles off the coast and succeeded in getting an absolute service from it. I think at the time when the deputy and our engineer were there, some portions did seem to be very cumbersome and difficult to handle, but since then the receiver, which was quite a large piece of machinery, has been reduced in size so that its disc is scarcely larger than an American dollar. It certainly seems to be admirably adapted not only for coastal service but perhaps for the waters of a river. I feel that we should have this matter looked into, as it is likely to be of the greatest possible benefit in warning vessels, either in entering or leaving our harbours. I hope that the minister will find it possible to make a thorough examination of this system which is now being worked out. I may say that on the day I came from Boston the United States navy had representatives there looking into the matter themselves.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Under this item I would like to make a few remarks to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries about the steamer 'Stanley.' I understand the steamer now is some 12 years old, and is engaged in a very important service during the winter, plying between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. I have information that this boat is not in a condition to perform satisfactorily the service, and that many of her plates are in such a condition, bent in contact with the ice, as to render her efforts to a great extent inoperative. I also understand that the steamer now requires new boilers and engines. In order to make a complete success of the winter service between Summerside and Cape Tormentine and also to make the boat suitable for the service of the fisheries during the summer season I would like to call the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that there will require to be extensive repairs made both to the hull and to the engines, and I would like to see, in the sup-

plementary estimates, a sufficient sum to put this boat in condition to secure a proper service during next winter between the island and the mainland.

Mr. CLARKE. I want to emphasize the remarks which have been made by my colleague from Toronto (Mr. Osler) in regard to allegations which are made as to the inadequacy of the lighthouse, range light, and target service on the upper lakes. I was up there during the past autumn and I had conversations with more than one mariner engaged in the service on those upper lakes. I heard a great many complaints made as to the insufficiency of the service on the Georgian Bay and on Lake Superior. I am very glad to hear the statement made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to the steps he purposes taking during the coming recess to improve the navigation of the waters to the east of us. I have been credibly informed that representations have been made to the department from time to time as to the insufficiency of the service on the upper lakes and I hope the hon. minister will take steps during the coming summer to make an investigation into these complaints to ascertain whether they are well founded or not, and to ascertain whether it is a fact that the lighthouses, targets and range lights which were promised years ago have not yet been undertaken or completed. I can say to the hon. gentleman that I have heard comparisons not at all favourable to Canada made respecting the efficient service given on the American coast as compared with what is claimed to be the inadequate service on our own coast. I shall content myself with drawing the attention of the minister to the complaints I have heard made and ask him to give the question of the improvement of lighting on the upper lakes more attention than it has received for some years past.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In reply to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) and his colleague (Mr. Osler) I may say that there was a meeting of the lake carriers some time ago and that they furnished the department with a good deal of information together with their views on what was required in connection with this particular service on the upper lakes. I can say that provision is being made now for the establishment of four or five new lights, and I think that the hydrographic survey that we are going to undertake this summer of Lake Superior will be of very great advantage to those sailing on the upper lakes. One new boat will go up there. The matter which my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) has brought up will receive consideration. I am desirous and hopeful that this service should be a success, but I think he will agree with me that the businesslike and sensible way to deal with this matter is to find out what is best to be done, to prove the practicability of the route and then to make proper provision by furnishing a boat to perform the service. I am sure that the committee will sustain me when I say that the most necessary thing now to be done is to demonstrate the practicability of the route. The matter is somewhat new to me, as I suppose it is to the majority of the hon. members of the House, except in a general way, and I have no desire to ask for a large expenditure of money until we have more information upon the subject. On the contrary I believe true economy is getting good value for the money expended and doing what is necessary. My utmost effort will be, before bringing down a report or asking for anything from parliament, to get the best possible information of the latest improvements in all directions. My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) has referred to one, of course, there is not one of these improvements that is not referred to the department. It will be the desire of the officers of the department and myself to do everything within our means to improve the route and I am of the opinion that there is nothing too good in the way of lights, sirens and whistles for the improvement of this service. I shall to the best of my ability get the best information there is to be had, and I hope that I may be able to start out upon some systematic plan. Of course, we cannot do all this in a few months, or perhaps one or two years, but we desire to adopt a plan that will receive the approval of those who know most about it and which will have the confidence of every one interested in making the route better.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. minister if it is his intention to bring down supplementary estimates in which provision will be made to carry out some of the urgent reforms that were asked for last year by the shipping interests ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I might say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) that we expect, out of some of the estimates passed, to make a considerable improvement in the direction of the representations made to us by the shipping interests. Further, I cannot say positively at the present moment what recommendation I will bring down. Probably, if I am satisfied, that these recommendations are the best and the most practicable, I will, in the supplementary estimates, ask for some amount to carry out more of the work than is provided for here.

Mr. MONK. I asked the question because last year the underwriters and shippers represented to the government that the St. Lawrence route was defective from the gulf up to Montreal. The lights were bad, the lighthouses themselves were condemned, the system of signals, the sirens, were pro-

nounced defective and the lighting of the river between Quebec and Montreal was pronounced to be very defective. It was urged that it was possible to come up from Quebec to Montreal at night by the expenditure of a reasonable amount of money for the lighting of the route. The high rates of insurance that discriminate so greatly against the St. Lawrence route were ascribed to these obstacles and also to the defects in the pilotage system. When this matter was discussed in the House last year the predecessor of my hon. friend denied that there was such a need. I remember distinctly that he stated that he had on the occasion of two crossings of the Atlantic called the captains of the steamers into his room and asked them if there were any improvements to suggest along the St. Lawrence route and they had said that they really could suggest nothing. The underwriters ascribed the high rates to the causes that I have just indicated to the committee and shippers ascribed the high rates of freights to these causes also. I am sure that both sides of the House would willingly vote any amount that might be required to remove those objections to the route that were so forcibly put before us last year. The shippers held an expensive inquiry, in which the government did not take part, and we had the whole of the evidence, and a resume of the evidence, put before us. This is why I think it is very important that the question should be considered by my hon. friend and that these objections which militate so strongly against the St. Lawrence route should be removed as soon as possible.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) had been in the House when I referred to this matter he would have heard me say that I had spent several hours to-day with representatives of the shipping interests and had gone over the items of the whole route, and that they are coming on another day next week to complete the consideration of the subject. There are differences of opinion on this question, I find, among the engineers and those interested, but, by meeting together and having a good business talk, I find that they generally arrive at some practical solution in regard to the various points. We are putting in three sirens in place of fog whistles. We are putting a new light on Belle Isle, and a new siren at Fame Point, and in addition to that we are asking for tenders for a new permanent lighthouse at the Traverse which will be a very important work.

Mr. SPROULE. I introduced this subject because of the specific assurance of the minister (Sir Louis Davies) last session that everything was perfection as regards the lights and buoys. As to the number of casualties that took place on the St. Lawrence last year, it will be desirable to know how many of these were due to preventable causes such as defective lights or buoys or want of sufficient water. The country will be glad to hear that the new Minister of Marine intends to adopt some intelligent plan to carry out this work, after consultation with the shippers, and we suppose we may have hopes for the future. It would seem from the departmental report that there has been some carelessness in the departement because the buoys above Three Rivers were frozen in last year, and as the report says, they will have to be replaced at considerable expense. I find that the following reference is made in the departmental report to the chartered steamer which took the place of the 'Newfield':—

> During the season of 1900, the steamer 'Newfield' was wrecked, and consequently the department found it necessary to charter a steamer for lighthouse and buoy service in Nova Scotia, but owing to lack of equipment necessary for lifting and placing buoys on board of the chartered steamer, the service was not as satisfactorily done as by the 'Newfield.'

In other words, I presume there was a good deal of loss because the steamer was not properly equipped. The sooner the minister and the vessel owners of Canada get together and adopt the best possible system of lighting and buoying the St. Lawrence so as to reduce the danger of accidents and thereby reduce insurance, the better it will be for the people of the whole country. The route is getting into disrepute because of some defects, and the sooner they are remedied the better it will be.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am afraid I will have to plead guilty to some extent for the damage done to the buoys, but I left them out at the request of the shipping interests, and perhaps I went too far to try and please them.

Mr. CALVIN. You did not. You did the right thing. It was the right thing for you to do under the circumstances.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We did the best we could, but the frost set in two weeks earlier than usual. I hope the loss will not be very great.

Mr. FRASER. There are certain places in which there is some certainty as to leaving out the buoys each year, and there are other places where there is great uncertainty. It will always be necessary for the department to give some discretion to those in charge as to how long the buoys will be left out. In the county I represent there is a regulation that the buoys shall be taken in at a certain time, but it is wise in some seasons to leave them out longer. There is no human means of judging of the weather conditions during any particular year. It

is easier to deal with this matter in Nova Scotia than it is in the St. Lawrence, but even in Nova Scotia the seasons vary. I congratulate the department and the minister on what has been done to aid navigation in the lower provinces. During the last five or six years more has been done to recognize the wants of the fishing and shipping interests than was ever done before. To-day, take the coast of Nova Scotia from Canso to Yarmouth, and particularly from Canso to Halifax, and there never was a time when better facilities were provided for those engaged in the shipping trade. I would again point out that no definite rule can be made as to when these buoys should be taken in and that the best man to judge of that is the officer in charge in the locality. One season you have to remove them in November, and another season you may leave them out till January. The rule of the department used to be elastic in this respect.

Mr. SPROULE. That is left entirely to the discretion of the minister and he can give whatever orders he likes. In so far as the buoys were left out for the purpose of testing winter navigation no complaint can be found, but these buoys which were lost were above Three Rivers, and it was not intended to test winter navigation there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There were several belated vessels and the owners pressed very hard to have the buoys left out.

Mr. TALBOT. In the province of Quebec winter set in this year a month earlier than usual. We had winter on the 18th of October this year and we generally do not have it until the middle of November. These buoys between Quebec and Montreal were caught in the ice and that was due to the extremely cold weather which came a month earlier than any one could have anticipated.

Mr. CALVIN. There seems to be no doubt that the minister (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) did the correct thing in allowing these buoys to remain out last fall. They were left out for the benefit of the shipping, and at the urgent request of those interested in steamers sailing from the port of Montreal. I do not know how many steamers were enabled to pass down the river because those buoys were left out so late, but even if only two or three steamers were benefited thereby, the expense caused by the loss of the buoys was a mere trifle compared with the great advantage which the shipping derived from the action of the minister. It must be a great relief to this House, as I am sure it will be to the producers and shippers of this country, to know that we have a Minister of Marine whose intentions are good, who intends to be progressive, and that we are to be no longer confronted, as we were last session, with a dead stonewall. It is satisfactory to know that we will not be met with the invariable reply : Oh, this department is all right; it does nothing wrong; it cannot possibly be improved. We have a minister now who intends to improve it, and whether he will be able to do so or not remains to be seen. But it must be a matter of satisfaction to the hon. gentleman himself to know that he is at the head of a department which can do the greatest good for the transportation interests of this country. In his hands are the lighthouses and other aids to navigation throughout our great waterway, and as one who uses that great waterway in its western part, I shall welcome every help that can be given it by means of new lights and buoys. As a citizen of this country, and as one who is in the transportation business, I am quite convinced that the greatest barrier in the way of transportation along the St. Lawrence is the insurance rates to and from Montreal and Quebec, and more especially from Quebec to the sea. By whatever route our products may reach our seaboard, whether by rail or water, does not matter, they must all go outwards from Quebec to the gulf, and inwards, too, our trade must use that same waterway, and the hon. minister's attention must be specially directed to the improvements from Quebec to the sea, so that that part shall be made so perfectly safe that the insurance rates will fall to a minimum. It is nonsense for us to say that these insurance men charge too much. Let us make that part of the river perfectly safe and then the rates will come down.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I wish to make a suggestion to the hon. minister in connection with the lighting of Port Hood Harbour. The instructions last fall were that the light should be kept at the entrance of that harbour up to the 1st January. So long as that port was merely used for local business this was all right, but now its business has greatly extended. A very vigorous coal company have taken the coal mines into their hands and they are rapidly developing that property. Last January the shipping was at a considerable disadvantage owing to the fact that the lights at the entrance of the harbour were not kept in operation after the first of the month. I now throw out the suggestion to the hon. minister that sufficient supplies should be furnished the lighthouse keeper at Port Hood to keep the lights going throughout the whole season of navigation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a reasonable request and will be attended to.

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses including the maintenance and pay of crew of lighthouse steamer 'Brant,' $250,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In making improvements to navigation, after the first expense has been incurred with the buoys and lighthouses, the only increase, of course, is in the two items

of salaries and allowance of the keepers and maintenance and repairs. If parliament endorses the expenditure we would not be going into something blindly, because we can estimate pretty closely what the annual expenditure on these two items will amount to. This is the same amount as last year. Although the expenditure last year was a little larger than the estimate, on going over the items we thought we could get through on the $250,000.

Mr. BELL. Is there to be anything done about building another lighthouse in the Traverse ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The plans and specifications are now prepared, and I am now considering whether I should invite tenders or take the figures from the engineer and give the work to some competent responsible contractor. It is a very important work, one that will require to be done by men of experience and responsibility.

Mr. SPROULE. We were informed last session that the government intended to make an effort to test the navigability of the St. Lawrence during the winter to Quebec.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We had no boat at the disposal of the department which could do that work, but I am informed that either of the new boats we will have next season will be available.

Scientific institutions and hydrographic surveys, Magnetic Observatory, $2,700.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the magnetic observatory that is to be built in Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, it is in Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE. It was intended to build one here, was it not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe the Department of Interior has an item for that.

Mr. SPROULE. Why have two different votes ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot answer that. It will come up in the Public Works estimate, and no doubt the information will be given.

Meteorological service, $81,953.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $4,360 here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I am right in saying that there are one or two agencies established in the west. The cost of these together with increases of $50 each to several of the officers recommended by Mr. Stupart, who is at the head of this service, made up the increase.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford).

Hydrographic surveys, including survey of Lake Winnipeg, $26,000.

Mr. SPROULE. You have been operating on the east side of Lake Huron. Has that work been finished ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand it has been completed, and the officers who were engaged in it are finishing their reports.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is it intended to work this summer ? I understood that Lake Superior was to be surveyed. I suppose that when the reports concerning Lake Huron are needed, maps will be completed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. What part of Lake Superior is the work to begin at ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The head ot the hydrographic survey tells me that they will begin at the east end of Lake Superior; he is preparing his plans now.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it you will use but one boat ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. We have a splendid steamboat.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister tell us when the maps of Lake Huron will be ready and how much they will cost. Inquiries are being made of us concerning these points.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand that when they are prepared by our officers they are submitted to the hydrographic office of Great Britain. As soon as they return they will be printed.

Mr. SPROULE. That is very indefinite.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will make a note of the point and bring the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONK. I think we have voted about a million for my hon. friend. The committee is very thin to-night, and I do not think it should be asked to sit much longer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am well satisfied with the progress that has been made. But there are only two small items remaining in the Marine votes and I feel sure they will not be controversial, as they are the usual votes and there are no increases.

Some resolutions reported.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing :—1. Whether the government or any member thereof, by letter or other-

wise, gave any public or private assurance that in the selection of officers for the Canadian South Africa constabulary which left for South Africa last year, preference would be given to those Canadian officers who have served in South Africa and to other officers of the Canadian militia.

2. What persons, officers or others, applied for commissions in said constabulary ? What is the military record of each, either in Canada, South Africa or elsewhere ?

3. (a) What officers were selected and appointed ; (b) What is the military record of each ?

4. Who of those selected as officers had never before been officers ?

5. Whether there were enough applications from officers of the Canadian militia to officer the constabulary, and the reason for their being passed over, and men without qualifications, if there were any such, selected ?

6. How many commissioned officers of the Canadian militia were enlisted in the first and second contingents, in the Royal Canadian regiment, the Canadian mounted infantry, the Royal Canadian dragoons, and the Canadian artillery. as (a) non-commissioned officers, and (b) as men ?

7. How many non-commissioned officers and men of the permanent corps were enlisted in the corps named in question. How many of these were non-commissioned officers in South Africa. (c) Why were the commissioned officers enlisted in the corps as privates, not given the non-commissions.—Mr. Monk—by Mr. Sproule.

Copies of all letters, telegrams and other correspondence between the Department of Labour and the Canadian Pacific railway, Mr. John Wilson, and other parties, in respect of alleged violations of the Alien Labour Law, between June 1st, and September 1st, 1901. Also, between officers of the Immigration Department and the Canadian Pacific Railway.—Mr. Puttee.

Return of all items of expenditure during the year ended June 30, 1901, in connection with the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways respectively, charged to revenue and subsequently transferred to capital account, with a statement of the reasons for such transfer.—Mr. Barker.

Copies of all accounts, vouchers, reports, contracts, minutes, and other documents relating to the items of expenditure charged to revenue account, and afterwards transferred to capital account in connection with the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway, respectivey, during the year ending 30th June, 1901.—Mr. Barker.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.25 p,m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 28, 1902

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 12) respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—Hon. Mr. Costigan.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Indian River Railway Company.—Mr. Béland.

Bill (No. 15) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—Mr. Ingram.

Bill (No. 16) respecting the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 17) to incorporate the Lake Bennett Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 18) to incorporate the Velvet (Rossland) Mine Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 19) relating to the Regina Law Library.—Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.

MARCONI'S WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

On the Order being called for :

First reading of Bill entitled : 'An Act to confirm an agreement between the Government of Canada and Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Company, Limited.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I wish, Mr. Speaker, that this Order should be dropped as the matter will be dealt with in another way.

Order dropped.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Department of Trade and Commerce, including J. P. Nutting, at $2,000, and J. Byrnes at $1,450, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $12,690.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I might explain to my hon. friends opposite that, owing to the inspectorship having been added to this department, they will find an increase here of one officer in the item of first-class clerks, who has been transferred from Inland Revenue to our office. With respect to the other matters of increases they will observe they are all of the $50 order with the exception of one, a chief clerk, Mr. J. Byrnes. Mr. Nutting, who is to receive $100, is an officer of long standing in the service and has now a pretty high rank, in fact, virtually acting deputy.

Mr. SPROULE. Is his place filled in the Inland Revenue branch by another man, or is the expenses of the Inland Revenue decreased by that amount ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is decreased.

Mr. SPROULE. In connection with the work done by the inspectors, there has been considerable adverse criticism of the system. Would the minister inform us how the system has worked ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My experience is not quite sufficient to enable me to answer that fully. I would just mention to my hon. friend that an item will come up under the head of grain inspection, when I shall probably be able to give the fullest explanation. Somewhere at the very close he will find that that item will come up. One complaint which was made to me, and I think it was made before I took over this branch, was that very large fees had been paid, I think amounting to as high as $10,000 or $12,000, to these inspectors ; and it was thought better to put them on salary and to have the fees paid into the general treasury, than to allow these gentlemen to go on collecting these very large amounts. That is the chief thing. Of course if there are any points in which the trade has occasion to complain, we should be glad to look into the matter and rectify it to the best of our ability. Then a complaint has been made, and is now being investigated, so far as I remember, that there is an unnecessary number of inspections, and that some of them might well be done away with. We are investigating that matter to see if it can be remedied. Of course it is our object to see that the trade is harassed as little as possible ; at the same time if the inspection is to go on at all the grain has to pass through the hands of an inspector. But later on that will be taken up. On page 87, item 276, my hon. friend will see that the whole matter will come up, and then it will be fully discussed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I observe that on this page there are, I think, 24 items altogether and with respect to 13 of them the Civil Service Act is repealed pro tanto. Does the hon. gentleman think that is a desirable style of legislation—to have an Act which is repealed with regard to any particular item whenever it is found convenient to repeal it ? The estimates are sent up to the other House under a condition that they must either accept the whole appropriation Bill or reject the whole of it. I have brought the matter to the attention of the House on other occasions, and I cannot allow this to pass without putting in my protest against this practical repeal of the Civil Service Act. The Act should be amended if it cannot be observed. It does not seem to me to be a good system, and I do not think my hon. friend will say it is a good system to pursue with reference to this Act.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend says. But at the same time he will see that often great inequalities have crept into the payments of many of these officers. In the case of Mr. Nutting, for a considerable number of years he received no increase at all, and this is virtually giving him the statutory increases which in the ordinary course he would have been receiving. In the other case it is only a statutory increase of $50. But this gentleman had been, as I understand, at the head of the second service class for a considerable time, and when he was put into my department and given charge of a rather important branch, it was thought the least we could do would be to give him $50 as well as the rank of first-class clerk. While I candidly admit that both legally and otherwise the hon. gentleman is right and we ought not to have so many of these cases, still these are very small sins, as he will observe.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). These are the pin-pricks which make our life intolerable on this side of the House. I want to say to my hon. friend that I am not finding any fault with these gentlemen, or criticising the increases to them in any way, for I have no doubt they are capable gentlemen and deserving of the increases granted. My remarks are applicable to the system. It seems to me a bad system, and that we would do better to amend the Act so as to confer some greater discretion, if necessary, on the different departments, than to repeal it from time to time in a way which prevents the Upper House from dealing with it. I am not sure that the Senate would not be perfectly justified in throwing out the whole appropriation Bill on this account. They are not supposed to amend that Bill at all, but must either reject or accept it in its entirety. The result is that an Act which they have passed is being repealed by this House in such a way that they have not one word as to the wisdom or unwisdom of the proposed repeal. That is not a satisfactory way of conducting legislation, and I am glad that, so far as the principle is concerned, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce agrees in the view I have stated.

Department of Trade and Commerce—Clerical and other assistance notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $2,500 ; printing and stationery, $1,700 ; sundries, $2,800 ; total, $7,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This increase is caused exclusively by the addition of grain inspectors to my department.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the mode adopted for the selecting and appointing of grain inspectors ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That will come up more particularly under item 276, on page 83, which is a special vote taken for these inspectors, under the General Inspection Act.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman bring down a list of the inspectors, their salaries, stations, and so on ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Certainly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is the printing done ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is all done at the Printing Bureau, I am informed.

Salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians, $85,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to have one item in connection with the Marine and Fisheries Department reserved for any remarks in connection with the department by gentlemen not present.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There will be items in the supplementary estimates, both for the current and coming year, on which any information may be asked.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Before considering the item before the committee, I would like to take this opportunity of answering one or two questions put by the hon. member for Grey with regard to a hydrographic survey. In connection with the hydrographic survey on the lakes, Mr. Stewart, the officer in charge, states that all the work on Lake Huron has been completed. The Americans having finished their work, the whole lake is therefore surveyed. The charts are about completed and will be forwarded to the hydrographic office in London, for engraving and publication. The expenses attending the printing, publication and issuing is made by the hydrographic office. As to the charts that have been issued, all, except this last season have been completed, accepted by the hydrographic office and will be on sale by the opening of navigation. The proof of the last one issued was received yesterday. As to the next year's operation, Mr. Stewart will leave with his staff on board of the 'Lord Stanley' for the eastern end of Lake Superior, working from Point Aux Pins westward. Although the whole work has been completed on the American side, there is only the demarcation of the shore line on the Canadian side, and Mr. Stewart thinks that this work will probably occupy several years. With regard to the question put by the hon. member for North Grey, as to whether any award has been made to Captain McDougall, who had saved a number of lives from an American barge or steamer, and who had been given a very handsome testimonial for his conduct by the United States, I beg to say that I have looked up the records in the department and cannot find record of any application for an award to Captain McDougall. Otherwise his case would have received every attention.

Mr. SPROULE. Where can these hydrographic charts be got. Will they be on sale.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They can be got at the Printing Bureau and also at Montreal, Quebec and Toronto. My deputy will have a circular sent to the hon. gentleman stating the places where these charts may be obtained.

In answer to the hon. member for Peel, with a regard to the silver medals promised to the men who saved life at Port Credit, Ontario, I may tell the hon. gentleman that I made inquiries by telegram and was informed that they were arranging to present these medals at an early date and I will see that this is carried out at once, and I thank him for drawing my attention to this matter. My hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) wanted information about the light at Port Hood. I have looked into the matter and have directed that the Port Hood light be kept in operation during the season of navigation.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to put the hon. minister a further question respecting a matter to which I drew his attention last night. I asked him whether he had received a petition from the National Association of Marine Engineers with regard to amendments they desired to the Steamboat Inspection Act. I understood him to say that he had received a petition and also had met a deputation from that body. Has the hon. minister anything further to communicate to us regarding the result of his meeting with that deputation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said further that after I had heard the deputation, the chairman of the Board of Examiners for the steamship engineers had made out a report on the various matters which came up before us. I also had an interview with the president of the association this morning, at which the chief officer of the department was present. The president of the association and the chairman of steamboat inspection of the department came to an agreement with regard to several matters, and after I have had an opportunity of studying the report following that interview, I intend to give the president of the association another meeting with regard to a few matters still left unsettled.

Mr. SPROULE. I was about to ask whether there had been anything done to define our rights in the fisheries, under the decision of the Privy Council. A few years ago the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided that the fisheries belonged to the provinces with the exception of some ocean fisheries, and we naturally expected that there would be a reduction

in the cost of looking after them. Last year, however, there was an increase in the item of salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors, overseers, and guardians amounting to $15,000, instead of a decrease, and I notice that this year the item is $85,000, the same as last. Has the government reached any agreement with the provinces as to the rights we have or the duties we are required to perform? And would it not be possible to reduce the expenditure on this item in view of the fact that the fisheries have been declared to be the property of the provinces? There ought to be some understanding between the Dominion and the several provinces on this matter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There really has been no progress made since last session with regard to this matter. The decision of the Privy Council is difficult to understand. So far as I have been able to inform myself, after looking into the communications between the different provinces and the department, the parties seem to be further away from an agreement as to the meaning of this matter than when they started. It appears to me, not being a lawyer, that this matter will have to be settled by one or other of two courses. So far as the present condition of affairs, it is certainly very unsatisfactory. Either the points in dispute must be referred to some tribunal for settlement, and both the Dominion and the provinces must abide by that decision, or there must be a conference and an agreement reached satisfactory to both parties. Before coming directly to the estimates, I may say that we all recognize the great importance of the fisheries of the Dominion and the necessity of having proper regulations to govern them. This one point is not in dispute—that the power to regulate the fisheries remains within the jurisdiction of the Dominion. That being the case, I think all will agree that, until some arrangement is made, it is the duty of the Dominion to see that the regulations are enforced and the fisheries protected. With regard to the item to which my hon. friend referred, that of $85,000, I find that at the time the judgment was given, the minister reduced the item, for some reason or other, by $25,000 or $30,000. It so remained, I think, for two years. But the expenditure remained the same as it had been and the result was a deficit, which, I believe, was made up by a supplementary vote last session. After careful investigation it is found that nothing less than $85,000 would do for this item. Previously, I think, it was $90,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is very desirable indeed that any difficulties with regard to the relative position of the Dominion and the provinces, if there are any such, should be settled at once. I have not recently examined the judgment of the Privy Council and am not sure now how far it goes. But I think that the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, during last session of parliament, told us that negotiations were to be had, or a further case submitted to the courts for the purpose of determining certain further questions. I may point out to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. James Sutherland) that the matter is of some immediate importance, because, as I understand, the provinces are about making a claim upon the government of Canada in respect of the fisheries award. I believe that the Attorney General of the province of New Brunswick has recently announced to the people of that province in an election manifesto that he proposed to make, or has made, a formal claim on this government for a portion of that award. If, while we are subject to a claim of that kind, we continue to pay for services, which, perhaps, legitimately belong to the different provinces, we are, certainly, not pursuing a very wise course. If these difficulties and uncertainties exist I would suggest to the hon. minister that he should lose no time in putting himself in communication with the Department of Justice and having a matter so serious dealt with at once.

Mr. WADE. In the decision of the Privy Council on this question and others that were submitted by the Dominion and the provinces, there are specific findings that it is well to understand. It was contended on the part of the Dominion that the Dominion had the proprietary right in certain of the fisheries. That was settled adversely to the Dominion, it being held that proprietary right of the fisheries were vested in the provinces or in the individuals who possessed the same at the time of the British North America Act. But it was also held that the Dominion has absolute control, so far as the regulating is concerned, and that in regulating, they can interfere to any extent with the proprietary rights, except to the extent of granting an absolute right of fishery to other parties. It is also decided that the Dominion, under subsections 3 and 12, has the right to raise a revenue by taxation on the fisheries by way of license, and that the provinces have a similar right. The whole question is reduced by that judgment, as I understand it, to this—that the Dominion government has the sole right to regulate the fisheries and the provinces cannot interfere with that in the slightest degree. Thus, the Department of Marine and Fisheries is left in the same position as before in this matter and must make the same expenditure as before, in order to enforce the law, because this parliament is the only parliament that has power to make regulations about the fisheries. Back of this, there is a question that may arise in the future, and that is whether the Dominion has or has not, in days past, undertaken to give an exclusive right of fishery when they

granted licenses for the use of traps and other engines for the capture of fish. If they did so, the question arises whether the parties who paid these license fees supposing that they were receiving exclusive rights of fishery would have a claim upon the Dominion for the refund of that money. But this does not question in any way the obligation upon the department to make and enforce fishery regulations, for, in that respect, the provinces are absolutely powerless.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that a great part of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) has told us was generally known. What I wished to know was whether any effort was being made to have a conference with the provinces with a view to a determination of the powers of either side.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There have been a great many negotiations in this direction. I may explain that, by agreement, we still receive all the revenues, except from the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, pending final arrangements. Negotiations have gone so far that we have in the department now a memorandum from the province of Quebec of a case that they would like us to join in submitting to the courts. The province of Quebec also has recently sent a very formidable statement of claim with regard to the province's rights in the matter. I agree with the leader of the opposition that, as soon as possible, some conclusion must be come to with regard to these difficulties. It will probably be slow work at the best, but it is my intention, as far as I can, with the assistance of the Department of Justice, to put the matter in shape and have it settled.

Mr. SPROULE. Who issues the licenses, the Dominion or the provinces ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The province, in the case of Ontario and Quebec ; but, in the other provinces, the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) to say that it was clearly decided by the Privy Council that both the province and the Dominion have the right to raise revenue from the fisheries. In what way does the Dominion propose to raise a revenue to recoup us for looking after the fisheries and controling them ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is one of the matters that parliament has to decide after these other matters are settled. We have not taken action to make up the loss of revenue. If the hon. gentleman had understood me he would have understood that we have receipts as formerly, except from Ontario and Quebec. Last year these receipts were about $45,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. Although under the decision, territorial rights or powers are held by the provinces it does not in any way relieve the Dominion from the obligation it is under to protect the fisheries. The Dominion has all the powers to regulate and even to restrain the fishery rights and carrying with it those powers certainly it carries with it the onus of protection. Now, in the province of New Brunswick they have enacted legislation giving power to the government to enter into negotiations and to lease the territorial rights to the Dominion. It would seem to me to be in the best interests of the provinces generally and indeed of the Dominion that the Dominion should control and should have all the fishery rights, even to the territorial rights. From the standpoint of the Dominion and from the standpoint of our trade and navigation all interests combine and unite in pointing to the Dominion as the proper authority. Under these circumstances it would seem to me that it would be wise on the part of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to conclude negotiations at as early a date as convenient and where possible with the several provinces with a view of acquiring the rights of the provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say in connection with this matter that I understand that we have the right to regulate and protect the fisheries ; that is to say the size of the mesh of the net, to regulate the close season and to prescribe the kind of fish traps to be used. But, the question is : If we get no revenue from it, is it worth our while to protect the fisheries all over the country ? If we have the right over and above the provinces to raise a revenue upon the sale of fishing licenses or from some other source had we not better avail ourselves of it, because otherwise the Dominion will be paying out money for doing the work of the provinces ? As this decision has been given some time ago, it would seem to be desirable for the government to endeavour at the earliest possible moment to reach some conclusion with the provinces in regard to the rights we have, the duties we must perform and where the revenue will come from to pay the expenses incurred in protecting the fisheries.

Mr. WADE. I would like to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the Dominion has been collecting a revenue from these fisheries for years by selling licenses to parties to fish with seines and fish traps. All along the coast of Nova Scotia these licenses have been sold by the Dominion authorities and the revenue derived from them has come to the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. The question is whether the Dominion shall be permitted to retain that revenue.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) must understand the dif-

ficulty in the distribution of powers. It is not an easy matter with a question over which the local legislature may have a partial authority and in which the Dominion may have rights to decide it as quickly as the hon. gentleman thinks. But, what I rose to say was that I dissent entirely from the proposition he makes: It is no difference if the Dominion has only such power to look after our fisheries, it must not do it unless it gets a revenue out of it. That is a proposition, I think, which must not be entertained for a moment. If the Dominion alone can do certain things it makes no difference whether we get a revenue or not. The Dominion must do it in the interests of the fisheries and the people of Canada. You cannot decide a question by saying that it simply costs so much and we must get so much for performing this duty or we will not do anything at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not pretend to advocate any such doctrine. What I suggested was that if the provinces get all the revenue and all the advantages from the fisheries, would it not be desirable to have a conference with the provinces and to decide who shall assume the full responsibility of protecting the fisheries.

Mr. FRASER. The government can only do what they have power to do. The argument, if I understand it, meant, that while the power might be inherent in one parliament to do a certain thing, unless it paid, parliament should not do it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman must not forget that the decision explicitly said that we had joint powers with the provinces.

Mr. FRASER. Very able lawyers differ about what it means.

Mr. COCHRANE. They always do.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is this anomaly, that while the territorial right is in the provinces, the Dominion may adopt regulations making entirely valueless these territorial rights; in other words, the Dominion, under its powers, can, by regulation, absolutely prohibit and restrain the use of a river in respect to its fisheries, and yet the territorial right is in the provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. A stronger reason for coming to an amicable understanding.

Mr. EMMERSON. I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman says with respect to the desirability of coming to an arrangement, but pending such the Dominion must expend the money in order to protect the fisheries and carry out the regulations, it alone having the power. The provinces have no power in that direction at all.

Mr. GANONG. Would the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) kindly tell us at what time that legislation was passed in New Brunswick to which he referred?

Mr. EMMERSON. In 1900.

Mr. GANONG. I am really pleased to hear the hon. gentleman saying this. That is not the tune we got in Charlotte when he was running his last election. The tune there which was sung to the poor fishermen was this: These are the fellows that will have you by the throat if you do not vote for the local government. To-day he has changed his tune, and it is a very different story to that which we heard in the election.

Mr. HACKETT. In connection with this question, I desire to offer an observation or two. We had a very interesting decision by the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island in regard to this question a few days ago. The farmers of Prince Edward Island have for the last twenty or thirty years been digging mussel mud in the beds of the rivers for the purpose of fertilizing their farms. A regulation was passed by the department that no farmer should use his mud machine within 200 yards of a live oyster bed. They submitted to that, but now we find the department has placed an arbitrary line across certain rivers restricting the farmers from using this mussel mud for the purpose of fertilizing their farms. While the oyster fishery in Prince Edward Island is a very important fishery, the farming industry is also equally important, and if you restrict the farmer from taking his mussel mud within 200 yards of the live oyster bed, you will give full protection to the oyster fishery. The decision in the Supreme Court was this: Up the North river, I remember very well, an oyster fishery, or a bed for the protection of the oyster, was set aside by the government of Canada some years ago. A farmer in the prosecution of his industry came along and placed his mud digger within the limits as laid down by the government of Canada. Now, we wish to protect this oyster fishery, but you will see that you have an oyster bed of so many hundred yards square. You have a live oyster bed that must be protected by the government, but can you prevent the farmer from coming along and prosecuting his industry in the vicinity of that oyster bed? It is true the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island decided that the government of Canada had the right to pass these rules and regulations, but if they were to be enforced, every farmer would be debarred from getting this valuable fertilizer in the vicinity of these oyster beds. I asked the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries a question a few days ago in connection with the lines drawn across the rivers in Prince Edward Island. Is it the intention on the Trout river and the Biddeford river in Prince county that no farmer shall be allowed to take mussel mud except within the lines he has defined?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would say that when he brought the matter to my attention the other day and when another application was made to the department, I looked into it and came to the conclusion that a good deal of discretion might be used in enforcing these regulations. I gave instructions to the principal officer of the department in charge on the island that he was not to enforce the regulations strictly unless it was really necessary to protect the oyster beds. I think we will all agree that it is necessary to protect the oyster beds, but otherwise I think a great deal of discretion can be left to the officers as to whether this practice will really destroy valuable beds or not. I have issued instructions to that effect.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is very little connection between the subject now under discussion in this committee and the elections which were held in New Brunswick in 1899.

Mr. GANONG. Not just now, but there was then.

Mr. EMMERSON. I fear that the hon. gentleman's memory fails him in respect to the attitude of the local government of that day. I can only say that the opinions which I have expressed here to-day were the opinions expressed by me, not merely in other counties in New Brunswick, but in the county of Charlotte. I know that my hon. friend (Mr. Ganong) feels a little sore with respect to that election, because he failed to carry out the pledge which he gave to the celebrated Moncton convention to send four Conservatives to the New Brunswick Legislature. That probably is a sore spot with him.

Mr. GANONG. I have to say that while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) does not mean to misrepresent me, his statement is absolutely untrue. I do not place the responsibility at the doors of my hon. friend, because I do not believe he would make the statement if he knew it to be untrue. Whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) made the statement or not, these men who followed him and did his work certainly said so, for I was at their meeting when they did say it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I spoke there at three different places.

Mr. GANONG. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) was like the ex-Minister of Marine ; instead of talking to fishermen he went to talk to the farmers. That was usually the way down there.

Mr. EMMERSON. I talked with pretty good effect in the county of Charlotte.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand that Ontario and Quebec issue licenses and refuse to pay the revenue over to the Dominion Treasury while the other provinces do pay us the revenue.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is practically correct if not technically so. So far as the other provinces are concerned we go on collecting the revenue by arrangement just as in the past. This vote amounts to some $300,000, and even if all the provinces collected the revenue, the House might come to the conclusion that it was desirable to vote money for the protection of the fisheries, the management of fish breeding establishments and so on. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in saying that Ontario and Quebec now collect the license fees, which formerly brought in a revenue of some $40,000 or $45,000 per annum to the Dominion, and we do not now receive any revenue from that source in these two provinces.

Mr. INGRAM. This appropriation is for the purpose of protecting the fisheries, and I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to what is now being done on Lake Erie. Before the province of Ontario took hold of the fishing rights the Dominion government limited the number of licenses ; but I am informed that the Ontario government proposes now to increase the number of licenses by some sixty or seventy along the Lake Erie front. If that is done it will be only a matter of a year or two when the valuable fishing grounds there are depleted. If the Dominion government had any control over the matter I could understand that we should vote money for the protection of the fisheries whose duty it would or ought to be to protect the fisheries and that can be done largely by limiting the number of licenses.

Mr. HACKETT. I want to say that this question of the protection of the oyster fishery, and allowing the farmers of Prince Edward Island to take mussel mud in the rivers is a very important question with us. The minister said that in connection with these two lines drawn across the Trout river and the Biddeford river, that the enforcement of that arrangement will be left entirely to the discretion of the local officers. You have quite a sufficient quantity of mussel mud for the use of farmers irrespective and clear altogether of the oyster beds. The first duty of this government is to protect the oyster fisheries and at the same time they can allow the farmer to prosecute his industry by getting this valuable fertilizer from the beds of our rivers. If you allow this matter to rest altogether in the hands of the local officers you may have partisanship. You may have one man digging mussel mud and taking it to his farm, while another man of a different political stripe will be prohibited from doing so. The government should not allow this matter to remain altogether in the hands of the local officers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The authority of the inspector in Prince Edward Island to exercise his discretion in this matter is subject to the approval of the department. I do not think there can be any partisanship because the officer once he decides that they can take mussel mud out of a certain place, cannot interfere with any one from taking it there.

Mr. PORTER. This vote includes the salary of a certain official residing in the county of Hastings, who had the honour of representing East Hastings for one parliament, who at the last general elections was defeated by the electors, and who shortly after that was appointed to the position of Inspector of Fisheries. I refer to Mr. Hurley, the ex-member for East Hastings. I understand that the principle is laid down by the government, that officials of the government should not take an active part in elections, and certain officers have been dismissed because it was alleged they did take an active part in politics. I wish to state that this official to whom I have referred, during the late by-election in the adjoining riding of West Hastings, was found to be active during the whole of that election. I am happy to say that his efforts to defeat the Conservative candidate were not successful. I am, however, unhappy to say that a petition has been lodged protesting the result of that election, and this officer whom I have mentioned, was, I am informed, upon authority on which I can safely rely, the very gentleman who solicited the petitioner to sign the petition against the return of the present member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter). I wish now to ask from the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Sutherland). I know much of this vote is intended to pay the inspector of fisheries for his duties as inspector, and what proportion of it is intended to remunerate him for the part he took in the late election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no part of this vote intended to pay him for work in the elections. It is contrary to the rules of the department that its officers should take an active part in elections. From what I know of my friend and late colleague here (Mr. Hurley) and from what I have seen of him since I have been at the head of the department, I would be surprised to hear that he took any active part in politics. I met Mr. Hurley in Ottawa one day when he was on business with the department, and forgetting for the moment I made some reference to politics to him, and Mr. Hurley at once replied : I do not talk any politics now. It will be seen that he was very guarded in his political utterances even when speaking to me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Hurley when a member of this House won the respect of every one who knew him, and I do not think it can be possible that he would be indiscreet enough to take a prominent part in the election. My hon. friend (Mr. Porter) ought to be pleased to have such a large majority, and probably if he knew the truth this officer of my department may have voted for him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the department any control over the number of licenses granted by the Ontario government ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. That opens up the whole question of jurisdiction. I suppose that if we thought the province was issuing too great a number of licenses, or were depleting or injuring these valuable fisheries by any action they took, we might by a regulation indirectly interfere with them. Directly, we would have nothing to say about the number of licenses they could issue.

Mr. INGRAM. I have the best authority for making the statement that it is the intention of the Ontario government to increase the number of licenses by sixty or seventy , and if they do that they will certainly deplete the fisheries along the frontier of Lake Erie. Is it not the duty of the department to communicate with the Ontario government to find out if this report is true, and if so to take action to prevent them issuing these licenses ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a matter which would come under the notice of the inspectors, and we have had no report from any inspector with regard to it. We might by arrangement as the hon. gentleman suggests, extend the close season or we might allow them to fish one week out of three or something of that kind.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the hon. minister would have no objection to allowing the correspondence respecting the presenting of those medals, to which I referred last night, to be placed at the disposal of the committee ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. None at all. I found on inquiry there had been some delay—not purposely but through carelessness—and I at once telegraphed and got a reply saying that the matter would be attended to at once.

Mr. BLAIN. I must say that the hon. minister was prompt in the answer he gave, but I explained last night that the department had decided to give to the captain of that life-saving crew a silver watch and to each member of the crew five dollars, and that the watch and the money were sent up to Port Credit. But for some unex-

plained reason the presentation was never made. On whose recommedation was the change made by which each member of their crew, instead of getting five dollars, is to get a medal ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not remember the hon. gentleman making any reference to that last night, and did not look into that phase of the matter, but will do so and give him what information I can obtain.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be all very well for the hon. and amiable Minister of Marine and Fisheries to dismiss the subject introduced by my hon. friend from West Hastings with a good-natured smile, but when we find a flagrant violation of the principle which the hon. gentleman admits, namely, that officials of the government should not take part in elections, we cannot allow the hon. gentleman to get rid of the matter in that off-hand way. When Conservatives are guilty of the same offence they are summarily dismissed. Is the hon. gentleman not going to apply the same treatment to his own political friends ? Are they to be allowed to interfere in a political campaign without incurring any penalty ? The hon. member for West Hastings has told this House that he was informed on authority which he believed to be absolutely correct, that this man had got up an election petition and solicited signatures, and possibly may have committed other improper acts, in view of the official position he holds, and all the minister has to say in reply is to pass it off with a wave of the hand and a good-natured smile. But the country will insist on something more, because otherwise we will have friends of the government in office doing with perfect immunity the very thing for doing which Conservative office-holders have been over and over again dismissed and dismissed without trial.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it was during either the second or the first session that I had the honour of a seat in parliament that the principle was laid down by the leader of the hon. minister, that if any civil servant undertook to devote his attention to politics and interfere in elections, he would be given full liberty to devote his whole time to that purpose. That is a very good principle, if carried out impartially, but not if it be used merely for the purpose of dismissing office holders whose political convictions are opposed to those of the party in power. That doctrine laid down by the leader of the government has been frequently applied in my own constituency. A postmaster in the county of Halifax was very recently dismissed from office solely on the ground that he had taken part in the last election and was dismissed without any trial, although he was prepared to prove that the charge was without foundation. Unless this declaration of the leader of the government was intended merely to humbug the public, the statement of my hon. friend from West Hastings is deserving of investigation at the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I do not ask that this official should be dismissed on the mere statement of the hon. member for Hastings that he had interfered in the elections, although that is the kind of justice that has been meted out to many Conservative office-holders—and one of them I might name in my constituency, who was dismissed from office during the past year—but we are certainly entitled to demand that an investigation he held.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understood my hon. friend from West Hastings to have brought this matter up in a good-natured way, and did not understand him to have accused the inspector of taking part in an election, but simply of having spoken as he should not have done to some person in connection with the petition filed. I agreed with the hon. gentleman that that was a very injudicious and improper thing for this official to do, and it is my intention to call his attention to the statement and ask for an explanation. I agree with my hon. friend that men holding positions in the public service cannot be too careful. I have always insisted upon their being careful. But I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in his sweeping statement regarding dismissals of Conservatives from office, and I think that on reflection he will admit that a very small proportion indeed have been dismissed on account of politics. And those who have been, he will find have been more injudicious than the gentleman referred to, and have taken more active part in the different campaigns. For my part I am inclined to take a broad view with regard to this matter, because after all in many cases it is simply gossip started by somebody who may want the job himself. However, I agree in the principle laid down, and, so far as I am concerned, will see that this matter is investigated and the officer punished if guilty.

Mr. GANONG. Has the hon. minister decided upon any action with regard to the number of licenses for fish weirs issued in the county of Charlotte ? Last year we had trouble. Many fishermen made their application as usual, having received no notice, and they were only notified that they would not be allowed to build weirs after they had provided themselves with the necessary material. The matter was then brought to the notice of the minister, and he decided to allow the weirs to be built. Some applications this year, I understand, have been refused, although the parties are distant the required distance, 1,000 feet or more, from the weirs owned by their neighbours. What I wish to call attention to is the fact that while the de-

partment has issued 300 or 400 linceses, these weirs are not all built, but the issue of these licenses prevents others building. Would it not be better to issue 25 per cent of these licenses—that being the proportion not built—to people who will build. We have lost in population simply because the fisheries have not been as well looked after as they should have been, and I am not attributing the blame to the Liberal government alone. I think our people should be allowed to take advantage of all the catch within their reach. We hear a good deal about the depletion of the fisheries, but if any one had been in Charlotte county this year and seen the thousands of hogsheads of fish taken out of the sea there, he would not have concluded there was much chance of depletion in the sardine fisheries. There were probably more fish in the inshore waters this year than has been known in the history of the sardine business.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is a matter upon which the Minister would hardly come to a decision without consulting the officers of the department. Every hon. gentleman who has taken any interest in these matters knows that there are great differences of opinion upon these subjects and knows also that the quantity of fish varies greatly with the different seasons. It may be that the regulation in this case is too strict. I will take the matter up with the officer in charge of this branch and will let the hon. gentleman know the decision of the government.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Who is the present inspector of fisheries for Manitoba? Has Mr. Colcleugh, who was inspector, been dismissed, or has he resigned ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. W. S. Young is the present inspector.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). What is his salary ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Twelve hundred dollars.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). What was his previous business ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand he was a hardware merchant.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). He had no previous training, then, in this particular line ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not aware that any expert knowledge is required of the occupant of this position. I should suppose that any sensible man could discharge the duties of the office.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Was Mr. Colcleugh forced to resign or was he dismissed ? If he was dismissed, will the minister say that it was because everything was not in good shape in connection with the fisheries ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My information is that he resigned voluntarily.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Can the minister tell us whether everything was found in good shape or not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not the report, but I will look it up.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Has a separate officer been appointed for the hatchery or is the management of the hatchery part of the duty of the inspector of fisheries ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The inspector is looking after the hatchery. An expert was sent up there to see about it.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Is it the intention of the government to appoint a separate officer as manager of the hatchery ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at present.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the item passes, I would like to ascertain the views of the Minister of Justice with regard to the necessity of having questions as to the respective rights of the Dominion and the provinces in the fisheries again submitted to the courts. I understood the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries to tell us last year that it was, in his opinion, necessary, or, at least, desirable, that some other question should be submitted. I think, also, he expressed his intention of having that course adopted at an early day. From the views that have been put forward by my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) and my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), apparently the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not correct in the views he then expressed. I would like to know the views of the Minister of Justice with regard to that, and whether he considers it necessary to adopt such a course.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The judgment of the Privy Council, is in my opinion, extremely confused and indistinct. In fact, were I not speaking of a decision of the highest court of the empire, I would be tempted to say that it is self-contradictory in its terms. However, I think we can safely say that there are two points which are firmly and clearly established. One is that the provinces have all the territorial powers as regards fisheries, and the other—but I had better read from the text so as to have it absolutely correct :—

> That the enactment of fishery regulations and restrictions is within the exclusive competence of the Dominion legislature and is not within the powers of the provincial legislatures.

Therefore, we have this condition of things, it seems to me, that the territorial rights as regards the fisheries are vested in the provinces and that the regulating of

the fisheries is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament. Now, in my view, speaking without very much preparation on the subject, I would be inclined to consider that the federal government can, irrespective of locality, declare that no one shall fish generally without paying a fishing fee or tax to the department; that they can also determine the close season, regulate the size of boats, license the boats—they can do all those things that have reference to the general regulation of the fisheries. Coming to the special question which the leader of the opposition has put, I would be disposed to say that the Dominion and the provinces might get together and, through their representatives, come to an agreement as to how this judgment is to be construed. If they are not prepared to do that, then, because of the vague and indistinct terms in which the judgment is couched it will be necessary to submit further questions to the court for the purpose of construing the judgment of the Privy Council.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) understand that the duty of protection would follow the territorial rights or the power of regulation?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think that would follow the power of regulation. In fact, I think there are very much larger powers vested in the Dominion than is at the present time generally admitted. I think the provinces are under an entirely erroneous impression with regard to this judgment. They are told virtually, if I may interpret the judgment: You are the proprietors of this property, but you have no control over it. I think the sooner we define and settle these questions the better for all concerned. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. James Sutherland) has begun discussing the matter with the department; and, if I may say so, I am ready to take the matter up and have it disposed of almost immediately. It may be anomalous to ask a court to construe its own judgment, but if we are forced to that conclusion, the fault is not entirely ours.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is one other matter I would like to say a word about, and to this I would ask the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is a matter I brought to the attention of the late minister. In a great many cases we find very small salaries paid to fishery inspectors accompanied by very large travelling expenses. At page P—109, of the Auditor General's Report, we find a salary of $218.75 accompanied with a charge of $746 for travelling expenses; another salary of $187.50 with travelling expenses of $507.05. On the following page we find 'salary, $175; travel, $562.73.' And on the same page a salary of $187.50 is accompanied by travelling expenses of $603.01. The explanation made by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries last year was that the travelling expenses were really a part of the salary; that the inspector went out with his own horse and buggy, and sent in vouchers as if he had spent so much money in travelling, though, in fact, he had spent no money, but had used his own conveyance. I think it would be better to put these things on a proper basis. If this is part of the salary let it be paid as part of the salary and not entered as fictitious travelling expenses.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is quite true, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) says that comparatively small salaries are accompanied by comparatively large charges for travelling expenses. I am assured by the officers of the department that these matters are very closely scrutinized, and that in no case that may be investigated will it be found that these are paid as part of a salary. The districts, in some cases, are very large, and the inspectors have to travel by hiring horses and rigs. They are allowed a fixed rate of ten cents per mile of travel, twenty-five cents for each meal, twenty-five cents for horse-feed, and twenty-five cents for a bed. These accounts are sent in and sworn to by the parties, and are carefully investigated by the department. Whether any other system can be adopted that will be better while securing equal efficiency, I could not say. I will look into the matter.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. minister say who is the inspector of fisheries at the town of Wallaceburgh, Ont., and what is his salary?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not find in the list any officer at Wallaceburgh.

Mr. CLANCY. I think if the hon. minister will make inquiries he will find that there is a gentleman acting in that capacity there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am assured by the officers of the department that we have no officer there.

Building and maintenance of fish breeding establishments and lobster hatcheries, $60,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is an increase of $10,000 owing to four new hatcheries having been established during the year, one at Margaree, in Nova Scotia, a combined salmon and lobster hatchery, one at Gaspé, and two salmon hatcheries in British Columbia, one at Bedford Creek and the other at Skeena River.

Mr. SPROULE. How many hatcheries have we now altogether, and what are they for?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are fourteen now. One at Newcastle, Ont., for salmon; one at Sandwich, Ont., whitefish; Ottawa, salmon and trout; Quebec, salmon; Magog, salmon and trout; Gaspé Basin, salmon and lobsters; Campbelltown, N.B., salmon; South River, N.B., salmon; Grand Falls, N.B., salmon; Bedford, N.B., salmon and trout; Bay View, N.S., lobsters; Margaree, N.S., salmon; Selkirk, Man., whitefish; New Westminster, B.C., salmon; Battle Creek, B.C., salmon.

Mr. SPROULE. Last year I drew the attention of the minister to the fact that there were splendid opportunities for establishing fish hatcheries on the Georgian Bay. The place where they collect fish fry for their hatcheries is about 300 miles distant from here. It seems to me it would be a better plan to establish a hatchery in close proximity to where the fish fry is collected, because it would sustain less injury in transportation. There are several streams entering into the Georgian Bay that I believe would be very suitable places for fish hatcheries. One especially at the Beaver River, which enters into Georgian Bay at Thornbury—I do not think there could be a better place found in Canada for a fish hatchery for salmon, trout and whitefish. Salmon, trout and whitefish fry are collected there and also at Meaford. There is only one other hatchery on these waters, that at Sarnia, none on the Georgian Bay whatever. The minister last year promised to give it some attention, and I inferred he would consider the matter favourably during the summer. But although three new hatcheries have been established since then, or are in process of being established, I see he has overlooked my request entirely. As the present minister is an Ontario man and knows the locality well, I merely direct his attention to it. There is very little distribution of public money in these constituencies up there. I think the business could be carried on more economically there than down here, where fish fry have to be brought some hundreds of miles before they are deposited in the hatchery.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In accordance with the promise made by the minister last year, the officers of the department inform me that an investigation has been made regarding this matter, and probably a vote will be put into the supplementaries this year to carry out the project the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. GANONG. I am glad to see the additional amount here, because I think there is nothing we can do that adds more to our national wealth than the development of fishing industries. I had hoped that a portion of this money would be spent in the Bay of Fundy or in the county of Charlotte. I would like to have seen one Liberal promise carried out. The late Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Railways and Canals, when they were down there certainly promised that a fish hatchery should be one of their first considerations. In a business point of view there is no location in the country in which a hatchery would add so much to the national wealth as it would in the county of Charlotte. The fish hatcheries, some of them at least, such as the lobster hatcheries on the Nova Scotia coast, I think at Bay View, are providing lobsters chiefly for canning. The hatchery on the Bay of Fundy, as the hon. member for St. John will admit, would furnish a class of lobsters that bring 18 or 20 cents alive. The fact that we are so close to the American market certainly makes that location one of the best in the lower provinces for such a hatchery. I hope the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries will, at his earliest convenience, take this matter into consideration. Those waters in years past have been teeming with lobsters, and so far as a feeding ground is concerned, no doubt the biological report will show there are no waters in the country better fitted for propagating lobsters than the waters of Charlotte county.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he makes provision for any lobster hatcheries in New Brunswick ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, but representations have been made, the matter is being investigated, and probably we will deal with it later on in the session.

Mr. EMMERSON. I call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that the hatchery at Pictou has been doing very excellent work indeed. I am informed that the officers of the department have had under consideration a very favourable report on the necessity of establishing a hatchery somewhere on the Straits of Northumberland, at or near Shemogue, of which place we have heard; and also in the county of Gloucester, at Shippegan. I am sure the necessity must be apparent if one takes into consideration the decrease in the fishery returns in respect to lobsters. I need only invite the attention of my hon. friend to the importance of establishing such hatcheries in New Brunswick.

Fisheries protection service, including maintenance of new vessels in British Columbia, $120,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What headway has the hon. gentleman made with the new vessel they were building last year in British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will very soon be ready for service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the minister to reserve one item in these

estimates so that the higher estimates could be discussed later on, and those relative to the fisheries generally.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I made that proposition yesterday, and I am glad to agree to it. Being new in the department, I am anxious to hear criticisms from both sides, and I am also anxious to get all the information I can on these subjects.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) I expect will be here next week. He has taken a good deal of interest in matters relative to the fishery protective service, and has made, I think, some suggestions with respect to permanently employing the crews instead of dismissing them in the fall. I do not want to discuss the matter now, but merely ask to have the matter stand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The greatest latitude will be given to the discussion on that or any other matter. In a very few days the supplementary estimates will be presented, when another occasion will be afforded for discussing the matter.

Canadian fisheries exhibit, $2,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is that for ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is for caretaking and incidental expenses incurred at the exhibit on O'Connor street.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it for use for the purpose of improving and increasing the exhibit from time to time, or for maintenance ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is to be used in a practical way. There is a hatchery in operation. I would ask my hon. friend to go down and see the important work that is going on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I saw it a few years ago and I wanted to know whether it is just the same as it was then or whether it is improving.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is improving.

To pay persons employed in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for services in connection with the distribution of the fishing bounty, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $5,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the explanation of this vote ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend, perhaps, is aware of the fact that there is a large amount of this bounty to be paid out and a large number of temporary employees, altogether young ladies, are engaged about the first of the year getting out the bounty cheques. This has been the practice ever since this bounty has been paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This work is performed here in Ottawa?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. GANONG. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the commanders of the cruisers receive any additional pay for the distribution of the bounty cheques ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed they are not distributed by the captains of the cruisers at all but by the fishery overseers.

Mr. GANONG. That may be true in some instances, but I had some communication with the department some time ago in connection with Captain Pratt, who should have paid the bounty to the fishermen several weeks sooner but did not do so, simply because he happened at the time to be away on the coast of Nova Scotia. I made the suggestion that the cheques be sent to the collector of customs at Grand Manan.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is an inspector of fisheries as well.

Mr. GANONG. I think that some better means of distribution should be arranged. The captain may be at North Head one day and the fishermen may be 14 or 15 miles away, unable to make communication with him, only having their boats. Unless the tides serve well, it is impossible for them to get up in time. If these cheques were left with the collector of customs, who is a very honourable and trustworthy man, and a good Liberal, at North Head, he would be able to distribute them much more conveniently. I think that at some time in the future the hon. minister might consider another thing to which I shall draw his attention, and it is that I believe that the inspector's position in these coastal waters would be much better served by having available a steam launch of sufficient size to perform the service in these waters alone. This steam launch would be available for service in the event of any wrecks such as have occurred along the coast of Grand Manan. I think the hon. gentlemen all know of the reefs off that island and of the disastrous wrecks that have occurred there. While we have a life-saving station at Seal Cove we have not the advantage of steam communication. If these two services were combined it would make them very much more efficient, and I believe that the navigation of these waters would be made very much safer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am pleased to have the statement of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) who lives in the vicinity, and

I shall certainly ask a report from the officers of my department upon the suggestions he has made.

Mr. SPROULE. How much money is distributed in fishing bounties every year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $160,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Distributed amongst how many—boats, I suppose it is ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, it is individuals—in round numbers 25,000 cheques.

Mr. SPROULE. And it takes $5,000 to make out 25,000 cheques ?

Oyster culture, $7,000.

Mr. WADE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if out of this vote ground is to be prepared at Goat Island in the Annapolis Basin ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am unable to give the information, but I will make a note of the question and bring the information later.

Mr. BELL. I would like to ask the hon. minister what work is proposed to be done under that estimate in the lower provinces—Nova Scotia for instance, this year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is proposed to provide oyster beds in Nova Scotia, at Minas Basin, Annapolis Basin, Malagawatch, Mira River and East Bay, south side of Bras d'Or Lakes. There are five places where beds are being prepared.

Mr. HACKETT. How many of these beds have been prepared in Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Beds have been prepared at Murray Harbour, North River, Grand River, and Richmond Bay.

Mr. HACKETT. In what part of Richmond Bay is this bed placed ? Richmond Bay is a natural oyster bed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry that I am not able to give the information, but I will send the hon. gentleman a sketch of the point where this bed has been placed.

Mr. HACKETT. What has been done on the North River ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed that beds are being prepared there. The planting will be done during the coming session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman tell us what the practice of the department is in regard to the issue of oyster licenses ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When the application is made for an oyster license, a lease is made out and the location is defined by the inspector, or fishery overseer of the district.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For what period of time are they usually granted and what is the fee ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One year. In some cases I am informed they have been given for three years. The accountant does not remember just what the fee is that is charged. It seems to me the fees vary according to the size of the ground granted by the overseers.

To assist in the establishment, maintenance and inspection of cold storage for deep sea fishermen under conditions to be fixed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, $25,000.

Mr. KENDALL. Before this item is carried, I would like to bring to the attention of the committee the fact that the results which have attended so far the initiation of the cold storage system in Nova Scotia have been more gratifying than we could have anticipated. I wish to point out to the government that if we are going to deal with this great question of bait supply for what is perhaps the greatest industry we have in the maritime provinces, an industry which would represent $15,000,000 annually, we cannot stop at the point we have now reached. The bait freezers at present in operation are principally to serve the wants of the shore fisheries while no provision has been made for the bank fisheries. Of course, the stores in these small freezers can be drawn upon by the bank fishermen, but when we take into consideration the enormous loss entailed every year by the bank fishermen it will be seen that something more will have to be done. I would throw out by way of suggestion that in my humble opinion it would be a paying thing for the country and for the government to establish one freezer at a cost of about $35,000 or $40,000 at some important point along the Atlantic coast where bait could be most easily procured, in order that five or six hundred vessels, some large and some small, would be enabled to obtain a sufficient supply of bait. I think there is no doubt that our losses would average at least anywhere from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 yearly from the want of this accommodation. I wish to point out also to the government that the adjoining colony of Newfoundland is now arranging for the installation of a bait plant there. If we are to compete with the Newfoundland fisheries, we must be thoroughly supplied with bait as are the Newfoundland fishermen. I would point out that our competitors from Gloucester, New York, and Boston have also constant supplies of frozen

bait on hand. It is a matter of prime importance that perhaps the largest industry, except agriculture, in the maritime provinces, should be accommodated with all necessary adjuncts for its successful operation. There is another matter to which I wish to call the attention of the House. I wish to point out that the freight receipts from the growing fresh fish trade from the maritime provinces to the west are increasing and increasing rapidly. I will give you one instance. Four years ago one firm, probably the largest of the fish firms, paid $10,000 in railway freights from the Straits of Canso; next year it paid $12,000; next year $14,000, and last year it paid, I think, $20,000. Let me say also that the facilities at the railway terminals in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are not what they should be. Before we can meet the requirements of the fresh fish trade we must have a few small refrigerators costing anywhere from $1,500 to $2,500 at the principal railway terminals in the maritime provinces.

Mr. GANONG. Do you refer to mechanical cold storage ?

Mr. KENDALL. No. As far as I can understand the mechanical cold storage is more economical when you freeze over 800 tons, but under that, the idea seems to prevail that ice and salt is more economical. I repeat what I said last year, that on the Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway the cold storage cars provided are not what they should be. Numbers of these cars are defective in construction. At some other time I shall draw attention to this matter, but I may state now in passing, that a great number of the cold storage cars on Canadian railways are not in a sanitary condition. It is also true that many of the refrigerators in Canada are not in a sanitary condition and very frequently meat and fish transported arrive in a semi-putrid condition. I am nevertheless of the opinion that the results from our system of cold storage have been very gratifying up to the present time, and I beg to urge upon the government that they should grapple with this larger question which is certainly one of very great concern to a large proportion of the population of the maritime provinces —a population which seems inclined to remain by the fishing industry, and which I regret to say is very much inclined indeed to move to the United States.

Mr. HACKETT. I corroborate the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall). Some few years ago, that hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) came to Prince Edward Island for the purpose of establishing these bait freezers and the undertaking has proved a complete success. If there was nothing else done by the government during their period of office to assist the fishermen of the maritime provinces, the establishment of these bait freezers has been a great boon to them. On the coasts of our maritime provinces, we have fishermen who must go out to sea in their small boats, and if they have not proper bait they cannot succeed in their calling. Gentlemen from the other provinces may not think much of the bait freezing experiment, but it has undoubtedly proved a great boon to the fishermen of the provinces by the sea. I would like to call the attention of the government to the fact, that after a shore fisherman catches the fish he must have some appliances whereby he can cure his fish properly for the West Indian and other markets. I believe that the government should do something in the way of providing patent driers to assist the fishermen in carrying out their industry. If you have these driers you will have the fish cured in proper condition, so that it can fairly compete with other fish in the markets of the world. That is especially true of the province of Prince Edward Island where, because of the sandy and loamy soil, and damp weather causing evaporation, the fish becomes dark when sun dried, and do not take the position on the markets which they should take. I trust that in addition to the bait freezers, the government will see its way clear to assist the fishermen in getting these patent driers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am pleased to hear the remarks of my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) and also to hear an endorsement of the benefits which these bait freezers have conferred. I think the proposition of my hon. friend is a practical one, and while I promised probably to do a good deal, I certainly feel that the subject he has brought before the House, and the suggestion he has made is a very important one, and it will have early consideration.

Mr. GANONG. Perhaps I may be in a better position to speak on this vote than some of the other members of the House, because I have invested some $15,000 in mechanical cold storage for precisely the purpose that is referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Kendall). There is no question but that this scheme can be carried out, and I think the amount the hon. gentleman suggests probably would be sufficient. I believe a cold storage plant that would cost $35,000 would probably freeze and care for, from two millions to three millions pounds of fish. You may wonder why I did not continue in the business, but I may say that the fish were running erratically for a year or two, and other matters demanded my attention. I may say, however, that the establishment built at White Head, Grand Manan, is still there and I have an engineer to look after it every year so that it will probably be running again. One year I successfully froze 750,000 pounds of fish. It was the year of the Spanish-American war and this fish was sold to American

fisherman. They sent boats to Grand Manan and bought the fish from the freezers, and carried them away in American bottoms. It occurred just about the time of the declaration of war, and the Gloucester fishermen were advised to throw their fish overboard and come home, which they did, fearing that some Spanish cruiser might tramp along the coast. I very much favour the proposition made by my hon. friend (Mr. Kendall) as it is one of the most important things which the government can possibly take up. There is a great deal of expense in connection with it. While there is a great difference between the initial cost of the fish and the price for which we can sell them, yet you have constantly to maintain your power and appliances, and with other attendant expenses the scheme gets too costly almost for a private corporation to take hold of. Up to the present time there is certainly some element of experiment in it.

Mr. KENDALL. I wish to recognize on behalf of the maritime provinces, the benefits we have derived during the initiation of these plants, from the services of Mr. J. F. Fraser, one of the engineers of the department. Mr. Fraser has given a degree of satisfaction that has made him the friend of every fisherman on these shores where he has visited. I also wish to observe that while we have had success in connection with a number of these freezers, we have not had success with regard to all. We have found it very difficult indeed to get the fishermen to co-operate. We started out with an ideal plan of putting the refrigerators in the hands of the fishermen themselves, but I am afraid that in some cases at least we will have to recede from that position and endeavour to enlist the sympathies of some business men.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) what railways he is referring to when he speaks of the refrigerator cars being in an unsanitary condition. Does he include the refrigerator cars on the Intercolonial Railway, or are there any such ?

Mr. KENDALL. There are some refrigerator cars on the Intercolonial Railway, and while I do not say that they are in an unsanitary condition, yet the construction of some of them is defective. I have seen cars arriving in Sydney and Glace Bay loaded with meat from large Ontario concerns and when the meat arrived, it certainly was not fit for food.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As far as many railways are concerned, we have no particular control over them, but in the case of the Intercolonial Railway we have something to say. If the hon. gentleman has anything to complain of with regard to the construction of the cars or the accommodation on the Intercolonial Railway, we should know it, so that we may bring that matter to the attention of the railway department.

Mr. KENDREY. It has been brought to the attention of that department.

Ottawa-Astronomical Observatory, $15,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before this passes, I would like to remind the Minister of Public Works that last year he promised the Committee on Public Accounts that Mr. Charleson and Mr. Rochester and any other necessary witness would be present before that committee this year with all necessary vouchers. I would like to know whether or not he will be in a position to redeem that promise.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Charleson and Mr. Rochester are both in town and available as soon as the committee on Public Accounts meets. Mr. Boyer, one of the officers sent to the Yukon, will also be here a short time, and Mr. Taché.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much has been expended and what will be the total expenditure on this item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not made much progress. The plans have been prepared and a site chosen on the experimental farm. But the plans prepared were too expensive, and new ones are being made for a building, the cost of which is not to exceed $40,000.

Ottawa—Branch of Royal Mint, $50,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect visited England, France and Belgium in order to obtain data for the preparation of plans. He has come back and prepared plans which have been sent to England and have not yet been returned. We are ready to begin the work now and are awaiting the return of the plans. The site chosen is on Nepean Point. The cost will be about $300,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the plans have to be approved by the Imperial authority ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is a branch of the Royal Mint.

Mr. PUTTEE. Has the Minister decided whether this building is to be constructed on the day labour principle.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In every work we have undertaken, we have always submitted our rates to the Labour Department, although perhaps at times that has caused us a lot of work and trouble. Still we have acted in good faith with the House.

Parliament buildings—addition to building over engine-house and improvements in main vestibule, including two electric elevators, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that the words 'including two electric elevators' be struck out as these elevators are paid out of another appropriation. The $15,000 I am asking for is destined to provide further accommodation in the attic. I think the work carried on has been successful. We intend taking as many rooms as possible in the attic for members of parliament and replacing the old flooring by mosaic pavement.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this include the new building put up here ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, this is new work altogether not yet undertaken. If my hon. friend will go up stairs he will find that we will be able to give more accommodation by building rooms in the attic and continuing the work we have begun.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose this is intended to induce us to live on another year on promises.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid my hon. friend lives too much in the past.

Mr. SPROULE. Last year we were promised a considerable number of rooms for the use of members, but this year we find very few more than last, although considerable extensions have been made. The opposition have hardly been given their just rights and would like the Minister to do something more.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I have done for the Opposition this year is not as much as I would like to have done, but I propose to do more later on. I have consulted Mr. Speaker, and we have given a large room to the leader of the opposition for the province of Quebec (Mr. Monk) and another room to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden). That makes two additional rooms for the opposition, and when we have built more rooms in the attic I think we will be able to gratify the wishes of our friends opposite. Our friends on this side complain just as bitterly and perhaps more so than my hon. friends opposite. We cannot give more than we have. We have built a very fine committee room. The debates reporters have been given nice quarters and their old room has been given to the Minister of Finance, who requires a large room as he receives large deputations.

Mr. SPROULE. As regards the distribution of the rooms, I think there might have been a better distribution without doing great injustice to any person. While on my feet, let me say that last year I understood that one of the objects of building this extension was to give a much larger committee room to the Railway Committee and allow the Railway Committee room to be used by some other committee. I asked that the Agricultural Committee should be allowed to use the old Railway Committee room because it is the next largest committee to that of railways and because the room in which it has been the custom to meet is altogether too small. In fact it is impossible for its members to get seats when there is an average attendance. I suggested, at the last meeting of that committee, that we should use the old Railway Committee room, but was told that we could not be allowed the use of it for the present. There was no particular reason why we should not use it, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether it was not the intention, when providing this increased accommodation, to furnish larger rooms for the use of some of the larger committees.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Speaker has the right of distributing the rooms and I do not object to his doing so at all. I am prepared to give up all my privileges in that connection because they really give more trouble than pleasure. I am in the hands of the House. If the House prefers to deal with Mr. Speaker, I shall be delighted to give up all my rights immediately. If I am to distribute the rooms, I am prepared to be responsible, or I am quite ready to act jointly with Mr. Speaker. After the observations made, I do not see why the old committee room should not be used by the Committee on Agriculture, which is a very important committee. We have a large committee room up stairs, large enough to accommodate a considerable assembly of people. So, I do not see why the old committee room should not be used in the way pointed out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would hardly be convenient to have this room assigned exclusively to the Committee on Agriculture. There are other important committees, and they do not all meet on the same day. I should think that several committees could use this room, with a little adjustment. I would like it understood that such committees as that on Banking and Commerce, Public Accounts, and others, have equal rights.

Mr. SPROULE. I had no intention of suggesting that the Committee on Agriculture should have sole use of the room. The Committee on Public Accounts and possibly others might also use it, as they do not meet on the same days as the Committee on Agriculture. This room might accommodate two or three committees. As soon as the Minister of Public Works and Mr. Speaker come to a decision as to who has authority, we shall be able to discuss matters. It is easier to deal with one of these gentlemen than both. Both are very able, and I do not know with which of them I would prefer to deal. Heretofore we have always considered that Mr. Speaker has authority in these subjects.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection.

Mr. SPROULE. When we find who has the authority, we will deal with him.

Mr. COCHRANE. Did I understand the Minister of Public Works to say that when he got the plans for the Royal Mint he was going to construct that building by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WO[illegible] No, it will be by tender—most decidedly.

Mr. CLARKE. How many additional rooms does the hon. minister hope to be able to provide in the attic of this building by the expenditure of this vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect thought he would be able to provide four large rooms.

Mr. CLARKE. Will there be any further accommodation for hon. gentlemen on this side ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think we may speak of that when the rooms are ready. I will do the fair thing next year, as I have done this year.

Mr. CLARKE. There is another matter to which I wish to direct attention, and I am sure that I have only to mention it to have hon. gentlemen opposite agree with me. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has a room about twenty feet long by ten feet wide. An hon. gentleman beside me suggests that it is six feet wide, and probably it is nearer six than ten. In the discharge of his important duties, the leader of the opposition, as hon. gentlemen opposite know, must receive a great many persons who desire to call upon him. He requires also the services of a stenographer. And, when I point out to the minister that when a gentleman calls upon the leader of the opposition on business, he must send his stenographer out to stand about in the lobby until the interview is over, I think I say all that is necessary to convince him that better accommodation is required for the leader of the opposition. The suggestion has been made—I do not know enough about the internal arrangement of the House to form an opinion as to whether it is practicable or not—that if the room between No. 6 and that occupied by the hon. leader of the opposition were vacated by the present occupant and added to the room which the leader of the opposition occupies, it might be used by his stenographer and also by some other members who have large correspondence and require some better accommodation to enable them to handle it. At any rate, I feel I can appeal to the hon. Minister of Public Works on behalf of the leader of the opposition to ask that better accommodation be provided.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know very well that the hon. leader of the opposition is not accommodated as he ought to be. It is true that all leaders of the opposition for the last twenty years have occupied the same room, but that does not make the case any better.

Mr. CLARKE. It is time for a change.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In some respects—yes. So far as the point referred to is concerned, I fully agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) that it is time for a change. The room allotted to the hon. leader of the opposition is so small that no ordinary business man would locate even a subordinate employee in it. His secretary must be in the same room and right at his side. When the new rooms are built upstairs, if my authority in the matter is admitted, I think I may find it possible, not by a general change, but by a pretty general change, to accommodate my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) as he has a right to be, and as the country has a right to expect that he will be accommodated.

Mr. BELL. Do I understand that that part of the vote relating to two electric elevators is struck out ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the elevators are built and are being paid for out of another appropriation.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—public buildings—Ottawa-Victoria Memorial Museum, $50,000.

Mr. CLARKE. We would like some information about this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say we have not done much yet. The chief architect has been away in connection with the Royal Mint, and we had so much on hand in the way of public buildings that we have not been able to proceed very fast. Moreover, there are difficulties in the way. The first difficulty is as to site. It was suggested last year that we might choose Major's Hill Park. I am free to admit that I have not made up my mind about the matter yet. This is a very important question. We claim to be a nation, and we are getting big very fast. We are not building for to-day only, but must think of the future. I have, therefore, hesitated to make definite choice of a site. Moreover, I would not like to spend too much money on this museum. At the same time, I feel the responsibility which rests upon this government as it has rested upon previous governments, in that we have a valuable national collection which is exposed to destruction any day. I would not like, however, to spend over half a million for this building. I have no doubt that when I come before the House next year a definite step will have been taken. So far, at least, no money has been spent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I notice that the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) seems to be very

much worried over the expenditure of money. I have observed the same thing ever since I have come into the House. I hope his anxiety concerning this expenditure or any other is not affecting his health seriously. As to myself and the accommodation which has been afforded me, I am glad to say that, so far as the room can be made suitable, I certainly am indebted to the hon. minister for doing everything in his power to provide for me.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—Harbours and rivers, River St. Lawrence Ship Channel, $500,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the hon. minister going to do with this money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the work that is in progress between Quebec and Montreal. We have six elevator dredges, and one large suction dredge lately built at the Polson Iron Works in Toronto. These six dredges work night and day at a cost of $30,000 each. We expect that the large suction dredge to which I have alluded will cost for operation $70,000 a year—and by a year, I mean 185 days. That dredge was tested last fall. Should it, in actual work, respond to our expectations—which are very high, I wish to say—she will work at a very cheap rate. She has a capacity of 2,000 yards an hour; in other words, if she works well, she will dredge nearly nine millions of cubic yards in 185 days. I do not rely on such large results; but, even if you take off 20 per cent you will see that the dredge will carry on our work very fast and at a very cheap rate. In fact, if it worked to its full capacity the cost of dredging will be only eight-tenths of a cent per yard, that is, if it worked twenty-four hours a day at its full capacity. But I do not expect that result. But even if it only does half that, you will have the dredging done at a cent and a half a yard. We expect that that dredge will do work for one cent a yard. Other modern dredges we have built during the last three or four years are doing work for 3, 3½ and 4 cents, while the old dredges did work at a cost of 25 to 30 cents a yard. Now, of this $500,000, $250,000 will be employed for dredges on the St. Lawrence river. The balance of the money will be employed, among other things, to build a new twin screw tug to replace an old one, which will cost in the neighbourhood of $25,000; for the construction of two large dump scows for dredging, $26,000; completion of one scow, $4,000; construction of one flat scow with boiler, $7,000 ; construction of one saw-mill, $15,000 ; construction and equipment of a marine railway, workshops and shipyard, $20,000 ; refitting shipyard, $5,000 ; rebuilding wharf, $3,000. We have $30,000 left for unforeseen expenses.

I will add for the information of the House that we have now in Sorel a shipyard in first-class condition. We are building not only for the St. Lawrence channel, but for the whole country. For instance, we are building at this moment a large dredge for the maritime provinces. We are building it with Canadian labour, we are building it on Canadian soil, we are training Canadian skilled men, we are doing the work as cheaply as it can be done on this side of the ocean. I hope and trust that in the future the government will never be obliged to go elsewhere for our ships or anything else that we can build here. I have endeavoured, as far as my department is concerned, to carry out a policy of building on Canadian soil, either at Sorel or elsewhere, all the plant that was necessary to do our work.

The capacity of the dredge that we are building in the maritime provinces will be 1,800 yards an hour. I may say that I hope it will be the best dredge in the world. It is a very complicated piece of machinery indeed. That is saying a good deal, but I think I am within the truth in stating that the dredge that we have built in Toronto is the most modern dredge that has been built. The dredge for the maritime provinces will be a suction dredge and an elevator dredge at the same time; in other words, when the dredge is called upon to work in soft material we will use the suction machinery, and when it works in harder material we will use the elevator machinery. Now this suction dredge has discharging pipes, and at the same time it will be a hopper dredge. In other words, it will carry away its own material when the weather is stormy, or when the dredge works in some exposed place. I think that dredge will cost in the neighbourhood of $300,000. The Toronto dredge costs $250,000 with the whole equipment. The capacity of the Toronto dredge is 2,000 yards an hour. My opinion is that that dredge will do work for less than a cent a yard.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). I am delighted to hear from the Minister of Public Works that we are going to have in Nova Scotia the benefit of the best dredge in the world. I think that will be very satisfactory to the people of Nova Scotia. Being a suction dredge, I hope it will be successful in sucking up some of the shoals we have in the harbours already built. There is a harbour in my own county that cost $80,000 or $82,000, on which no work or any improvement has been made for the last twenty-eight or twenty-nine years. It now needs to be dredged, and I hope before the season is over to see this great dredge doing service in several places in Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I listened with a good deal of pleasure to the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and was glad to learn that he had adopted the plan of building dredges which I recom-

mended to him three or four years ago. I made a statement in the House some time ago that material in the city of Liverpool for deepening the Mersey had been excavated and removed a certain distance for a sum so small as to seem incredible. I think it was in the neighbourhood of 3 or 3½ cents per cubic yard. I stated also there were improvements likely to be made in the port of New York, and that dredges of the kind they used in Liverpool were going to be adopted in New York. My remarks fell upon appreciative ears, and I find that the Minister of Public Works has built dredges after the Liverpool plan and the New York plan. The hon. gentleman says that material can be moved for eight-tenths of a cent per cubic yard on the St. Lawrence. Possibly that may be so, under the system he tells us he has adopted, of using a hopper dredge having pipes carrying away the material to a certain distance and depositing it on either shore. If he succeeds, he will reduce the cost which has been in the past as high as 28 or 29 cents per cubic yard. Even if he reduces it to 4 or 5 cents, he will accomplish a great deal, and the dredge will well repay the expenditure of money used in building it. These dredges are necessary. The minister has not stated the number of cubic yards that require to be removed on the St. Lawrence and the probable cost of doing that work, or when it is likely to be completed. It is only a year or two since all the requisite improvements upon the St. Lawrence river between Montreal and Quebec have been completed. I remember when I was a minister of the Crown that we determined upon selling off those useless dredges which were encamped down at Sorel or in the neighbourhood. There were fifteen or twenty, for which there was no use at all after the improvements on the St. Lawrence river in the way of deepening had been nearly completed. The minister it appears has decided upon having a further depth at the port of Montreal, and I think he is correct. He is extending the depth from twenty-six or twenty-eight feet to thirty feet. I think that is the least we can do if we are going to make Montreal a terminal port for the purpose of transportation, so that a vessel of thirty feet draught will be able to come up to Montreal. As it is nearly six o'clock, I would like the minister to state the amount of material which is required to be excavated for the purpose of accomplishing his object, and the time it will require to do it. It is to be hoped that we may have soon an end of this enormous expenditure we have made in the past for improving navigation between Quebec and Montreal.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I will not be here after eight o'clock and as this item may be passed in the meantime, I would like to ask the hon. minister a question or two. He may answer it after eight o'clock, and if I am not here, I will read his answer in the 'Hansard' on Monday. I have no objection to a very large amount being voted for the purpose of improving the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec. I will go as far as the hon. minister, or any person in this House in that direction, but when that money is voted I want to know that it is applied to the purpose for which it is voted. I notice by looking at the Auditor General's Report, V—43, a long list of items charged against the money which is voted for this purpose and which have nothing whatever to do with the deepening of a ship channel. I do not suppose these goods are bought by tender because of the very large amounts which, I find, have been paid for them. At V—43 of the Auditor General's Report I find that Robillard & Co., of Montreal, received $1,271.45 out of the money voted for the improvement of the ship channel, as follows :

Wilton carpet, made and laid, 179·42 yards at $2.75, $493.41.

Two dollars and seventy-five cents for Wilton carpet ! I had my hon. friend (Mr. Birkett) telephone down to one of the large carpet houses in Ottawa and find out the price of the best Wilton carpet. He found out that Wilton carpet is worth from $1.50 to $2.35 a yard. For this same carpet the hon. gentleman has paid $2.75 a yard.

Wilton stair carpet, ¾, 7 yards at $2.75, 1, 6½ yards at $3.25 ; paper, 100 yards at 10c., Brussels carpet, 20 yards at $1, $69.83.

Linoleum, 38 yards at $1.50, 202 yards at 65c., 100 yards at 60c., $248.30.

Livonea, 64½ yards at $1.50 ; table oil cloth, 18¾ yards, $7.80, $104.55.

Edging, 180 yards at 50c.; bazier, 24 yards at $1.85 ; velvet rugs, 5 at $4, $154.40.

Silk lining, 60¼ yards at $1.25 ; special loops, 32 at $2; 1 sweeper, $4, $143.31.

This is one of those carpet sweepers that you can buy at any carpet store for $2.25.

Table cloths, 1 at $20, 1 at $5; tassel hooks, 32 pairs at 35c.; 2 mats, $7.50 ; sundry, $13,95, $57.65.

Making altogether a grand total of $1,271.45, taken out of the money that we voted last year for the improvement and deepening of this ship channel, and for what purpose ? Fitting up, I presume, some tug boat down there, because the hon. gentleman has nothing but dredges and tugs. It may have been for the fitting up of the steamer 'Eureka' or some other tug. Is that a proper way to spend the money that we have voted for a specific purpose, for the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec ? I turn over to the next page V—44, and I find that Messrs J. & R. Weir, Montreal, were paid $4,125 for a marine, D., flue boiler for tug boat tested to 200 lbs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. After a tender this time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the tenders must have been very limited, because I am asking for tenders for a boiler of practically the same capacity and I have a tender which I will bring on Monday for a boiler of 150 h.p. placed in our factory for $1,000.

Mr. COWAN. It is second hand.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is not second hand; it is made by the best makers. It is practically a marine boiler and just as good a boiler as there is in any tug boat, and it is made by Messrs Goldie & McCulloch. My hon. friend talks about the price of a tug boat, but if he pays $4,000 for a boiler he will have nothing left for the rest of the equipment. I find in the report of the Auditor General large sums of money, which we have voted, expended in the purchase of goods, bought without tenders and for which two or three prices have been paid to the political friends of the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Prince and Princess of Wales were to visit this country. I thought it was only fair to have a boat equipped on which they might be entertained on the lakes. We were building a boat at Sorel, and I plead guilty to the charge of having equipped her in a way in which I would not have thought of equipping a boat under ordinary circumstances. I quite admit that my officers have spent perhaps $2,000 or $3,000 and perhaps more, but they have done it in providing a boat in a fitting way for an event that was expected to take place.

Mr. TAYLOR. For the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Minister of Public Works has been only twice on board of that boat. I am not a man who travels for pleasure. I have not done it so far. I hope I will be able in my older days to do so, but so far I have not found time to do it. I would like to have that pleasure. This boat was equipped with a certain degree of luxury. Those of my hon. friends who have been ministers of the Crown will freely admit that it is not a bad thing when strangers of distinction come here that we may be enabled to place at their disposal, cars and boats that will not be a disgrace to us. However, I state the case as it is. I quite grant that we have spent a little too much money for ordinary purposes, but there was no boat on the lakes suitable for the expected occasion.

Mr. TAYLOR. How about the prices that I have quoted ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not bought carpets myself. If my officers have paid too much, I would be very sorry, but my hon. friend has proved on several occasions that he falls into exaggeration. There are carpets and carpets, as there are men and men. There are some carpets that cost more than other carpets do. I am very glad that my hon. friend has asked the question, because if it had not been explained it would not have looked very well for an ordinary tug boat to be equipped in such a way as that.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the Prince and Princess of Wales were entertained upon that boat ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, because the Prince made up his mind not to travel on the lakes. The programme which was placed in our hands at the time provided for a trip on the lakes. We had no boat ready, and I think it was not a crime for me to do what I have done.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this the boat into which the new boiler was put ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the new boiler that my hon. friend speaks of is in the right place. My hon. friend speaks of political friends. Will he allow me to state that Mr. Weir, of Montreal, is not a political friend of mine. The order has been given to Mr. Weir after tender in competition with several firms and it was given to a man, who, as I have said, is not a political friend of mine.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this the boat from which that magnificent display of fireworks was made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must say that it is the same boat.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 7) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Ingram.

Bill (No. 10) respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Parmelee.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

River St. Lawrence Ship Channel, $500,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was asked by the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) to state the amount of dredging required to be done between Quebec and Montreal to give a channel 30 feet deep. I have much pleasure in being able to give the information. There are 24,000,000 cubic yards to be dredged to accomplish that work. This is made up of 2,000,000 cubic yards for the Longue Pointe section which is between Longue Pointe and Cap St. Michel. It is estimated that three dredges will do that work in 200 days. The second section is the Contrecœur section and the quantity to be dredged is estimated at 3,000,000 cubic yards. Three

dredges will do that work in 200 days. There is Lake St. Peter, 18 miles long, and there will be about 19,000,000 cubic yards to be dredged, if we dredge 500 feet wide; but if we dredge it 450 feet wide there will be between 16,000,000 or 17,000,000 cubic yards of dredging. In the balance of the work between Lake St. Peter and Batiscan, there are 2,800,000 cubic yards. I have no doubt whatever that that work will be completed within the next two years. We have now the equipment to do the work. The ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has very truly said that a few years ago we had only very old dredges. In point of fact when the care of the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal was handed over to the government by the Montreal Harbour Commission in 1888, we had five dredges which were between fourteen and fifteen years old. They had wooden hulls and were altogether out of shape and out of date. You can imagine the condition in which these dredges were when I took office. There was at the time practically only one dredge which was fit for work. That was the dredge 'Laval' that was built by my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Ouimet. Since then, thanks to the generosity of parliament, thanks to the attention that has been given by both sides of the House to the transportation question, I have been able to get enough money to build a magnificent fleet of dredges, of stone elevators and tugs. With the dredges we have on hand now we will complete that great national work of dredging the St. Lawrence river 30 feet deep and 450 feet wide between Quebec and Montreal during the next two years, or about that time. As I have said, in Lake St. Peter there are between 16,000,000 and 17,000,000 cubic yards of dredging if we dredge the channel 450 feet wide. With the big suction dredge that was tested last fall in Toronto I am confident that work will be completed in two years or about that. There were 50 miles to dredge between Quebec and Montreal to make the channel 30 feet deep, but during the last two years we have dredged 19 miles. Therefore, to-day we have 19 miles, 30 feet deep and 450 feet wide, and still wider in the curves. There remains 18 miles in round numbers to be dredged in Lake St. Peter. That work will be done by the big dredge constructed for that special purpose.

Mr. WILSON. How deep is the water in that part?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was supposed that we have 27½ feet, but I am sorry to say that in reality we have not that depth of water. We are to-day dredging to 30 feet deep, which is to say 4 feet deeper than the lowest water in 1897.

Mr. KEMP. Does this channel fill in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The channel does not fill in.

Mr. KEMP. The ice does not move the boulders into the channel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. I have a statement here from Mr. Cosky, the engineer in charge of the work on the St. Lawrence, to the effect that during the last ten or twelve years we have not spent $20,000 to dredge any parts of the channel where there may have been some filling. In point of fact there is no filling. In two years or about that, we will have between Quebec and Montreal a channel 30 feet deep, 450 feet wide in the straight parts and from 500 to 800 feet wide in the curves. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has asked me how much it will cost to complete that work. It is an easy calculation to make. I am asking $500,000 this year. Out of that amount $250,000 will be for the working of the fleet of dredges. We do not expect to spend more next year for that purpose. This year, as last year, I expect that I will ask parliament for large sums of money to build dredges. It is practically our last year of building. Our fleet will then be completed as far as I can see. We will have some little work to do, but the main work of dredge building will be completed. Our expenditure will be then confined to the working of our fleet. There is some work to be done below Quebec. At low tide there will be, I suppose, about one mile to dredge where there is now only 22 or 23 feet of water at low tide. Of course we have betwen 16 feet and 18 feet of tide there. In the calculation I have submitted to the House I did not take into account the Cap la Roche and Richelieu channels, because there we are helped by the tide. I do not say that it will not be found necessary later on to increase the width and depth of that channel, although there is a difficult problem to solve there.

Mr. KEMP. Below Quebec?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) will kindly have a look at the map he will find that Cap la Roche is situated above Quebec. We have a tide there. When the trade develops later on, the country will see whether it will be necessary or not to do any work there. For the time being we do not find that it is necessary.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). What is the nature of the dredging to be done there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Lake St. Peter it is sand and clay.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Where do you deposit it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Lake St. Peter we have a big suction dredge with a discharging pipe. The material is dredged out and at the same time deposits it 1,000 feet or even 2,000 feet away from the dredge. We will not have

any trouble there. Elsewhere we are obliged to use scows and tugs to deposit the material wherever it is most convenient to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Did I understand the minister to say that the dredging done by this new suction dredge will cost only about one cent a cubic yard ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we expect it will not cost more than that.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the estimated cost of all the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This year we will spend a quarter of a million; next year there is no reason why we should spend more; the year after we will spend about the same. In round numbers, I do not think, by what I can see, that it will cost more than a quarter of a million dollars each year for working the dredges we have in hand now. In two years I hope we will have about completed the work, but let us say that it takes at the outside three years to do it. I do not expect all the work to be done below Quebec in that time, although there is not much expenditure there.

Mr. SPROULE. There are only about 24,000,000 yards to be dredged between Montreal and Quebec and if the hon. gentleman can do that at less than a cent a yard, that would be $240,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said I expected that the dredging in Lake St. Peter would not cost more than a cent a yard, but I did not say that the dredging in the other parts of the channel could be done for that price, because the material is harder. If my hon. friend wants to know what the dredging costs to-day, he will find it in my report at page 186. During last year the dredging done by the dredge 'Lady Aberdeen' cost three and a quarter cents per yard in some parts and in others two and half. The dredging done by the 'Lady Minto' cost in some parts two cents and in others twenty-two cents and in others four and a half and four and three quarters. The 'Lady Laurier' did the work at three and a half cents. The dredging by the dredge 'Laval' cost six cents in some parts. The cost varies according to the material to be dredged. The new dredges are doing the work at three cents and three cents and a half on an average. We have an old dredge, number 11—an old remnant of the past—which cannot do the work at the same prices at all.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the name of the new suction dredge built at Toronto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have had the weakness to call it after myself, and I know it will do just as good work.

Mr. WILSON. I did not quite catch what the hon. minister said about the cost of the dredging.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We expect to spend about a quarter of a million dollars each year for three years.

Mr. KEMP. I understood the hon. minister to say that the channel would be thirty feet deep, and I understand that St. Peter's channel originally averaged nine feet deep. Does the hon. minister say that the walls of this channel through lake St. Peter, which is to be thirty feet deep, although of clay and sand, will stand as though they were masonry and that no filling in will take place.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I said it was clay and sand, I should have added that in the channel itself it is only clay. The channel has been dredged for many years and there has been practically no falling in except in one part. We have the experience of the past to go by, and that experience shows us that the walls keep very well because they are of clay. There is sand on the bank, but the channel itself is of clay, and according to our experience that will stand.

Mr. KEMP. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that these dredges were specially built for this work and that this work would be completed in three years. What use will there be then for these dredges ? Can they be used in other places? Can they be taken through the canals and used in Lake Ontario, dredging out the harbours there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be no difficulty at all in taking all these dredges to the lakes. Their heaviest draught is between nine and ten feet when light. As to the use that will be made of them, I have not much anxiety. There is any amount of dredging to be done, and there will be no difficulty finding use for them. Of course it will be always necessary to keep some dredges on hand, but if the country should decide to dispose of those dredges, there will be no trouble doing so because they are very fine dredges indeed. Of course I do not know what the future of this country will be. It depends on the men at the helm, it depends on public opinion, but my hon. friends will agree with me that the transportation question is taking hold of public opinion more and more every day, and I am glad to see so many demands made on me for maps. It proves that public opinion is on the right track at last. On the lakes, I do not hesitate in saying, we are not in it. We are only beginning. All our harbours have to be dredged and equipped, and we are doing that work now. There is that French river scheme of mine, which my hon. friends opposite are afraid of. All I ask

of them is the careful attention which public men are bound to give any new question. That is not asking too much. And since I am on this subject I may be allowed to ask my hon. friends on both sides how they intend to dispose of the crops of this country in the future. This year we have a crop of 100,000,000 bushels of grain in Manitoba. Now to carry 25,000,000 bushels of grain through the Canadian system of canals would in the fall require a fleet of over fifty Canadian boats, because an American boat cannot navigate between Canadian points, and each boat cannot carry more than 80,000 bushels through our system of canals. Well, we have not the boats, we have not the equipment ready, and it will take some time before we have that equipment. And when we have disposed of those 25,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat, we have not touched at all the American crop. Duluth, Chicago, Milwaukee—all the great American centres are tributaries to the St. Lawrence. There is only one St. Lawrence river, and thank God it flows through Canadian channels. Taking those figures, I ask you not to be frightened when I speak of the French river channel, because you cannot dispose through Canadian channels of your Canadian crop and you cannot touch at all the American crop. We have spent, and we are spending, large amounts to complete the equipment of our harbours. I want to know why we should not spend a good deal more to complete our channels. Is it not better that Canadian and American crops should be carried through the Welland Canal and French river than be carried through American channels. You have to choose between the two. There is no alternative. Some of my Ontario friends say there are some other routes. I do not hesitate in saying once more that if I had a free hand, if I were an absolute ruler such as the Czar of Russia, I would spend a large amount of money to build up all the avenues of trade that lead to the St. Lawrence. I would not hesitate to recommend a careful study of that air line which my hon. friends from Toronto speak of. The Canadian people do not realize the immense possibilities before them.

Mr. KEMP. I do not wish to discuss the subject which the hon. minister has raised, but simply to ask him a question. He has told us the amount of Canadian grain we have to transport to the seaboard. What is the capacity per annum in bushels of the St. Lawrence Canal system, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada Atlantic at present, and what capacity may they be expected to develop in the course of the next five years ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a question my hon. friend is just as competent as I am to answer. This year Mr. Booth's system has carried twenty million bushels of grain—not all by the St. Lawrence route, but to American ports also. The Grand Trunk Railway has carried a pretty large quantity. I know that the Canadian Pacific Railway carried twelve millions of bushels of wheat to Port William by the close of navigation. Of this quantity seven millions went out by Canadian ports, and five millions by American ports. If the Grand Trunk Railway would make up their mind to double their track between Midland and Montreal, if they would make up their mind to give up Portland and carry by the St. Lawrence route—and I hope they will—great things might be expected. As to the Canadian Pacific Railway, they have not in the past carried a great deal of grain by rail. I am glad to say that this year they are doing better than in the past. They have taken grain direct to the winter port. They are not doing it to very great advantage, perhaps, but they are doing it. When the improvement of the French river is carried out, when you have made it possible for the great lake carriers to take grain to Lake Nipissing, which is 360 miles from Montreal, you will necessarily see a vast accumulation of trade—not only grain, but other trade—at that point. From Lake Nipissing, the Canadian Pacific Railway, during the winter months, will convey the freight to our winter ports. When I speak of the St. Lawrence route, I do not speak only of Montreal, Three Rivers and Quebec, but of the St. Lawrence as a whole—of our winter ports just as much as any others. I believe the Canadian people are realizing more and more that, if we are to be a nation, we must make ourselves independent of our neighbours, not only industrially and commercially, but also in respect of transportation. I have never felt so strongly as I do now that Canadian people should be their own masters. Our American neighbours are, perhaps, friendly to us, but I think we had better be our own friends and consider the ways and means by which we may remain masters of our own destiny. And it is because I have given some attention to this transportation question that I ask hon. members on both sides of this House to study it—I will not say as much as I have done, because I do not boast of having studied more than others—but to give this question the attention that, in my opinion, it deserves.

Mr. FRASER. This question is the most important one before the country. I may differ in opinion from many members of this House, but my opinion is that, while, perhaps, these expenditures are necessary they will not be operative in the end. I believe, that, situated as we are, with the climate that we have, ultimately we must come to it that the exportation of the great volume of products of this country must be carried on from ports that during summer and winter are alike. It might

be worthy of consideration by this parliament whether the sums of money that are being voted could not be set aside to help the railways to make the freight rates as small as possible, so that all the year around the freight could go to the lower provinces to be exported. Of course, for a certain length of time in the year after the crop is gathered, there can be a good deal of exportation by waterway. But that is only for a short time at best, and we cannot look forward to any change in that respect. Might it not be worth our while to look at the larger question ? Is it of sufficient importance that all this grain raised in Canada shall be exported from a Canadian port ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. Then, if it is, we must see to it that we have methods of transportation in Canada and exportation from Canada that can be used all the year round. I have faith in Canada. I believe that not only shall we increase as we have been increasing, but that every increase now will help to make greater our ratio of increase for the future. The more people we get, the more grain we raise, the more we do, the more we produce, the more rapid will be our increase in the future. I believe in the St. Lawrence route. I believe it is necessary, even if they should fail in their immediate purposes, to make these expenditures. A nation often has to spend money to demonstrate a truth, it has often to spend money to find out what is the real value of an idea strongly held by many of its people. But I am firmly convinced that we must come to it that the lower provinces, with their ports open all the year round, must be the points at which we export as well as import. Nova Scotia is the vestibule of this Dominion. Geography is in our favour; and I believe that as we grow—and we shall grow—it will be seen that it is in this way that all our products must go and come. As I say, it may be necessary now to expend our money in the way proposed. In any case, it will do no harm to have an alternate way of carrying, subsidiary to the great system by which freight can be carried and exported all the year round. It is like the money spent on our canals, which was thought to make them all that was required, but which had to be supplemented with more money to deepen them—and I believe that, if those canals are to be really effective, we must deepen them again. We are only making these tentative steps in our history. I believe, however, that the country will yet come to the conclusion that the really useful expenditure is that which will make it possible for the producer in Canada to ship his products over a Canadian route and by a Canadian port, and that rather than spend our money continuously in other ways, we should devote our resources to the carrying out of this idea. So strong am I in this position, that, while I am in full sympathy with the expenditures made, if they are necessary, I believe, looking at it in the broader light of geography and climate, we must ship from ports where neither frost nor tide will interfere with work whatever the season may be.

Mr. KEMP. I have before me a map which bears the name of the hon. Minister of Public Works. I am trying to get at the hon. minister's point of view. May I inquire whether he has ever considered the idea of having a barbour on the north shore of Georgian Bay near the mouth of the French river, for the purpose of allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway to tap it at that point and transfer grain ? Then, I would like to ask how much sooner in the autumn the French river is closed in the winter by ice than is the Welland Canal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very glad to be in a position to give a definite answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp). I was asked a few days ago what the distance was between the Soo line and a port on Georgian Bay, and I was not able to give the exact distance at the moment. The distance between the Soo line and the nearest point on Georgian Bay is 90 miles. There are great engineering difficulties——

Mr. CLARKE. What is the greatest distance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The distance from the Soo line to the Georgian Bay is ninety miles. That is the distance that would have to be covered if a branch line were built. Now my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) has a map in his hand. I hope my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), has one also. Let them look at the different centres of trade. Let them look at Fort William, which is a point from which our Canadian grain is carried. Now let them look at Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago. From Fort William to North Bay the distance is 473 miles; from North Bay to Montreal, 317 miles, I speak of nautical miles. That makes altogether 890 miles. From Fort William to New York there are 1,182 miles, making 292 miles of difference in favour of the Canadian route. Now from New York to Liverpool there are 3,105 miles; from Montreal to Liverpool there are 2,773 miles, a difference of 332 miles. This is for the French river route. From Fort William to Port Colborne there are 737 miles; from Port Colborne to Montreal there are 321 miles, in all 1,058 miles. From Fort William to Buffalo there are 750 miles; from Buffalo to New York by the Erie Canal, 500 miles, or 1,250 miles in all, making 200 miles difference in favour of the Canadian route. But if my hon. friends will look at the figures published on the map they will find that, taking Fort William, Duluth, Milwau-

kee and Chicago as shipping points to Montreal or New York, there is a difference in round numbers of 300 miles in favour of our Canadian route. Now adding the difference there is between Montreal and Liverpool and that between New York and Liverpool, you will find in round numbers a difference of 600 miles in favour of our Canadian route. Now I want to know why we should not divert a vast quantity of trade from all these centres through the Canadian route.

Mr. CLARKE. But you are now pointing out the disadvantages of the Canadian route.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not at all. How so ?

Mr. CLARKE. You are speaking of all water Canadian routes. There are half a dozen routes partly rail and partly water that are 600 miles shorter than the all Canadian route.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not admit that. When I speak of the French river route, I speak of an all water route, not of a railway route, because Buffalo is our objective opponent, if I may so speak. Let us take Buffalo, and let us see what is the difference between Buffalo and North Bay, for instance. Between Montreal and North Bay—I do not now speak of nautical miles—there are 364 railway miles; between Buffalo and New York there are 445 railway miles. Between North Bay and Montreal, the Canadian Pacific Railway is running on the down grade, and can haul just as many cars as the New York Central does, and the Canadian Pacific Railway would have nearly 100 miles less. I want to know why we cannot acquire a vast quantity of trade at North Bay on Lake Nipissing and carry it in the winter months to the port of St. John ?

Mr. CLARKE. Would not that argument apply to other points on the Georgian Bay ? Why could not other railways accumulate freight in the fall at other ports on the Georgian Bay ? I am only making these suggestions to the minister to ascertain how deeply he has looked into the qualifications of these other ports on the Georgian Bay. He has given the figures correctly. The distance from North Bay to Montreal is 364 miles. What is the distance between Parry Harbour, a port that not a dollar need be spent on now—what is the distance between Parry Harbour and Montreal by rail ? What is the distance between Midland and Montreal by rail ? These are two splendid harbours already provided on Georgian Bay. What is the distance from Collingwood to Montreal by rail ? What is the distance from Owen Sound to Montreal by rail ? We want the minister to give us all the information so that we may study it out carefully; and when he comes down this session or the next session, and asks parliament for an appropriation which will eventually aggregate $5,000,000 to make this French river navigable from Georgian Bay to the North Bay, we, having all the facts before us, may be able to discuss it intelligently with him. When he completes the work of making the French river and Lake Nipissing navigable to North Bay he will find that North Bay is five miles further away from the Sault than Parry Harbour, and ten miles further away than Midland. These two harbours already provided on Georgian Bay are nearer to the Soo, the common point from which all the vessels must start after they come through Lake Superior. Both these ports are nearer to the Soo than North Bay will be after this enormous expenditure has been made upon it.

Now, I am not saying that this expenditure ought not to be made, but surely we all, on both sides of the House, have a right to the fullest possible information as to these distances. And let me tell the hon. gentleman that this table of sailing distances which is printed on the lower right hand corner of this map may be misleading. I do not of course think it was put in there at all for that purpose. I think, too, that if he is going to ask us to consider this French river route the information contained on this map should be implemented. We should have the distances from Fort William to Collingwood and from Collingwood to Montreal, and from Toronto to Montreal or Quebec by water. We should have some data, some information as to the relative cost of carriage by water as compared with carriage by rail. The hon. gentleman who addressed us a few minutes ago said, what I believe to be substantially correct, that in the future a very large proportion of the grain grown in the west will find its way to the east almost altogether by rail or very largely by rail. We must not overlook the fact that at present we are engaged in a very large expenditure to complete our all water Canadian route. We are engaged in the work of making a harbour at Port Colborne, the Lake Erie entrance to the Welland Canal, and before that work is completed a very large sum will have to be expended. That route is unfortunately handicapped by being 600 miles, on the round trip, longer than these routes that are being spoken of, North Bay, Depot Harbour, Midland and Collingwood, but it has the advantage of being an all water route.

Now, if we want to get the best possible results for the producers of this country we must not tie ourselves up completely to railways. We must give our farmers the advantage, and our shippers the advantage of more than one avenue for conveying the produce of this country to the

seaboard. We have in the North Bay route, when it is completed, a line that obliges a land haul of between 300 and 400 miles to Montreal. We have as against that our present all water route, handicapped, as I have pointed out, by being, for the round trip 600 miles, in round figures, longer than these other routes, but with the advantage of an all water carriage. We can have another route by making a portage railway from Meaford, or from Collingwood, or from some point on the Georgian Bay, to Lake Ontario, which will give us a very much shorter water route, and which will give us just as short a route from Sault Ste. Marie to Montreal as any of these other routes, and with only seventy miles or eighty miles at most of land carriage. I think in fairness to the members of this House all the facts in connection with all these propositions—and the minister says he has considered this proposition of a portage railway from Georgian Bay down to Toronto—I think all the facts should be laid before us so that we may be able to bring the best possible intelligence to bear before we are asked to come to a conclusion. I want to assure the hon. gentleman that there is nothing sectional, nothing narrow, in the opposition, if he can call it opposition, that we are offering to this French river proposition. We are not necessarily opposing that scheme because it means an expenditure of $5,000,000 away up in the north. But we want to be perfectly satisfied before we vote for that expenditure that it is the best possible way of expending the money, and will produce the best possible results in the years that are to come for those people who are going out west in such large numbers to make themselves homes. The hon. minister must not overlook this fact, that, as he has pointed out, there is a down grade from North Bay to Montreal, so that consequently, there must be an up grade going back. If he desires to see the Canadian inland marine prospering, if he desires to see large additions made to the tonnage of that marine he must give vessels all possible facilities to go up to the head of Lake Ontario and it is only policy carefully to consider at what point on Lake Ontario these vessels will be likely to get the largest and greatest number of return cargoes. My idea is that the making of a national port at Montreal will not completely solve this transportation problem.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. Of course it is only my own opinion, but I believe that the old port of Quebec will eventually become the national port of this Dominion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear; one of them.

Mr. CLARKE. I am perfectly well satisfied that before a complete solution of this transportation problem has been reached it will be necessary to equip our harbours on Lake Ontario and to build a portage railway from the head of Lake Ontario to a port on the Georgian Bay, so that we may have vessels running from the head of Lake Ontario, not only to Montreal but to Quebec, and if proper lines of vessels are established on that route I am perfectly satisfied they will get substantial freights to bring back with them and exercise a salutary check on the excessive freight rates charged by the railway companies. We have spent a large amount of money in the digging and deepening of our canals. As the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) pointed out that work is undoubtedly, to a certain extent, experimental. However, it was work that was necessary. We have spent a large sum in deepening these canals to fourteen feet. We ought not to abandon the St. Lawrence route entirely. We ought to utilize it to act as a check against the extortionate freight rates being now charged on the railways, and it is only reasonable that we should have information upon every single proposition before the country as to the advantages and disadvantages of these propositions before we are asked to seriously consider the proposition the hon. minister makes, to expend $5,000,000 of money on another harbour on the Georgian Bay, which when completed, will be no nearer the point of production than the splendid present harbours which exist on those waters. I ask from the hon. minister consideration of these other routes and that he will lay before the House elaborate maps of these other routes before he asks us to commit ourselves to this expenditure on the French river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Chairman, I am not asking the committee to commit itself to the French river improvement. I am calling attention to it in connection with the work that is going on on the St. Lawrence, and I am very thankful to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) for having spoken as he has done. My hon. friend should not speak of abandoning our Canadian system of canals.

Mr. CLARKE. Certainly not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nobody thinks of it, but he has given us figures that are eloquent. He has stated that the Canadian system of canals; that is to say, the all-water route, is 600 miles longer than the route from North Bay, or Midland, or Depot Harbour.

Mr. CLARKE. On the round trip.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, of course, and, moreover, it is a water route; that is to say it is a route that is closed for six months in the year in round numbers. Look at the map. What is the

use of talking as the hon. member for Guysborough has talked ? What is the use of saying that we can transport grain by rail the whole year round ? It cannot be done. The route is on the great lakes; Fort William is on the great lakes, Milwaukee and Chicago are on the great lakes, our American friends can command to-day 96 per cent of the tonnage on the great lakes. We command only 4 per cent. Why ? Because we have not equipped our waterways, because we have not to-day any Canadian harbour on the lakes. Again look at the map. Here is Buffalo at the right hand of Lake Erie; at the left is Port Colborne, 20 miles distant—Buffalo, with its fifty-five elevators which are being improved day after day. Last year they built four magnificent new and modern elevators at Buffalo, and they have miles and miles of breakwaters and basins. At Port Colborne there is not the shadow of a harbour. How can we expect the trade, I want to know ?

Mr. CLARKE. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a magnificent route, but it is only open six months in the year.

Mr. CLARKE. It is open as long as the French river is open.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will come to that. Depot Harbour has no western connection except by water.

Mr. CLARKE. Neither will North Bay have.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Midland is in the very same position—no western connection except by water; that is to say, that for six months in the year, these harbours are practically closed.

Mr. COCHRANE. So is Buffalo.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) says that North Bay is in the same position. I say no. North Bay is on the Canadian Pacific Railway line. the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has cost this country $100,000,000 in land and money, has a western connection. Where does our export trade come from to-day ? With what materials are the bottoms that are lying in St. John loaded ? Not with grain only. Grain is only a small incident in the very great traffic carried on there. The Canadian Pacific Railway have chosen St. John as their winter port because they carry to it a large amount of package traffic from the west, and from the American west especially. They are carrying to-day twenty-five cars a week of meat and so on from American points. I ask the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) where is the other railway in this country which is in the same position. There is not one. The Grand Trunk Railway have chosen Portland as their winter port. We cannot expect any export trade from the Grand Trunk Railway, we cannot expect any export trade from the Canada Atlantic Railway during the winter months. The Canada Atlantic Railway is closed. Then, the Canadian Pacific Railway is the only road which has a western connection and which can give export freights to our winter ports. The reason I am speaking of the improvement of the French river, is that during the months of the fall when the grain is accumulated at Fort William, Duluth, Milwaukee and Chicago, it is seeking the best and easiest route, and the best and easiest route is undoubtedly the French river route.

Mr. CLARKE. How does the hon. minister make that out ? Will he give us the facts ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I will give the facts. The distance is the same between North Bay and Midland and Depot Harbour. Let us say that. But, will those railways carry exclusively grain during the winter months ? Not one. The Canadian Pacific Railway, having this western connection, will simply take the grain accumulated during the fall and carry it to the winter port. The Canadian Pacific Railway is the only railway which will take grain to the winter port.

Mr. CLARKE. What has become of the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend must not try to trifle with the question.

Mr. CLARKE. Well, what is the matter with the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman knows that the Intercolonial Railway cannot compete with the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. KEMP. What was the elevator at St. John built for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a very small and incidental question. Let us not get into details. We are dealing with large questions.

Mr. CLARK. We want to get the details.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not despair of seeing the elevator at St. John filled with grain. If the Intercolonial Railway cannot fill it, the Canadian Pacific Railway can fill it. There is no reason why it will not do it. Let not my hon. friends run away from the main question. The main question is : Which is the best route ? I say that all the routes are good, and I say let the hon. member for Toronto not lose sight of this point that the Canadian Pacific Railway, as things are to-day, is the only railway which can give us an export trade. We are talking of a fast line are we not ? How can we have a fast line if we have no trade from the west to export by that line ?

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman in the course of this discussion informed us that

the Canada Atlantic Railway had carried from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 bushels of grain from Depot Harbour to the seaboard or towards the seaboard. Is that right ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About that much.

Mr. BOYD. When ?

Mr. CLARKE. During the season of navigation last year. I appeal to the minister, that if facilities for storing the grain in the shape of elevators and warehouses were provided at Depot Harbour ; is it not a fact that the quantity of grain that could be carried to the seaboard from Depot Harbour during the winter months when the French river and Midland and Parry Harbour would be sealed up, would be only limited by the capacity of the railroad to carry it ? If the French river route were completed—I am not offering any particular objection to the French river route if the minister can persuade the House that it is the best route—but, if the French river route were completed to-morrow, when that river and lake Nipissing are frozen up there can surely come no grain in by the French river route to augment the quantity that may be stored at North Bay. The Canada Atlantic Railway has no western connection during five or six months of the year, and yet it carried 20,000,000 bushels of grain during the season of navigation, according to the statement of the minister himself. Could not that quantity be duplicated by the construction of elevators at Midland, that splendid port now in existence on the Georgian Bay ? Of what advantage will it be to the Canadian public to have this French river route completed to North Bay, further than that during the period which elapses between the taking off of the crop and the close of navigation, great quantities of grain may be brought by water, and stored at North Bay to give the Canadian Pacific Railway traffic during the winter months ? Will not the same conditions apply so far as the Canada Atlantic Railway at Depot Harbour and the Grand Trunk Railway at Midland are concerned ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) has proven a strong case against himself.

Mr. CLARKE. I am very glad if it will assist the minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman is a Canadian as he is, he must make up his mind that we must have Canadian winter ports.

Mr. CLARKE. You will not have a winter port at French river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to speak. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) is a Canadian.

Mr. CLARKE. I am a Canadian and an Irish Canadian.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Any one would know that by looking at you.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is a good Canadian and I ask him to tell me where the grain that would be accommodated at Midland would be carried in the winter months by the Grand Trunk Railway if not to Portland.

Mr. CLARKE. Then I would ask the Minister of Public Works if the Intercolonial Railway is of no use to the public whatever ? After all the statements we have heard from gentlemen opposite as to the advantages obtained for this country by the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, are we to be told now that these advantages amount to nothing ? Is it not the case that a proper national policy in connection with the administration of the Intercolonial Railway would give us competition from Montreal eastward, when the country is practically tied up to the Canadian Pacific Railway for its export business in the winter months ? Are we to be told now by the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that notwithstanding the fact that during these five years past we have spent $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 on capital account, on the Intercolonial Railway, that it is practically useless as an instrument to assist in carrying out the products of Canada from Montreal to the seaboard during the close of navigation ? Is that the situation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is making party politics now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Nonsense.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are you doing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not believe that I am making party politics out of this question, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two and two make four, and not five. Surely my hon. friend did not mean to say that the Intercolonial Railway would be working in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway for the carriage of grain conveyed by the Grand Trunk Railway. It is a preposterous idea. Why should the Grand Trunk Railway give to the Intercolonial Railway any of its trade ? Where is the railway that would do that ? That is not a business proposition. The Grand Trunk Railway runs from Midland to Portland, their own winter port, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) suggests that the Grand Trunk Railway should hand over its business to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal for transport to a Canadian port.

The hon. gentleman will not say that again. If he does I will let him say it, and I am sure that no other gentlemen in the House would make that statement. The position is exactly the same so far as the Canada Atlantic Railway is concerned. The Canada Atlantic Railway has its terminus in the United States. It has no terminus in Montreal. My hon. friend knows that the Canada Atlantic Railway does not reach Montreal on its own rails. So much is that the case that Mr. Booth has been obliged to establish a line of barges between Coteau and Montreal to carry grain during the summer months. The grain that Mr. Booth's railway system would carry in the winter months would simply be carried to American ports. During the summer months a good deal of the Canada Atlantic Railway grain is carried to Montreal, but the greatest part of it is carried to American ports. We are talking now of a winter port. In the winter months the Canadian Pacific Railway, as things are to-day, is the only railway that can carry export trade to our Canadian winter ports. The Canadian Pacific Railway has been built long ago. We had our eyes open when we built it. We have built it to make it what it is—a Canadian railway carrying trade through Canadian channels to and from all parts ; from Japan, China, the United States and Canadian points. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) says that we must not be at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I grant that. In the summer months there will be no danger of being at their mercy, but if perchance later on the French river scheme were carried out, and there should be trouble with the Canadian Pacific Railway should they try to exact unfair tolls, well, there are only 360 miles to be built after all.

Mr. CLARKE. Where ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From Montreal to that point.

Mr. CLARKE. To what point ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To North Bay. But, when there are so many railways in competition, there is no danger that one railway will exact more than is necessary. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) not forget one thing. I know he is in good faith, but let him not forget that Buffalo is our rival. So far our trade has gone via Buffalo. We have very little of our own trade and very little of the American trade passing through Canada and so there must be something wrong. The Grand Trunk Railway was located at Midland long ago ; the Canada Atlantic Railway was located at Depot Harbour several years ago, but still our trade is going to American ports.

Mr. CLARKE. Has not high insurance and high freight rates something to do with that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I grant you that we were not equipped for the trade. The St. Lawrence was not deepened, or buoyed, or lighted, as it should have been. All that is true. But now, if we want to be independent of the American ports we must have a winter port or winter ports of our own. We must have our winter ports as well as our summer ports. Let my hon. friend, let any member of parliament rise in his seat and tell me where is the other railway to-day that can give us export trade for a Canadian port like the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway is the only one. I am always sorry—if I may express my regret—when I hear men of the standing of my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) speaking of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a monopoly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not fair to the country. I do not care about the Canadian Pacific Railway *per se*. I am just as independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway as my hon. friend is, but I cannot forget that I was a newspaper man here when Sir John A. Macdonald —who was just as big a man as the gentleman who is laughing over there—initiated the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in this House. The whole Conservative party was behind him and many Liberals were in their souls with him too. Those of the Liberals who then fought the Canadian Pacific Railway, perhaps have changed their minds a little to-day, as my hon. friends opposite will change their minds in reference to the speeches they are making now. The Canadian Pacific Railway is not a monopoly. It is a great transcontinental railway carrying trade from Japan and China and all parts, on Canadian soil as against competition from five or six American railways. We must not be ashamed of such a monopoly. I am not ashamed of such a monopoly. The Canadian Pacific Railway is only a factor in this question. Our waterways are a great factor; and the equipment of our harbours is a factor, and in point of fact we have an entire system to complete on land and on water. Perhaps I have wandered a little far from the estimate of $500,000, but still I feel that we have not wasted our time. I feel that we are dealing with a broad question, and I feel that all these questions are bound together. When we have completed the deepening and widening of the St. Lawrence channel, when the ports of Quebec, Three Rivers and Montreal are equipped, we will have that part of the St. Lawrence route in good shape. I share the views of hon. gentlemen who have spoken so far as Quebec is concerned. Montreal will not be able to handle half of the trade that is in store for the St. Lawrence route. There was a good deal of money spent in Quebec in

days past, and I feel that the time is coming when it is necessary to equip the port of Quebec. There are large ships that will never be able to come to Montreal. I will say more than that : The port of Quebec will be opened and is open for five or six weeks both during the fall and the spring, longer than the port of Montreal and that amounts to a great deal.

Quebec has direct connection with the west by the Great Northern. I hope that route will be put in good shape in a short time. Quebec, Three Rivers and Montreal will have their hands full. When the lake ports are equipped with proper harbours, they will be great reservoirs of trade. But that does not alter the position, so far as the improvement of the French river is concerned. You will not be able, by the canals alone, to handle the trade you have in store, not only Canadian but American trade. Of course, if you make up your minds that you do not want that trade, the system of canals will be sufficient. But those who think the matter over carefully—and I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will do so—will admit that all these harbours on the great lakes will have to be attended to. We are attending to them. Port Colborne is being equipped, Midland is being equipped, Depot Harbour is fairly equipped. Of course, if an American syndicate buys up the connection with one of these harbours, we must look carefully, before spending our money, to see where the Americans are carrying our trade. I, for one, will not be very enthusiastic about giving money to improve Depot Harbour if the American syndicate does not make up its mind to stand by our Canadian ports. When you have the Canadian Pacific Railway on Canadian soil, you are sure of one thing—that Canadian trade will go through Canadian channels. I say again, and I appeal to my hon. friends from the maritime provinces, that you cannot have a winter port, you cannot have a fast line, you cannot have trade in the winter months, if you do not have an export trade; and where are you going to get it if the Canadian Pacific Railway does not take it to you ? You cannot have it otherwise. There is not enough trade on Canadian soil to feed our winter ports. As I have said, the port of St. John, and, to a certain extent the port of Halifax, are being kept by American trade as well as Canadian.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope the hon. minister did not desire to misinterpret what I said respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway. I rather think I did not make myself clear enough to be understood by the hon. minister. I certainly repudiate any suggestion that I desire to exhibit hostility to the Canadian Pacific Railway. On the contrary, I desire to see that institution promoted and sustained by the Canadian people. With the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and most of the hon. members of this House, I believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway has done more to cement together the different portions of this Dominion, and to solidify the country, than all the other agencies put together. Consequently, I should have no desire to advocate any policy that would militate against the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, so long as those interests do not run diametrically counter to the interests of the Canadian people. I suggested—and I think it was only just to the hon. members on both sides—that before we were committed to this scheme of improving the French river and Lake Nipissing and making a harbour for deep draught vessels at North Bay, we should have full information as to the other propositions presented to the hon. minister within the last four or five years. If the scheme has the merits that the hon. minister says it has, it is only just to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which will be one of the chief beneficiaries of this improvement, that the facts should be laid before parliament and the people, so that they may be as much convinced as the hon. minister evidently is that the French river route is a practical work and one of national importance. I have said that it seemed to me that, if the scheme were carried out, the only benefit would be the laying up of large stores of grain, from the time the crop reached the head of Lake Superior at Duluth and Fort William, in an elevator at North Bay to furnish the Canadian Pacific Railway with freight during the winter months, and that would practically tie up a very large quantity of grain and leave it at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway winter rates. I pointed out to the minister that if he desired to give employment to roads running from Georgian Bay eastward the same results could be accomplished by building grain warehouses at Parry Harbour, Midland, Collingwood, Owen Sound and other ports on Georgian Bay that are already fairly well equipped. I am glad we have had so much explanation from the Minister of Public Works, and all I can do is to ask him to go further and give us maps and plans showing these other propositions as clearly as he has shown this French river plan ; and I think, he can depend upon the patriotism of the Canadian parliament to promote Canadian interests.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman will consult the map he will see that there is information with regard to all routes——

Mr. CLARKE. Oh, no. If the hon. minister will allow me I will give him a sample. Here, for instance, is a table of 'sailing distances.' Now, that is a very simple expression and we all know what it means. The distance from Depot Harbour to Montreal—the sailing distance—is

given as 797 miles, from North Bay to Montreal 850 miles. This table shows the distances a vessel would have to navigate from Parry Harbour, or Midland, or North Bay or these other ports, if they went around by way of Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, Detroit river, Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie, the Welland Canal, Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence to Montreal. Surely it is not unfair to say that a table framed in that way is not as fair as it might have been. The sailing distance, it is true, is as stated on the map, because you must go around four or five hundred miles to get to the St. Lawrence river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend says that grain accumulated at North Bay would be at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What do we see to-day ? The rate between Buffalo and New York is ten cents per hundred pounds. Canadian wheat that was carried to Buffalo during the last of the fall is paying that rate to the New York Central from Buffalo to New York. If the Canadian Pacific Railway accumulated twenty-five or thirty millions of bushels of grain at North Bay, I make bold to say, that the rates would not be the same—far from it. The hon. gentleman speaks of competition, but, to-day, the Canadian grain is practically in the hands of American routes.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it be better to have more accommodation by establishing elevators at Midland, Depot Harbour and other places so as to give us a chance against Buffalo ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Elevators are already provided. But my hon. friend must not forget that Midland is tributary to the Grand Trunk and American ports. That is the point I want to make the House understand. What I want is to give our Canadian ports the traffic of the west.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). I would like to ask the hon. minister if it is not the fact that the Welland Canal is left unlighted at night ? I think one of the very pressing questions in connection with our lake traffic is the lighting of the Welland Canal. I am informed that captains are constantly complaining of the great delay arising from that cause. A small expenditure would enable the government to light the canal at night. The canal itself would furnish the power, making the service a cheap one.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have many things to do to-day on the lakes and canals. I do not know whether the Welland Canal is lighted at night or not. But when a ship laden with grain reaches Port Colborne to-day she has to lighter into the Grand Trunk elevator there. And do you know what the Grand Trunk charges are for the twenty-seven miles of their road to Port Dalhousie ? They charge two cents per bushel. They charge two cents per bushel, and how in the name of Heaven can you expect trade to flourish under such an exorbitant charge ?

Mr. CLARKE. Will not that situation continue until you either deepen the Welland Canal to a greater depth or build a line from Port Colborne to Port Dalhousie ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is very much afraid lest we should commit ourselves to any further expenditure, and yet he wants us to undertake this enterprise. Does he know how much it would cost to deepen the canal ?

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister seems to have a streak of Irish in him, for he is answering my question by asking another. He complains of the extortionate rate charged by the Grand Trunk Railway for hauling grain from Port Colborne to Port Dalhousie. I ask him whether, after he has completed the improvements at Port Colborne, which will cost $500,000 to $1,000,000, the situation will be improved, so far as the carriage of grain by land is concerned.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, what will happen is this : We have not got a harbour at Port Colborne. The great carriers of grain, which are going to Buffalo to-day, could not go to Port Colborne. My hon. friend knows that on Lake Erie the waves are as big as on the Atlantic ocean, and the big lake carriers cannot get to Port Colborne.

Mr. CLARKE. How will they get through the canals ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is a most impatient Irishman.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the hon. minister would answer the questions put to him instead of making speeches which tax the patience of the House, he would not have to complain of any impatience.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that two Irishmen are too many for me. My hon. friend, I am sure, is looking ahead. We must have Canadian bottoms on the lakes. The large lake carriers cannot go to Port Colborne because we have no accommodation there. There is neither wharf nor elevator nor anchorage facilities. We therefore have to be content with the ordinary carriers which can navigate our Canadian system of canals. But when Port Colborne is equipped, as it will be next season, those large freight carriers will be able to go there safely. Then from Port Colborne to the St. Lawrence you will have another fleet of steamers which, I hope, we are going to build.

Mr. CLARKE. How will you get from Port Colborne down the St. Lawrence ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will simply have boats that will draw fourteen feet of water.

Mr. CLARKE. They will not get through the canals.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, they will. The problem will be solved, and I hope my hon. friends on both sides will not lose sight of the vital importance of having Canadian bottoms on the lakes. If you have not Canadian bottoms on the lakes within two or three years, you will not be much better off than you are now, because American bottoms cannot navigate between Canadian ports. But if you have, then the problem of the carrying trade between Port Colborne and Montreal and Quebec will be solved.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will not these new steel steamers which the hon. gentleman speaks of from Port Colborne to the St. Lawrence have to lighten just as the present boats ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is the hon. gentleman going to deepen the Welland Canal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. How then will he carry any more in these steamers than in the present ones.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To-day we command only about four per cent of the tonnage on the lakes. We have in round numbers between fifteen and seventeen Canadian bottoms carrying grain. There are ten boats to-day being constructed. I anticipate that we will have more Canadian bottoms built for that very navigation between Port Colborne and the St. Lawrence, now that the St. Lawrence is equipped. Those boats could not find any trade for the excellent reason that the large carriers could not unload at Port Colborne, but now that Port Colborne is equipped the large carriers will carry the freight there, and then we will have a fleet of smaller craft carrying freight between Port Colborne and the St. Lawrence. I hope that the day is not far distant when our boats that will carry grain and other produce from the west will take back Nova Scotia coal to the west. I hope that when we have equipped our rivers and harbours completely, when we have the St. Lawrence a cheap route, our Canadian bottoms will be in the same position as the Americans. An American bottom goes to Buffalo loaded with grain or ore and returns loaded with coal, and there is no reason why Canadian bottoms should not carry Nova Scotia coal to the west. I am quite of the opinion that the Welland and all the other Canadian canals should be equipped thoroughly, lighted night and day, and made as cheap and safe as money can make them.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is not the Welland Canal thoroughly equipped now for its depth of fourteen feet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is well equipped but we are just completing our work on that canal.

Mr. KEMP. May I ask the hon. minister one question with reference to this map ? What purpose was it intended to serve, in connection with this table of sailing distances, to say that Depot Harbour is 797 miles from Montreal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We simply wanted to give all the figures and information possible. On the other side of the map the hon. gentleman will find the railway distances.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is a pity that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) was not present to hear the Minister of Public Works describe as party politics the arguments we heard from the Minister of Railways and Canals three years ago. The Minister of Public Works is just as responsible for the statements made at the time when the contract between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway was brought before this House as was the Minister of Railways and Canals, and we were told then that the Intercolonial was extended to Montreal for the purpose of getting a large portion of the western trade and bringing it over the Intercolonial Railway to St. John and Halifax. When the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) to-night made a reference to that statement, the Minister of Public Works said he was introducing party politics. If it was party politics now, I suppose it was party politics then, and the Minister of Public Works is responsible for what was said then just as much as if he had made the statement himself. He talks as if an expenditure of $300,000 or $400,000 for an elevator were a trifle not worthy a moment's consideration. An elevator was built in St. John with the idea of bringing western freight over the Intercolonial Railway which we were assured could and would be done. I pointed out to the Minister of Railways then that it would be far better to attempt to bring the freight to Halifax and save thereby 250 miles of the ocean distance. I also pointed out that the Canadian Pacific Railway should not be ignored, and that instead of spending all the millions which were spent in extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, we should get running powers over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Quebec to Montreal, which would be available as soon as the bridge across the St. Lawrence at Quebec was constructed, and in return should give the Canadian Pacific Railway running rights to Halifax, and thus confer upon the people of Nova Scotia the right to use the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way, which they do not possess at present. The Intercolonial Railway—for the management of which my hon. friend is responsible as a member of this government—has not permitted the Canadian Pacific Railway to be available to the people of Nova Scotia during the past two years at all, as far as freight is concerned. The Intercolonial Railway has refused to accept freight for St. John to be delivered there to the Canadian Pacific Railway for transmission to Montreal. I do not know whether the Intercolonial Railway does so now, but for a considerable period, during the past two years, it refused to accept freight for transmission over that railway. Does the hon. gentleman think that that is dealing with the Canadian Pacific Railway as a national railway and in the spirit in which it should be dealt with, and in which the people of Nova Scotia should be dealt with. These people have paid their share of the construction of that railway and are entitled to the use of it as well as the rest of the Dominion. If there is any change of mind on this matter, it is not on the part of my hon. friend from Toronto, but on the part of the Minister of Public Works himself, because he supported the Minister of Railways and Canals in that contract by his vote, if not by his voice, and that contract went through for reasons which the Minister of Public Works now says are absolutely unworthy of consideration and which should not have the slightest weight for one moment. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows well enough that that elevator was not built at St. John to be used in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. He surely does not pretend that the idea was ever advanced by any member of the government of which he is a member.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say it was.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then why does the Minister of Public Works suggest that it can be used for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It might.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It might, but that was not the reason on account of which the hon. gentleman voted to expend $300,000 or $400,000, that was not the reason on account of which he supported his colleague when he brought down that scheme. My hon. friend knows that the elevator has not been put to very much practical use since, though I quite agree—the same idea passed through my own mind in visiting St. John the other day when I saw these steamers lying on the western side of the harbour and wharf, and the elevator on the eastern side not used at all—I agree possibly that although this elevator could never be used for the purpose for which it was intended, it might at some future time be used in connection with the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But it is hardly worth while for the hon. gentleman to cast a reflection upon an absent colleague, which he did to-night, by using the language he did use; and because the Minister of Railways and Canals is not here to defend himself I am rising in his absence to defend him from aspersions. I trust that any suggestions of this kind that have to be made to this House will in future be made when the Minister of Railways and Canals is here to defend himself.

Now, we are pretty far afield from the particular item under discussion. But there is one practical question to which I would like an answer, as this subject has been gone into. What does the minister say is the relative cost of water borne freight on, this great waterway which he eventually proposes to construct, so far as I can gather, the Georgian Bay waterway; what is the cost of water borne freight on that waterway as compared with the probable cost during the next five years, or ten years, of freight borne by railways ? If we are going to discuss this question at all that is one of the first things that we have to ascertain, because we cannot come to any proper conclusion on the subject until we get the relative cost of these two modes of conveying freight. The hon. gentleman in answering that question will have to take into consideration all the modern improvements which have been made in railways, the great reductions which have been made in conveying freight on the American railways, and the probable advances towards further reduction of that cost which will be made in the near future. This is a practical matter which I think he might present to the House, and possibly it would be of as much importance for us to know that as to know a great many other matters with which the hon. gentleman has favoured us to-night.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry the Minister of Railways and Canals is not within the sound of the voice of the leader of the opposition because he would doubtless convey to him his thanks just now. I feel, however, that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals would not take objection to what I have said if he were here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the committee to come back to the item immediately under discussion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Please allow me to say only one word more. When it was decided to extend the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal the main object was to connect the town of St. John with that great centre of trade. The income of the railway proves that the extension has been good policy, trade has increased very largely indeed.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he has got any experts engaged in looking into the transportation question at the present moment ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have conversed with a great many men in different parts of the country, and asked advice of competent commercial men of different political opinions. I have been in communication with dozens of such men all over the country who take a deep interest in that important question. I do not know what my hon. friend means by an expert.

Mr. BLAIN. What I mean is this, has the hon. gentleman employed any person outside of his own department to look into this great question ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we have not.

Mr. BLAIN. Just simply within your own department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My own officers, and business men.

Mr. TUCKER. In connection with these canals, I would like to say one word for what I may term the winter port of Canada, I refer to the port of St. John. Before I left home I procured some statistics which give the quantity of exports from that port. I find that the exports of this year exceeded those of last year, between the 27th of November, and the 25th of January, by $1,050,000. Now in regard to foreign goods shipped from the port of St. John between the 27th of December and the 25th of January, I have also statistics to show that from across the line, from the neighbourhood of places on the established railways of the United States, we had during that period shipped $1,400,958 worth of foreign goods. If we can do that in the present condition of our harbour we can do a great deal better after it has been improved. If these goods can be shipped from St. John in the present state of our harbour and the present state of the American railways, and we can compete favourably with them to the extent that I have indicated, there can be no risk in making that port the future winter port for the business of Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. I desire to say a word concerning this St. Lawrence ship channel for which there was voted last year the sum of $669,000, and for which we are asked to vote this year $500,000 more. The minister says it is his intention to deepen the water to some thirty feet and make the channel 430 feet wide between Montreal and Quebec. The hon. gentleman has told us that he has a magnificent fleet of dredges. I have not been able to glean from his remarks how much each dredge cost, the capacity of each dredge, and the number of dredges that are employed in doing that work. But I notice in the Auditor General's Report that the following dredges have been engaged on this work. The 'Laurier,' the 'Lady Minto,' the 'Lady Aberdeen,' the 'Labelle,' No. 8, No. 11 and 'Spoon Dredge' No. 6. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he intends to employ any more dredges than I have named on the work for which he proposes to spend $500,000. I would also like to know when these dredges were built, where they were built, who built them, what is the cost of each dredge, and the capacity of each dredge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am employing this year a new dredge that started work last autumn it is called 'Sir Louis Hypolite Lafontaine,' which will take the place of No. 11. That will make one dredge additional. All these other dredges, except the 'Laval,' have been built since we took office—since 1896-7. There is a big dredge, the last one I have had built, in Toronto, which will be used also and which will bear my own name. That will be twelve dredges that will be employed. I have said that the suction dredge has cost $250,000 and that the other dredges have cost in the neighbourhood of $125,000. They have all been built at Sorel, except the one built at Toronto in the government shipyard with Canadian labour entirely.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman has not stated the capacity of each dredge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The capacity of the dredges depends very largely on the material on which they work, but the capacity of these dredges night and day is between 6,000 and 8,000 yards per day. It depends very much on the character of the material and whether they strike a rock or other obstruction.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The hon. Minister of Public Works referred to the dredges that entailed an expense of 25, 10, 6 and 4 cents, and so on, for dredging. What does the hon. minister intend to do with these old dredges ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is not one on the St. Lawrence now. They are all gone. I am sorry to say that we have some left on the lakes, but I am now building two new dredges. When I come to that vote, I will give a more detailed explanation. I am building dredges for the lakes also. All of these old dredges are now gone from the St. Lawrence. They cost more than they are worth to operate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is away to-night and possibly he may want to make some observations in regard to the matters discussed under this item. I am not asking it to stand, but I would like it to be under-

stood that it may be discussed at a future time if my hon. friend desires to offer any observations upon it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be full opportunity. I may say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier came to my seat and said that the only question he wanted to say a word upon was the post office in Montreal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Last year $669,000 was voted. That has all been expended, I suppose?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there is $170,000 which is not spent yet, but it will be expended by the first of July in building further additions to our fleet, equipping our shipyards in Sorel, and in doing other things in regard to which I will be glad to make a statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The result of the expenditure, so far as it has been made, is shown in the report of the hon. gentleman's department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is all shown?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All shown.

Port Arthur extension of breakwater and dredging, $35,000. River Kaministiquia, $10,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this all the expenditure that is to be made in connection with the harbours and rivers of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no, there is a lot of money for Ontario, but this is all for this special work which is chargeable to capital.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this all the expenditure that is to be made on the harbours and rivers of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot answer for the supplementary estimates but in the main estimates this is all.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there nothing to be done to Toronto harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Toronto harbour has never been charged to capital account.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We perhaps might have some information from the hon. minister as to both of these items, in respect to the present condition of the work and the probable cost when completed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that we will spend much at Port Arthur in addition to the amount we are asking for now. As my hon. friend knows the Canadian Northern have now reached that point and it is in view of giving them more depth of water and better accommodation that dredging is going on now. We spent in the neighbourhood of $10,000 last fall. We expect to expend $35,000 this year to complete the dredging necessary. As to the Kaministiquia, I do not know that we will complete the work with that amount, as we are having a great deal of trouble with it. As hon. gentlemen know, this is the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway and every year we have to do a large amount of dredging there.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the attention of the hon. minister been directed to the question of the Canadian channel in the St. Mary's river ? I was rather surprised, going up and down that river last fall, to learn that we were dependent on the Americans to enable vessels, drawing more than 15 feet of water, to get from the Soo Canal to Lake Huron. I was sorry to learn that vessels drawing 15 feet of water or over had to utilize the new channel at Hay Island constructed by the American government, and which has a depth of 20 or 21 feet of water. Is it the intention of the government to give us a Canadian waterway, or is it intended that we shall remain dependent on the courtesy of our American friends to enable us to get from our Canadian Canal at the Soo to Lake Huron ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Permission was given to the American govenment, I believe, some 25 years ago to dredge in Canadian waters. That permission has been continued ever since. Not only have they been allowed to dredge in our waters, but they have been allowed to place lights and other aids to navigation. Whether this is a right or wrong policy is a matter for the House to decide, but 25 years ago, and perhaps more, permission was given to the American government to do these things. So far no trouble has taken place and I hope we will not have to regret it later on.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not understand that we are in our own waters when we are in the channel alongside Hay Island. I understand the channel is in American waters. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether I am rightly informed. There is no use in talking about having an independent Canadian waterway from the head of Lake Superior to the St. Lawrence if, at a critical point after leaving Lake Superior, we are beholden to the good offices of the American government to enable us to get from the Soo Canal to Lake Huron. Have we a channel 15 or 16 feet in depth from the Soo Canal to Lake Huron ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that we are dependent on the American government to enable vessels drawing more than 15 feet of water to get down to Lake Huron.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Department of Public Works has not done any work of that kind on the lakes. I am not prepared to answer the question my hon. friend has asked. The Department of Railways and Canals is dredging in the lakes. Because there were canals at both ends of the lakes, the Department of Railways and Canals has always gone on dredging the lakes. Last year or the year before that, we undertake a survey between Kingston and Prescott in view of ascertaining whether we could not have a Canadian channel of our own, in the way that my hon. friend is pointing out. The survey will be completed in a month and then we will be in a position to know in an accurate way, in what position we are ? Again I say that the Public Works Department have done no work in the past in these lakes.

Mr. CLARKE. We are asked here for an appropriation for harbours and rivers for Ontario and I thought this was the place to endeavour to elicit information. It is surely reasonable to expect that before making this appropriation the hon. minister will be able to make a statement to the committee, whether it is a fact that we have not got any Canadian water channel that will enable Canadian vessels drawing 15 feet of water or over to get down from the Soo Canal to Lake Huron, and that we are dependent on the amity and good will of the American authorities to allow our Canadian vessels to go down. I do not know whether that is a fact or not, but I am asking for information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe that we have not such a channel now. Some parts of the channel were in Canadian waters but these parts have been dredged by the Americans. That does not make our waters American. We have simply allowed them to dredge in Canadian waters.

Mr. CLARKE. But this is American water as I understand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think so. I will be in a position in a day or two to give a definite answer as to that.

Mr. CLARKE. I submit that this is a matter of sufficient importance to be taken into consideration when we are discussing what is called the national transportation scheme. We have been flattering ourselves that we were independent of our American friends; that we had a perfect water transportation system from the head of Lake Superior to the St. Lawrence, a system of inland navigation that had not a peer anywhere else in the world. We have been speaking about the desirability of keeping pace with the times by getting freight vessels of a capacity of 250,000 bushels, to enable us to bring in Canadian bottoms to Canadian ports on the Georgian Bay, the steadily increasing products of the Northwest that are available for export. Surely, if we have a comprehensive grasp of this transportation question it is of some importance that we should not be barred at any time, or under any circumstance from the right to navigate the St. Mary river and that we should have in Canadian waters absolutely, a channel of sufficient depth to enable these large freighters (which are the only profitable vessels on the upper lakes) to get from Sault Ste. Marie to Lake Huron and the Georgian Bay ports. I must confess that I shall be very much surprised to find out that the information that I obtained last fall is correct, but it is a matter of sufficient importance to justify me in taking up the time of the committee to make inquiry from the minister. If he is not advised at the present time, I hope he will make inquiries and take the House into his confidence in the near future. It is a matter we ought to know all about.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not believe that I am wrong in saying that we have a complete channel. I made a mistake in saying that some part of the channel was in American waters. I know that at Kingston——

Mr. CLARKE. I am not speaking of Kingston; I am speaking of the other end of the St. Mary river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no doubt that at the other end the channel is in Canadian waters, but the Americans have been allowed to dredge it. However, the next time I come before the House I will have the whole information on that point.

Mr. CLARKE. I may say to the minister that American despatch boats manned by American sailors are to be found along the route of that new channel, with the object of compelling vessels to observe regulations made by the United States authorities as to the maximum rate of speed at which vessels are allowed to travel through this channel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would like to know exactly to what point the hon. gentleman refers ?

Mr. CLARKE. The point I allude to is, that I am advised it is an American channel in American waters.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Where ?

Mr. CLARKE. In the St. Mary river; the river that connects Lake Superior with Lake Huron; twelve or fifteen miles east of Sault Ste. Marie. I have been told that this channel is in American waters absolutely, and that our vessels of large draught which take iron ore from Michipicoten, and the vessels that go to Port Arthur, Fort William, and Duluth, to bring down grain, are

compelled to use the American channel east of Sault Ste. Marie, because there is not sufficient depth of water in the Canadian channel. I wish for information on that point.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) need not be more surprised that Canadians use the American channel in the St. Mary river, than that in the Detroit river the Americans are using the Canadian channel and are spending thousands of dollars each year in deepening that channel. It is not more surprising that we should be using their channel than that they should be using our channel in the Detroit river.

Mr. CLARKE. That does not help the situation any. We all thought that we had a sufficient Canadian channel of our own.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring down the information.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that in going up the Sault channel on the Canadian Pacific Railway boat, the passengers can only be landed on the American side. I was humiliated last summer to find that to get to the Canadian Sault I had to go on the American side and take a ferry boat across the river. On making inquiries as to the reason, I found there was no pier with deep enough water on the Canadian side, and consequently that all Canadians who go to the Canadian Soo by boat must be landed on the American side.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) is perfectly right, but if he looks at the estimates, he will find I have placed in them a sum of money to have the channel deepened. When the Canadian Sault Ste. Marie channel was built there should have been further dredging done and a proper pier constructed. We are doing that now. Both the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) and myself are working at it now. I share the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Smith) that it is humiliating to see Canadian ships obliged to cross to the American side to take coal and unload there. I paid a visit there, and when I found that state of affairs I asked my colleagues to allow me to place in the estimates a sufficient sum of money to put an end to that condition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it a fact that the Canadian government never expended any money on the Lime Kiln crossing in the Detroit river, referred to by the hon. gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot answer that question, because, as I have said, my department has not interfered in the past with that part of the country. I am looking into the matter more carefully now.

Mr. CLARKE.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister ascertain if that is the fact ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With pleasure.

Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, St. Andrews Rapids, $125,000.

Mr. PUTTEE. Last year the appropriation for this work was $175,000, and $125,000 is to be revoted this year, making the expenditure last year $50,000 only. I believe the contract for this work is nearly two years old with only a life-time of three years, and at the present rate of progress it will take us twenty years to get the job finished. It seems to me that if there is any use at all in having these locks constructed, the work should be done within a reasonable time. I wonder whether the minister has got any explanation of the delay, or whether there is any hope that there will be better progress made in the future.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am indeed sorry to have to admit that the work there is not proceeding very fast. The lowest tenderer was accepted in this case. I knew very well when the tender was put before me that it was a very low tender. All my officers told me that it was a very low tender. The contractors deposited the money and I gave them the contract. Since then my officers and myself have been pushing them as hard as possible, but they have not done much work. They have not much plant on the spot. What am I going to do ? Am I going to take the contract from them ? I have notified them on two or three occasions during the last two or three months that unless they make more progress I will be obliged to take the contract from them and call for new tenders. There is no doubt there was ice on the river, and they have thrown the dredging material on the ice, so that it may be carried away when the ice melts, but that is not a satisfactory way of carrying on that work and unless within the next few weeks they show better progress I will be obliged to report to my colleagues and ask them to allow me to take the contract from the present contractors.

Mr. PUTTEE. I believe now as I believed before that contract was let, that the department would be more capable of doing the work itself. I believe that such work as that should be done under the day labour system. I asked a question this afternoon with the idea of trying to get the minister to express his opinion and his experience on the operation of the day labour system. As to the unsatisfactory way the work is being done, of course that would not occur if the department had done the work itself. The department then would only have in view the object of completing the work properly and in good time, and that is what we want up there. Does the minister expect that the $125,000 now asked for will be all

the work that he will be able to get done this year ?

Mr. McCREARY. I think the $175,000 as shown on the second column will lapse on the first of July next, and consequently unless there is some portion of it paid out between now and then there will be only $125,000 left for the following year. I must admit that the contractors have delayed considerably the progress of that work, but the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) is mistaken when he says that two years of the time given them has elapsed. As a matter of fact, the two years will not elapse until next October. There is some excuse for the delay. It happened that last year, Kelley Brothers, who are certainly one of the best contracting firms of the west, undertook to construct a bridge across the Red river at Winnipeg for the Canadian Northern Railway and also another stone bridge across the same river for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Each of these was a large contract, and as it was difficult to obtain labour in the west and wages were high not much progress was made with their contract with this government.

The plant required for the present work has been moved on the ground lately, and from fifty to a hundred men are employed on it now. This year the contractors intend to do work to the extent of $250,000 to $300,000 on this contract, so that the hon. minister is not providing sufficient in the estimates to pay them, and I would suggest that he should put an extra sum into the supplementary estimates.

I would ask the hon. gentleman if he has considered the petition sent in to have the cement work changed to stone. I might point out to him that this work is being done within a very few hundred yards of where there are large stone quarries from which the stone could be brought to the ground at a very small cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By using cement we save $200,000.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. gentleman cannot get in Canada the quality of cement required by the specifications. He will have to get either St. Louis or Portland cement. In Winnipeg we have never yet been able to get Canadian cement to meet the specifications required by our architects for public buildings, and even some of the American brands of cement, such as was used in the Osborne Street Bridge, were condemned by our architects. If this work could be changed from cement to stone—and I believe that could be done at a very small extra cost—the change should be made and all the work done in this country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am putting in the estimates as much money as is necessary. My hon. friend will see that we are re-voting $125,000. The $50,000 on last years vote we will be able to pay up to the 1st of July, and then we have a re-vote of $125,000. I will be very glad if they will do more work than that, but they have not done anything to prove that they will do more. If they do parliament will meet early next year, and we will vote a supplementary sum. As to the change from concrete to stone, my hon. friend is unfair to Canadian cement. I am using large quantities of Canadian cement, and my experience is that the Owen Sound and Deseronto cement are just as good as any American brands under the sun. The change suggested would cost about $200,000 to this country. There is no good stone available near by as the quarry there is soft stone which could not be used in such work. Cement being as good as stone and on many occasions better, there is no reason why we should make such a change. Canadian cement may be procured as cheaply, if not cheaper than American, and I say that it is better.

In answer to my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), who suggests that if the Department of Public Works had done the work by day's labour more progress would have been made, I believe he is right. But parliament has such strong objections to day labour work, that every time I ask for even a small expenditure on any public work, hon. members insist that I should give it out by tender. I remember saying some five years ago, when I first took office, that when you can find a good foreman and a good engineer—and both are procurable—the day labour system is as a whole the best. I have nothing to gain by this system. It gives the minister a great deal more trouble to carry out the work by day labour, but it has this advantage to the labouring community that the government do not expect to make any profit out of the men or out of the purchase of the material. There is no reason why a government should not carry on work by day labour just as well as any contractor does. But public opinion has to be educated. I have not been able yet to educate it up to that point that I would ask the House to permit me to carry on a work of such importance as this by day labour. But if my hon. friend, who is an educator of public opinion, will help me in that matter, I shall be very glad to have his assistance.

Mr. PUTTEE. Is the contractor bound to use Canadian cement ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I do not believe he is. I have found out in another contract that the contractors were using American cement, and since then I have instructed my officers to specify Canadian cement.

Mr. PUTTEE. In that case the minister should urge on the contractor to use Canadian cement. The petition circulated very extensively throughout Winnipeg and Sel-

kirk during this winter asked the Department of Public Works to consider whether a change could not be made from cement to the native limestone. I am loyal to my province first, but quite a good enough Canadian to say that I would not ask the government to spend $200,000 just for the sake of pleasing us in the west, if the work is not to be benefited to any extent by the change. That is a matter which must be left with the engineers who must be held responsible. If they are found to be right, I am prepared to support the minister in the position he has taken, but I think he should insist that Canadian cement be used. There is a large quantity of cement to be put into the work, and if our cement is as good and as cheap the contractors should be made to use it and that of course will dispense with the objection that we are encouraging a foreign producer.

Mr. McCREARY. I am certainly surprised that such good cement can be found in Canada. That has not been our experience in the west. The contractors of our great corporations use nearly entirely St. Louis and Portland cement.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Canadian Pacific Railway are using Owen Sound cement.

Mr. McCREARY. It must then be very lately. The city engineer at Winnipeg condemns it. With reference to the hon. minister's statement that the stone quarry is not suitable, my information is that the Tindall stone quarry, nine miles from the works, has as good limestone as can be found on the American continent. That stone is used in the Canadian Pacific Railway bridges and the Canadian Northern, and nearly all the bridges in our province are built of it, and it is found most satisfactory. Portions of the stone are to be seen in the industrial exhibition grounds, thirty feet long and two and a half feet square in one piece, which is pretty good size stone. Mr. Carson, formerly of St. Catharines, an old stone quarry man of large experience, is in charge of the quarry, and he tells me that it is one of the best he ever saw. Even if stone cost a little more than the cement it is due to the people of the west that it should be used. Of course should it transpire that the hon. minister can change the specifications, so that the cement may be bought in Canada of equally good quality, the argument that the money is being sent out of the country will not apply, but if the stone were used, that would enable the people of the west to develop those quarries. I would ask the hon. minister to make further inquiries for his engineer cannot be aware of the fact or he would not have given the information he has. The stone is perfectly suitable and I have no doubt just as cheap as the cement. I have no doubt that some of these stone quarry men would undertake to furnish it at the same price.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot make any promise to my hon. friend. I have reports in my department from competent officers—not alone my engineers in the west, but competent officers of the department here—showing that the stone out there is not fit for such a work. It may be good for bridge work, but cannot be used in work such as this. It is not strong enough. My hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) will not lay down the doctrine that, because there is a local quarry, even if the use of that stone would cost $100,000 more and would not do the work so well, we must use the stone. Such a doctrine could not be defended in parliament. I compliment the hon. gentleman, however, on defending the interest of his province. But the work has been designed for concrete and the concrete is better. Canadian cement can be procured cheaper than American. Messrs. Kelly have not bought any cement yet, but if I can use any influence with them, that influence shall be exerted to have them use Canadian cement.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—Transportation facilities—Montreal Harbour (lower division), improvements below Ste. Marie's Current, $300,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract and is proceeding rapidly. The time limit fixed for completion is the 25th December, and I have no doubt it will be completed by that time. The contractors are a first-class firm and are proceeding with the work with rapidity and skill.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who are the contractors ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Malone & Poupore.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the nature of these improvements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A jetty 1,000 feet long is being built in the eastern portion of the harbour. The harbour commissioners built two wharfs there some time ago. They are low-level wharfs, but the wharf we are building is a high-level wharf. As we have learned from the newspapers, the Canadian Pacific Railway are going on with very extensive works in that part of the city. Already, a very large trade is going there—the bulky trade seems to be locating in that part of the harbour. It is for the accommodation of this trade that the work has been undertaken. I think I may make bold to say that it will be one of the finest works on this continent. All the work above the water line will be concrete work.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). This item speaks of the lower division. What about the upper

division ? Is that being completed ? And when will the harbour be finished ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only work being carried on by my department is the one under discussion. All the other works are under the direction of the harbour commissioners. Things are not going quite so quickly, perhaps, as I would like, but still we are making a great deal of progress. If my hon. friend knows the harbour of Montreal, he will understand that a great longitudinal wharf is being constructed, and three large piers. The longitudinal wharf is very much advanced, and two of the piers are built. The third will be completed during the season. After that, the equipment of the harbour will have to be undertaken—we must lay down tracks, put up sheds and build elevators. I suppose that it is too late to-night to discuss the question at greater length, but, on another occasion, I shall be glad if questions are put to me on these subjects. The country takes a great interest in the port of Montreal. That port does not belong to the city of Montreal alone, but is essentially a part of our national system, and we all take a great interest in it. I anticipate that in a couple of years we shall have a port well enough equipped to handle the vast trade in store for us.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—Transportation facilities—Port Colborne—Harbour improvements, $220,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. How much has been spent on Port Colborne harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount paid to the contractors so far is $75,000. Of their first contract of 1,300 feet of breakwater, they have completed 900 feet. I was there a few weeks ago, and I am glad to say that the work has stood the test of the storms, though the plan was a little weakened while I was on the other side of the ocean. Before I left we had specified a breakwater 25 feet wide, with a buttress inside. Only the breakwater has been built. Though it has stood the test very well, we have been obliged to put heavy rip-rap on the outer side. My hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) knows Lake Erie better than I do, and he knows that when there is a large storm there the waves are as high as on the Atlantic Ocean. In spite of that, and in spite of the fact that we had this winter two big storms, the breakwater has not budged more than a couple of inches. Still, on examining the work I thought it better to authorize the rip-rap to be used. To build the work to the shore, we shall require an additional length of not quite 4,000 feet of breakwater and 800 feet of stone approach. The whole length of the breakwater and stone approach will be about 5,700 feet. When this is completed you will have an area of twelve acres for a harbour there. The Department of Railways and Canals are building wharfs at the entrance to the canal. The breakwater is intended to protect the grain trade coming into the canal.

Mr. LANCASTER. How much more is it going to cost before we are through with it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The whole contract all expenses included, amounts to $435,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does that include the extra work that the hon. minister found it necessary to do on account of the storms ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was a very small amount, only about $10,000 or $12,000.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). That is exclusive of elevators ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am reminded that the contract itself is for $395,000.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). That is exclusive of any elevators ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think we had better not take up the next item. I would suggest that perhaps the hon. minister is too tired to go on with anything further to-night.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Public Works, House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 3, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. Henry G. Carroll, member for the electoral district of Kamouraska, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Justice (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick).

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, a certified copy of the judgment of the said court in the election appeal for the electoral district of Beauharnois ; by which the appeal was dismissed and the decision of the lower court, declaring the election void, was confirmed.

In conformity with chapter 9, section 46, of the Revised Statutes, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Port Dover, Brantford, Berlin and Goderich Railway Company, to change its name to 'The Grand Valley Traction Company.'—Mr. Heyd.

CHIEF JUSTICESHIP OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I would like to ask the right hon. the first minister whether the rumours in the press are correct with regard to an appointment having been made to the judiciary of British Columbia. The judicial work in the courts there has been at a standstill awaiting this appointment, and I hold a telegram in my hand stating that the press despatches announce the appointment of Mr. Hunter to the Chief Justiceship. The bar are very anxious to know whether this is accurate.

The PRIME MINISTER. The appointment has been made.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 9) respecting the United Gold Fields of British Columbia, Limited.—Mr. Galliher.

PROCEDURE *RE* BILLS.

Mr. SPEAKER called: 'Questions to be put by members.'

Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.) There is great inconvenience in passing over all these private bills simply because the letter 'E' does not appear after their notice in the order paper. Of course I know that objection can be taken to our proceeding with the next item, because it is not represented in the order paper as having been printed, but I hold the printed Bill in my hand. There are no doubt good reasons for pursuing this course, but it will be found very inconvenient this session, because we expect it to be short and because there is a large amount of private legislation before parliament which should be facilitated.

Mr. SPEAKER. We are guided to a large extent by the Orders of the Day. I see, by the Orders of the Day, that these Bills have not been printed; and I am informed also that, in many instances the reason why Bills have not been printed is that the promoters have not brought them in at the time prescribed by the rules of the House. I do not think that blame should attach to officers of the House.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to speak again—I did not intend to impute blame to any person. I think the rule is that the Order paper for Monday is printed on Saturday morning. That is necessary, I presume, for the convenience of Council, for that is a busy day for Council, and they have to consider matters coming up on Monday. But if this Order paper had been printed this morning, this Bill would have been marked as printed. I have no objection to the rule, but I would call the attention of the government to the fact that it is going to be inconvenient in regard to private legislation.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In the case to which my hon. friend refers, which, I understand, is the second order, the Bill respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company, I understand, from the statement that has just been made by my hon. friend (Mr. Costigan), that this Bill has actually been printed. It was not printed when the Order paper was printed, but it is now, I understand, in the hands of members. Under such circumstances, I think the House might well take up the Bill. If it is the intention of my hon. friend to have the Bill read the second time, before it is printed I think the House should not agree to that proposition. But, when the Bill is printed, as a matter of fact, I think the order might be proceeded with.

EDMONTON AND SLAVE LAKE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 12) respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

QUESTIONS.

THE CENSUS—EXPENDITURE TO DATE.

Mr. CLARKE asked:

What sums have been paid out to date in connection with the taking of the recent census of the Dominion?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The total amount to date is $948,410.55.

GOVERNMENT ELEVATORS, ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What quantity of grain or other produce has been handled by the government elevators at the cities of St. John and Halifax, respectively, between January 1st, 1901, and January 1st, 1902?

2. What revenues, if any, have been received from these elevators, and what has been the total cost of running and caring for these elevators, respectively?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland).

1. There has been handled by the government elevator at St. John in the year ended 31st December, 1901, 146,087 bushels of wheat. No grain or other produce was handled by the government elevator at Halifax between 1st January, 1901, and 1st January, 1902.

2. There are no direct revenues from the elevators; the elevator charges are included in the through rates for carrying the grain. The cost of running and caring for the St. John elevator was $4,989.93, and the Halifax elevator $2,016.50, up to January 31st, 1902.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER DAVID CLINTON, WELLINGTON, ONTARIO.

Mr. ALCORN—by Mr. Lennox—asked :

For what reason was David Clinton dismissed from the office of postmaster at Wellington, Ontario ?

If for alleged offensive partisanship, of what overt act or acts was such partisanship alleged to consist ?

Were any, and what, specific charges preferred against him, and by whom ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. William Mulock). It was shown that the postmaster at Wellington was in the habit at parliamentary elections of allowing the post office to be used practically as a committee room by his political friends, and also of permitting political posters of a partisan character to be hung up on the walls of the post office during elections, to the great annoyance of those patrons of the office not in political sympathy with him, and that he proved himself an energetic and offensive political partisan; and that his health was so poor as to not allow him to give proper personal attention to the affairs of the office. Under these circumstances he was relieved of the office. The information reached the Postmaster General from a source that is considered, beyond any question, reliable.

THE CANNERS AND THE COMMISSIONER OF FISHERIES.

Mr. BELAND asked :

Has the attention of the government been called to an article which appeared in the Victoria 'Colonist' on the 9th February, 1902, part of which reads as follows :—

'In speaking of the grievances of the canners, Professor Prince, commissioner of fisheries, said there were no doubt many grievances, many matters to set right, and if they had been set right long ago, it would have been better for the government; but the government have not had a minister who could form a resolution and act on it since the days of Sir Hibbert Tupper.'

2. Is it the intention of the government to have an investigation as to whether Professor Prince expressed himself as above reported ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). In answering this question, I think I cannot do better than read a letter received from Professor Prince. It is as follows :

Department of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, 3rd March, 1902

Dear Mr. Sutherland,—Respecting the question of Mr. Béland, M.P., as to a statement which it has been alleged I made in an interview on the 8th February last, I beg to say that the statement is absolutely untrue and without foundation. I made no such statement to any representative of the press or to any other person.

Yours faithfully,
EDWARD E. PRINCE,
Dominion Commissioner of Fisheries.

The Hon.
James Sutherland, M.P.,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I may also add that Professor Prince informs me that no such interview took place, and that the paragraph quoted in the question is part of a long series of statements published in the newspaper referred to, which Professor Prince shows not only misrepresent his views on British Columbia questions, but are exactly opposite in every particular to the opinions held by him.

THE SALARY OF THE GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

Has the government under consideration, or has it decided on, an increase in the salary and allowances of the General Officer Commanding in Canada, so as to make the income nearly equivalent to that of a major-general on service in the Imperial service ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). The government has not had under consideration any proposal to increase the salary and allowances of the general officer commanding.

DUTY ON BLEACHED AND UNBLEACHED COTTON.

Mr. MADORE—by Mr. Lavergne—asked :

What is the present rate of duty on bleached and unbleached cottons ; and what was the rate on the same under the Mackenzie tariff ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The present customs duty on cotton fabrics, white or gray, bleached or unbleached, is 25 per cent ad valorem, subject to a rebate of one-third the duty, making the net rate 16⅔ per cent, when made in and imported direct from a country admitted to the benefits of the British Preferential Tariff of Canada. The customs duty on the same fabrics under the Customs Tariff of 1877, was 17½ per cent ad valorem.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY SHOPS, MONCTON AND CHARLOTTETOWN.

Mr. PUTTEE asked :

1. How many men are employed in the government railway shops at Moncton, New

Brunswick, and Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island ?

2. How many hours constitute a day's work in these shops ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. There are 755 men employed in the government railway shops at Moncton, New Brunswick, and 79 men in the government railway shops at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

2. Ten hours constitute a day's work in these shops.

PRINCE OF WALES VISIT—ILLUMINATION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. To whom was given the contract for the illumination of public buildings in Ottawa during the visit of the Prince of Wales last year ?

2. What was the amount paid for such illumination ?

3. How much was charged per lamp ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). In the absence of the hon. Minister of Public Works, I am requested to give the following answers to the hon. gentleman's questions :

1. Ahearn & Soper.

2. Amount paid $5,000, but cost was : Parliament Building, at $5,000; East and West Blocks, at $4,000 each; equals $13,000 as per plan by tender. Langevin Block, bridges, Wellington Street, post office and festoons, $4,150 as per tender for buildings, &c. ; total, $17,150.

3. The contracts were given for designs, lamps to be placed at given distances or groups. No account was kept of the number used.

PAYMENTS TO NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total amount paid by the government to the Montreal 'Herald' since the 30th June last ?

2. What is the total amount paid by the government to the Toronto 'Globe' since the 30th June last ?

3. What is the total amount paid by the government to the Halifax 'Chronicle' since the 30th June last ?

4. What is the total amount paid by the government to 'Le Soleil,' of Quebec, and 'La Patrie,' of Montreal, since the 30th June last ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This information cannot, at present, be obtained. I think it would be more convenient if the hon. gentleman would move for a return, as the information he desires relates to various departments, and not to any one particular department.

CIRCULATION OF DOMINION NOTES.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. How many one dollar bank notes were issued in each year from 1892 to 1901, both dates inclusive ?

2. How many two dollar bank notes were issued in each year from 1892 to 1901, both dates inclusive ?

3. How many four dollar bank notes were issued in each year from 1892 to 1901, both dates inclusive ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The hon. gentleman's question is intended to refer, I presume, to Dominion notes, not to bank notes, notes of the denominations mentioned are not issued by the banks. The following is a statement of the Dominion of Canada $1, $2 and $4 notes issued by the Comptroller of Dominion Currency at Ottawa to the several assistant Receivers General in Canada for each year from 1892 to 1901, inclusive.

1891..	1,452,000	816,000	304,000
1892..	1,536,000	832,000	320,000
1893..	1,680,000	872,000	304,000
1894..	1,636,000	896,000	288,000
1895..	1,788,000	1,024,000	208,000
1896..	1,784,000	1,008,000	176,000
1897..	1,816,000	1,000,000	208,000
1898..	2,344,000	1,280,000	352,000
1899..	2,596,000	1,480,000	264,000
1900..	2,272,000	1,544,000	40,000
1901..	2,760,000	1,616,000	816,000
	$21,664,000	$12,368,000	$3,280,000

LIEUT.-COL. VANWAGNER'S REMOVAL.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth) asked :

1. Has the matter referred to in the following letter, addressed by C. D. Pinault, Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, to Lieut.-Col. VanWagner, on November 25th, 1899, been investigated :—

'Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 8th inst., addressed to the Right Honourable the Earl of Minto, and transferred to this department, I have the honour to inform you that the matter concerning your removal will be investigated.'

2. If so, by whom ?

3. What is the finding ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). After the date of the letter of the deputy minister quoted in the question, I looked into the matter, and came to the conclusion that there was nothing requiring investigation.

STEAMSHIPS WITH COOLING PLANTS OR FANS.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth) asked :

1. What steamers have been fitted up with cooling plants to cool the compartments containing perishable products in conformity with agreement with the government of Canada ?

2. What other steamships than those named in the House by the Minister of Agriculture last year have been fitted with fans to produce a circulation of fresh air in the compartments in which perishable products are carried, if any ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Part of the information called for in this question is now in the hands of the department, but another part has yet to be obtained. I will allow the question to stand until I can get the whole.

BUSINESS OF 'SAMPLE POST.'

Mr. BROCK—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

1. What quantity of samples by 'sample post' is brought into Canada ?
2. Does the postage thereon pay the cost of carriage and handling ?
3. If not, what amount is lost to the country ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. No record is kept by this department of the quantity of samples brought into Canada from foreign countries.
2. The postage on such matter is paid in and retained by the country of origin, and in accordance with the provisions of the Universal Postal Convention there is no charge by Canada except in the case of deficient postage.
3. It is impossible to form an estimate of the cost of transmission of such matter.

THE GERMAN TARIFF.

Mr. KEMP—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

1. To what nations or dependencies does Germany apply her minimum and maximum tariff respectively ?
2. What is the date of the last Anglo-German Treaty ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) :

1. The latest list of countries enjoying 'Most Favoured Nation Treatment' is that published in July, 1898, and is in virtue of a decision of the Bundesrath, dated 26th May, 1898, and is as per attach.

All other nations are supposed to be subject to the maximum tariff.

It does not follow in all cases that because certain countries are on the list as enjoying 'Most Favoured Nation Treatment' that they have the full benefit of the minimum tariff, as in some instances they are under special treaty covering only certain specified articles.

2. The date of the last Anglo-German treaty was May 30th, 1865, with some subsequent supplements, which treaty has been denounced, so that there exists at present no regular commercial treaty between the two countries, but pending negotiations Great Britain and her colonies, with the exception of Canada and Barbadoes, are given the benefit of the 'Most Favoured Nation Treatment.'

Bulletin International des Douanes.
The International Customs Journal.
Germany.
16th Supplement to No. 25.
(July 1898.)

In virtue of a decision of the Bundesrath, dated May 26, 1898 (1), the list of countries enjoying the most-favoured nation treatment(2) is modified as follows :

Argentine Republic, Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, France including Colonies, transmarine Possessions and the Principality of Monaco, Greece, Great Britain including Colonies and transmarine Possessions (3), Guatemala, Hawaiian Islands, Honduras, Italy including the Republic of Saint Marin, Colombia, Republic of Liberia, Madagascar, Morocco, Mexico, Nicaragua, Netherlands including Colonies and transmarine Possessions, Austria-Hungary including the territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina belonging to the customs circumscription as well as the Principality of Lichtenstein, Orange Free State, Paraguay, Persia, Roumania, Russia, Salvador, Sweden and Norway, Switzerland, South African Republic (Transvaal), Turkey (with Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia), Tunis, United States of America, Zanzibar, German territories excluded from the customs circumscription, German Colonies and Protectorates.

(1) 'Centralblatt f. d. Deutsche Reich' No. 22, of 1898.

(2) See No. 25, page 3.

(3) According to the law of May 11, 1898 ('Reichsgesetzblatt,' No. 19, of 1898), the Bundesrath is authorized to grant the most-favoured nation treatment to Great Britain, her Colonies and transmarine possessions until June 30, 1899.

ADVERTISEMENTS OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. In what newspapers was the advertisement for the sale of binder twine inserted, and how many insertions in each paper ?
2. To whom was the circular asking for tenders sent ?
3. What quantity of each kind of twine was purchased by Henderson Black ?
4. From whom were tenders received ?
5. Was the highest tender in each case accepted ?
6. Has any binder twine been sold since June 30, 1901, without tender ?
7. Where does Henderson Black reside ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll) :

1. Toronto 'Globe,' Hamilton 'Times,' London 'Advertiser,' Montreal 'Herald,' Montreal 'La Patrie,' Winnipeg 'Free Press,' London 'Record,' Brandon 'Sun,' Windsor 'Record.' Two insertions in each paper.
2. Two dealers to whom prison twine had previously been sold as well as to other twine dealers known to the prison officials.
3. Five hundred and eighty-six thousand seven hundred and ninety-three pounds of mixed grades, and 60,000 pounds of sisal.
4. Tenders were received from Henderson Black, Hobbs Hardware Company, Ontario Binder Twine Company, and S. S. Dickinson.
5. The highest tender in each case was accepted.
6. Twine when available has been sold to farmers since July, 1901, in the same manner as previous to that date.
7. At. St. John's, Quebec.

PARTISANSHIP IN ELECTIONS.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. What measures does the government purpose adopting in regard to such public employees as take an active and open part in a Federal election ?
2. Has the Honourable the Prime Minister ever, in the course of a speech in the House

of Commons, given expression to an opinion on the subject of such employees ?

3. If so, what was that opinion ?

4. If not, does he hold one, and what is it ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The same measures will be taken in the future as have been taken in the past with regard to public employees who are accused of offensive partisanship. When the charges are brought to the attention of the government they will be investigated, and the case will be dealt with according to the evidence.

SESSIONAL CLERKS.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Maclean—asked :

Are there any of the sessional clerks employed in any other capacity in the civil service and drawing pay for it, except their duties here ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government have no knowledge that sessional clerks are employed in the way suggested by the question.

NOTES ISSUED SINCE 1892.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. How many sheets of $1 notes have been issued since 1892 per annum ?

2. How many sheets of $4 notes have been issued per annum since 1892 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Number of sheets of $1 and $4 notes issued by the comptroller of Dominion currency since 1892, per annum :

Year.	$1 Notes Sheets.	$4 Notes. Sheets.
1893	420,000	19,000
1894	409,000	18,000
1895	447,000	13,000
1896	446,000	11,000
1897	454,000	13,000
1898	586,000	22,000
1899	649,000	16,500
1900	568,000	2,500
1901	690,000	51,000

MR. C. R. DEVLIN, IMMIGRATION AGENT.

Mr. WILSON—by Mr. Gilmour—asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been called to an interview alleged to have been given by Mr. C. R. Devlin, ex-M.P., Canadian Immigration Agent in Ireland, to the Montreal 'Witness' of the 17th January, 1902, as follows:—

'Mr. C. R. Devlin, Dominion Immigrant Agent, is a follower of John Redmond. Believes that Ireland should have a separate parliament. Why Canada does not get the Irish immigrant in large numbers.

'Mr. Charles R. Devlin, the Dominion Immigrant Agent at Dublin, Ireland, has often, upon the floor of the House of Commons, and the public platforms of the country, eloquently pleaded the cause of Home Rule for Ireland. An Irish-Canadian, he was always candid in his sympathy for those who were fighting for a separate parliament for the Irish people.

'A residence in Ireland itself has but served to deepen his love for the cause. Mr. Devlin is an official of the Dominion Government, but he is an enthusiastic follower of John Redmond, who is now preaching a no-rent crusade in Ireland which threatens to have far-reaching consequences. But, Mr. Devlin, while fulfilling his duties, also subscribes to the Land League, and is heart and soul with those who desire to have separation with Great Britain.

'Mr. Devlin is at present in the city stopping at the Windsor Hotel. He was asked this forenoon to say a word as to the condition of Ireland at the present, more especially in regard to the acute form which the Irish agitation had recently taken—the form of an overwhelming organization, whose chief doctrine was that the people should not pay rent.

'Mr. Devlin replied by saying that it must be remembered that he was not a politician, but an official of the government, who was subject to criticism, and who must be careful of the answers which he gave. At the same time, he had never concealed his opinions when in parliament, and had not changed when he went to live in Ireland. He was a follower of John Redmond and a subscriber to the funds of the Land League. He was an Irish-Canadian, but blood was thicker than water, and he did not forget that England oppressed Ireland because the Irish were Catholics.

'You are not a believer in physical force, are you, Mr. Devlin ?

'No, I have no sympathy for physical force at all. I am for effecting the purpose by constitutional means. There is no necessity for physical force in the premises.

'Do you approve of the agitation of which the object is to prevent the tenant farmers of Ireland from paying rent in any shape or form ?

'I am in sympathy with the programme mapped out by John Redmond. Here is the stand I take, and I do not care who knows it :—

'I am in full sympathy with the National movement, and as an Irish-Canadian and a Roman Catholic, I see no reason why Ireland should not receive the same measure of responsible government as is enjoyed in Canada. To put the whole case in one word—before going to Ireland, I was a Nationalist, and since that I am now such in a more pronounced degree.

'The whole question is this, said Mr. Devlin, shall Ireland have a separate parliament ? I think she should. Others take a different view. They are entitled to their opinion. Indeed, we have frequent discussions over the matter in my office. There are those in Ireland who say that there should be no legislative separation ; on the other hand, the great bulk of the people are in favour of a separate parliament, and I am with them in this. I have nothing to conceal as far as my personal views are concerned, but, of course, I have no desire to talk politics.

'Do you believe, Mr. Devlin, that the establishment of industries in the south and west of Ireland would go far towards the creation of better conditions ?

'No doubt this would be a feature in the case.

'Is the country prosperous ?

'Well, there was a good crop.

'Have the farmers money in the bank ?

'I have not studied the economic question.

'How are the county councils working ?

'Very well, indeed.

'Do the people take much interest in the local questions which come up at the meetings ?

'Well, as much as they do in this country.

'Mr. Devlin was asked how it was that Canada got so few Irish immigrants, the bulk of whom went to the United States.

'First of all, according to Mr. Devlin, there is the question of the flag, which plays an important part with the Irishman. He does not particularly like the British flag. He does not want to go to another country where he will be under it. He goes to the United States in preference. He had no doubt that the action of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in appearing at Mr. Redmond's meeting would do much to remove the prejudice which was felt against the Dominion, while, at the same time, the Dominion was in no wise hurt by the action of the Premier.

'In the second place, Mr. Devlin continued, effort should have been made thirty years ago. That effort was only made yesterday, so to say. Ninety per cent of the persons who left Ireland for the United States did so on prepaid tickets—tickets which had been purchased by friends who had gone to the United States thirty, twenty, ten years ago. Had the Dominion made an effort thirty years ago, such passages would have been paid to Canada. In the third place, it must be remembered that Ireland had none of the aids to immigration which were so evident in England. She had only three agencies in the whole country. On the other hand, in England there was the work of the Dominion Government, the work of the Provincial Governments, the work of the Canadian Pacific Railway. At the same time, he could say there had been a considerable improvement, and the Dominion was beginning to get a fair share of Irish immigration. There had been fourteen hundred immigrants from Ireland to the Dominion in eleven months last year. This showed a decided increase over previous records.

'It has been said, Mr. Devlin, there is lack of zeal on the part of the government agents, who do their work perfunctorily, and who do not stir up the interest of the people in the advantages which Canada can offer.

'As I said, effort should have commenced thirty years ago in Ireland. All is done that can be done under the circumstances.

'One of the planks in the new programme of Mr. Redmond is that the people should be taught to remain in the country. As you are a subscriber to the funds of the league, is your position as an immigrant agent not rather incongruous? You sympathize with the desire of the league to retain the people on the soil, and yet you must urge immigration.

'But I don't urge it.

'No? Then the office and the work are in the nature of a superfluity?

'Come, come, said Mr. Devlin, laughingly, you are a desperate interviewer, but I will define my position.

'I do not urge immigration from Ireland, and I never will. I agree that Ireland should be the home of the Irishman, and I will be glad when the day comes when no Irishman will have to leave Ireland; I will then gladly come back to work in my own country. But we have to notice the fact that there is a large immigration from Ireland, and my aim is to secure for Canada the largest possible proportion.

'Asked if the establishment of a fast Atlantic service would have a beneficial effect on immigration, Mr. Devlin said he would prefer not to answer that question.

'In regard to his present mission, Mr. Devlin said:—I am here on important matters in connection with my office, and as soon as I can get them settled, I will go back. I am particularly anxious to have the Canadian exhibit at the Cork show made as good and as effective as possible. I hope to return in two weeks.

2. Did the government or any of its officers communicate with Mr. Devlin respecting such interview?

3. If so, what reply, if any, has been received from Mr. Devlin?

4. Has Mr. Devlin sent any communication to the department or to any officer of the government respecting the above interview? And, if so, what is the nature of the reply?

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

1. The government, through the press and through the proceedings of the Agricultural and Colonization Committee, has had its attention called to the alleged interview.

2. No.

3. See 2.

4. Mr. Devlin does not admit the accuracy of the newspaper report.

JAMAICA AND COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS.

Mr. KEMP—by Mr. Clarke—Asked:

1. Did the commercial agent of the Dominion make representations to the government of Jamaica in reference to the repeal of the law imposing a tax on commercial travellers from Canada; and has such tax been abolished?

2. What steps, if any, have the government taken to cancel or render ineffective certain legislation of the government of Prince Edward Island 'in restraint of the freedom of trade' popularly known as a 'tax on commercial travellers' from other provinces in the Dominion?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright).

1. The Department of Trade and Commerce received a communication from the commercial agent at Kingston, Jamaica, dated 9th October last, in which he stated that he had an inquiry some time previous from a Canadian firm asking whether if they sent a representative there to show samples of their manufactures he would be liable to pay a tax under existing law; and that he had raised the question with the government of Jamaica and hastened to communicate the fact, for the information of the Canadian government, that it is the intention of the government of Jamaica to introduce a Bill at the next session of the legislative council to repeal the law imposing a tax on commercial travellers.

2. No further information has been received on the subject.

INDEMNITY TO JOSEPH LAROSE.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for:

Copy of all correspondence upon the subject of an indemnity to Joseph Larose, of St. Laurent, P.Q., wounded in connection with the Cote St. Luc rifle ranges; and copy of the judgments of the Exchequer and Supreme Courts upon the petition of right of said Joseph Larose.

He said : In moving for this correspondence with regard to the claim made by Mr. Joseph Larose, of St. Laurent, I merely wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden) to the circumstances regarding it. The Minister of Militia and Defence and the members of this House will probably remember that three or four years ago Joseph Larose was very severly wounded by a bullet, which, as I think is admitted on all hands was established at the time he urged his claim against the government, came from the government rifle ranges at Cote St. Luc. An investigation was held by the department, and after taking evidence, the government came to the conclusion that Joseph Larose was entitled to an indemnity. This was a short time after the injury had been inflicted. The amount of $1,000 was placed in the estimates. But in the meantime the condition of Mr. Larose having become no better but worse, he consulted counsel in Montreal, retaining the services of one of our lawyers there, and after consulting others, his lawyer came to the conclusion that this sum of $1,000 was not sufficient to indemnify Mr. Larose for the injury he had received, the injury in the meantime having become of a permanent nature, as it is to-day. He therefore proceeded to obtain a fiat from the government in order to make a claim before the Exchequer Court. He proceeded by petition of right, and his petition was dismissed—I have not seen the judgment—but I think upon some technical ground. Speaking from memory, it was upon the ground that he had been wounded when he was not upon public works, but was off the area where those public works were being executed, and this barred his claim. That is what I was told ; I have not seen the judgment. This motion calls for a copy of the judgment of the Exchequer Court, and the judgment of the Supreme Court as well. He appealed his case to the Supreme Court and the appeal was dismissed. To-day the claimant is exactly in the same condition as he was after the wound had been inflicted. He is no better and no worse ; he is disabled for life, and is unable to execute any agricultural work whatever upon his farm. He is not a man of large means, he is obliged to employ a paid servant to do the work which otherwise he would be able to do himself. Under these circumstances, I think it is proper that the equity of his claim should be once more brought to the attention of the government, and I would ask the Minister of Militia and Defence to investigate anew his claim, after communicating with the lawyer who represented him in these two courts, and if possible, to grant him, if not the indemnity which was voted previously by this House, at any rate some indemnity to which I think he is absolutely entitled. Possibly, in view of the incapacity in which he finds himself to-day to do any agricultural work, the government might find some employment for him. But under the circumstances, he having been unfortunate in his attempt to recover before the courts, having been defeated, so far as I understand, upon a mere technical point, I think his claim should commend itself to the minister of the department.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). Mr. Speaker, the circumstances as stated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) are practically the facts. I am not thoroughly familiar with the judgment, but I know the result of the judgment is what the hon. gentleman has stated. In addition to that, however, I am aware that the judge, in delivering that judgment, expressed the hope—I think it was a hope—that the government might look further into the case, that although he had not been able to go into the case on account of some technicalities, he still thought it was a case that the government might fairly investigate further. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I have had it under consideration recently and that I felt that parliament would consent that the sum of $1,000 which was voted two years ago, I think, and not then accepted, should be again offered to Mr. Larose. In view, however, of the statement made by the hon. gentleman I am quite willing that a further examination of Mr. Larose should be made by a competent surgeon. I was not aware that his condition of health was serious. I was under the impression that he was able to do a certain amount of work, but if he is entirely unfitted for doing work perhaps it would be desirable that a further examination of the case should be made, and I shall be very glad indeed to have that done if necessary.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). If I indicate to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) where he will find the judgments, perhaps he will be good enough to withdraw his motion as it would then be unnecessary for us to get the judgments of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts. My hon. friend will find the Exchequer judgment at 6 Exchequer Court Reports, page 425, and the Supreme Court Judgment at 31 Supreme Court Reports, page 206. I may just add that when the accident happened and an investigation was made by the Militia Department, it was decided to place $1,000 in the estimates to provide for the remuneration of Mr. Larose to some extent for the accident, although, of course, no liability was admitted. Mr. Larose was not satisfied with the amount then offered and took proceedings in the Exchequer Court by which proceedings he claimed $10,000 damages. It was found in the Exchequer Court that there was no jurisdiction in the court to deal with the case, because the accident, if accident there was, did not happen on what is known as a

public work, it being held that the rifle range at Cote St. Luc was not a public work within the meaning of the Exchequer Court Act. The judge said that he thought the amount then put in the estimates to make provision for the damages would still remain available to him. The amount did remain available. Notwithstanding that Larose took an appeal to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court held, first, that there was no claim because the accident did not occur upon a public work, the man being a mile distant from the Cote St. Luc rifle ranges from which the bullet was supposed to have been fired, and it held further that as a matter of fact there was no evidence that the rifle ball had been fired from a rifle in the hands of a servant of the Dominion government or even of a militiaman, because the rifle ranges at Montreal are frequented, not only by militiamen, but by those who desire to indulge in target practise. However, so far as the courts are concerned, it has been decided that this matter is out of court. I am very glad to hear the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden) say that the amount originally intended to be paid might still be available, and I think this is fairly generous treatment under the circumstances, because the Crown has been put to a fairly large amount of costs in defending these suits.

Mr. MONK. I was not aware that the court had decided exactly to the extent which the hon. Minister of Justice just referred, and I am not aware that the rifle ranges, being used with the consent of the government even by a man who is not a militiaman, would shield the government from responsibility. However, in view of the explanations which have been just given, I see no object in pressing the motion, and I would therefore ask permission to withdraw it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will read from the judgment of the Supreme Court the following extract:

> I would say, apart from the reason that this rifle range was not a public work in the sense of the Act, that there is no evidence here that the suppliant's wounding resulted from the negligence of any officer or servant of the Crown while acting within the scope of his duties or employment, or that he suffered any injury on any public work. Moreover, it is not proved who fired the shot that wounded the suppliant. It may have been fired by one of the amateurs, or volunteers not on duty, who were there practising on that day with the men having what is called in the case, government practise.

Motion withdrawn.

TELEPHONES AND TELEPHONE COMPANIES BILL.

On the Order for:

Second reading of Bill (No. 2) respecting telephone companies—Mr. Maclean.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) to allow this item to be postponed as the government is going to introduce a measure to the same purpose.

Mr. MACLEAN. May I ask the right hon. gentleman when the government are likely to introduce the measure?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think on Wednesday.

Mr. MACLEAN. All right.

DRAINAGE ON AND ACROSS RAILWAY PROPERTY.

Mr. M. K. COWAN (South Essex) moved second reading of Bill (No. 4) respecting drainage on and across the property of railway companies. He said: Mr. Speaker, this subject of drainage on and across the property of railway companies is one that is not new to this House. It was some years ago introduced by the then hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). In 1900, some amendments were made to the Railway Act. The object and the purport of the Bill at that time was to amend the procedure by which municipalites and landowners could drain across the property of railway companies. In 1900, the Act was amended enabling landowners to come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Prior to that time they could only reach it through the municipalities and if it were a drain under the Ditches and Watercourses Act of Ontario, not being a municipal drain, within the true sense of a municipal drain, they could not get before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. In 1900, the Railway Act was amended enabling a land owner to come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council if he desired to drain across the land of a railway company. My object in introducing this Bill is to adopt the provincial laws in force in the various provinces enabling the landowners to use the provincial machinery to drain across the lands of the railway companies under the same procedure as they could drain across the land of any other landowner—with the exception, that wherever the procedure does not enable or provide for notice to be served upon the railway company, a notice shall be served upon them; giving the railway company an opportunity of agreeing with the engineer of the municipality or landowner as to the point at which the railway shall be crossed, and also as to the cost and other details in connection with it. In the event of these two parties, after a conference, failing to agree, the Bill then provides that the county court judge, or the judge having jurisdiction in the district, should settle the matter—the question of costs being determined by the judge. In order to safeguard the interest of the travelling public I have inserted a clause

to the effect that the railway companies shall have the right to do the work upon their own lands. I quite realize that it would be inadvisable to permit every person to invade the railway lands and construct a drain or tunnel under the road-bed. I have, therefore, in the interest of the railway companies, made that provision.

The necessity for drainage across railways was decided on in this House when the Railway Act was amended in 1900. I think the Prime Minister then admitted that there was a necessity for the simplification of the existing machinery. I contend that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is not the proper tribunal before which a private landowner should be compelled to go in order to enable him to construct a drain costing practically only a few dollars. There are very few farmers who will invoke the machinery at present in force and go to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The name in itself 'Railway Committee of the Privy Council' scares the average landowner from coming before that body, and the fact that an ordinary farmer may have to travel hundreds of miles to Ottawa is an absolute barrier. The farmers are not acquainted with the machinery of that tribunal, and I venture to say that there are not 50 per cent of the members of this House; yes, not 50 per cent possibly of the lawyers of this House who are acquainted with the different steps to be taken in order to bring a case before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

The portions of the province of Ontario which I think stand most in need of this legislation are the western counties. Take the counties of Essex, Kent, Elgin and Lambton and I am within the mark when I say that there is not a thousand acres in any of these counties but has been either directly or indirectly assessed and taxed for the construction of drainage work. In those flat sections of the country it is necessary to construct large artificial drains extending for miles, and portions of these counties present the appearance of being ditched like a checker board. So far as the county of Essex is concerned, the fall is to the north into Lake St. Clair. Along the northern border of that county, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Michigan Central, three large trunk lines have constructed their road-beds. In order that the farmer could successfully prosecute an action under the Ontario law against a railway corporation for the damming up or damming back of water, it must have been a natural stream or a natural watercourse. There are but few natural watercourses in that county, because the water flows gently over the surface of the land with a fall probably of from four feet to nine feet per mile. The result is that there is not sufficient current, and no hill to precipitate the water at a rapid rate so as to form cuts in the earth, and so there are miles and miles in that county where the water flows gently over the surface of the soil leaving no track behind it that could within the meaning of the law be called a natural watercourse. The result is that when the water flows down to the railway track and the railway company construct their road-bed closing up the point across which that water originally flowed, no action will lie against the railway corporation, because they have not stopped up what is called a natural stream, or a natural watercourse within the meaning of the Ontario decisions.

If a farmer desires to cross that track with his drain he is compelled to come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. As we know, railway corporations are slow to grant anything that they are not obliged to grant. I venture to say that there are few instances in which any railway corporation has ever permitted a culvert to be constructed under its road-bed, until it was compelled to do so by the highest legal authority. Suppose the matter is in dispute and a farmer in the county of Essex finds it necessary to construct a drain, then you ask him to come 500 miles to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council at Ottawa, to bring his witnesses and his engineers, and to retain counsel. I say there is not one farmer out of a hundred who will do that. I am within the mark in saying, that in these low lying sections of the country every four or five years some farmer loses the entire crop of the soil, because he is unable to make proper drainage across these railways. The land in that section of the country being largely clay and not porous as in sandy sections, it holds the water on the surface and therefore drainage is absolutely necessary. There is scarcely a township in the county of Essex that has not spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in the construction of drains to drain the land. It is a direct tax. These drains are filled up with silt, they cave in and so forth until it becomes necessary to renew them about every ten years on an average. The tax for the construction of large drains in the county of Essex through the flat section, runs from 75 cents to $3 per acre and it is a recurring tax. The railway corporations, I am bound to say, wherever the opportunity was afforded them to prevent the farmer or municipality draining across their lines, have not hesitated to take advantage of the opportunity. One corporation draining through a natural creek found it necessary to cross a railway in the construction of a drain costing between $30,000 and $40,000, and the railway company refused to let the dredge pass under the railway bridge until arrangements were made for the payment what they said—according to the statement of the contractor—was the actual cost. They made an arrangement that they should pass under the bridge on a

Sunday afternoon when there was little traffic. It took twelve men four hours to raise the girders, and before the railway company permitted the dredge to pass, they compelled them to deposit $1,500, as according to the statement of the contractor—I do not know how true—it was on the understanding that the sum was to cover the expense and that he was to receive back anything in excess of the actual expense. When he wanted to get the dredge out again he was compelled to deposit $1,500 more. It took twelve men four hours, or forty-eight hours labour of one man, to do it. I complained to the Department of Railways and Canals of what I thought was a deliberate steal, and the reply I got from the department was that they had submitted my complaint to the railway company, and the railway company said there was a contract, and consequently the department could not interfere in a matter governed by a contract between the two parties. The corporation still has that $3,000 for ninety-six hours work. In other words, the railway corporation charged at the rate of $31 per hour for what cost it 12½ cents per hour. There is no question of tariff or transportation, which is as important to the western counties as this matter respecting drainage. We do not want anything but what is fair, but we do want to be in a position to prevent a railway corporation from holding water back along its ditches for miles and flooding, in the county of Essex, the most fertile belt in the province of Ontario. Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he intends that the laws of the different provinces regarding drainage across the property of railway companies shall apply, not only as they are at present, but also as they may be from time to time amended by the different provinces.

Mr. COWAN. Section 3 of the Bill provides that subject to the provisions of this Act municipalities and landowners shall have the right of drainage on and across the property of any railway company to the same extent and by the same proceeding as they have by law on and across the property of any other landholders. This is subject to the provision that the railway company shall have the option of itself constructing a portion of the drains crossing its own land. In this I think we would be adopting the laws of the provinces, as they are now, and as they may subsequently be amended. Such is the intention at all events.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have no objection to the Bill going to the Railway Committee and there being fully discussed. But I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to the question whether we have the power to delegate to the different provinces an exclusive jurisdiction which we possess ourselves. By the provisions of this Bill, we are going to apply not merely the laws and procedure of the different provinces at present in force, but as they may be amended from time to time by the provincial legislature. Of course I may be told that we are simply applying the same principle as applies in the Franchise Act, but I do not think that we have the right to delegate to the different provinces the power to legislate, as they may see fit, from time to time, regarding a matter over which we have exclusive jurisdiction. If we have the right to delegate this power to the provinces why not delegate it to the different municipalities or to the different townships, which are more directly interested and have a better knowledge of the subject than this parliament can possess ?

Mr. COWAN. For the simple reason that no municipality in the county of Essex has any right to make a law which would enable any landowner to drain across the property of another municipality or another landowner.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If we have the right to delegate to a province could we not also delegate to a municipality ? I object to this Bill on the constitutional ground.

The hon. member has another ground on which he urges the acceptance of his measure. He says it will furnish a more expeditious and less costly means of dealing with the matter—that it is better to have it decided by a county court judge than by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Well, I have this much confidence in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, even as at present constituted, to believe that that committee will deal with this matter better than any county court judge or arbitrators or any other judge the hon. gentleman may select in the county of Essex or elsewhere, both from the point of view of equity and cheapness. There is no cheaper tribunal to be had than the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The party need not bring his witnesses, his counsel need not attend, the Privy Council will still hear the case, and may send, at the expense of the Dominion, an officer of the department for the purpose of looking into and reporting upon it. It is the cheapest and fairest possible tribunal that I know of. It is very popular to say that a party may get his witnesses near at home, and his counsel, and the court, and that that is a much cheaper and better system ; but until a commission is appointed, I believe that the cheapest and most equitable tribunal is the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

But what I particularly object to is the delegation by the Dominion of its powers to the provinces, and I think that if the question ever comes before the courts, they will decide that we have no power to make

the delegation proposed either to the provinces or to the municipalities.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). May I ask the hon. member for Essex a question ? I understood him to say that the work may be executed by the railway companies, with the object, of course, of securing public safety. Is there any provision in the Bill for determining the amount of expense ?

Mr. COWAN. Under the law the cost of the drain must be determined by the engineer in laying it out. There is an express provision in the Bill that the two engineers —the one named by the landowner and the company's engineer—shall meet to consider the proportion of cost to be borne by the company, and in the event of their failure to agree, the matter will be referred to a county court judge. I do not say that the Bill is perfect in its form, but if there are any little discrepancies they can be removed in committee.

Mr. McGOWAN. Does the hon. gentleman propose to apply this Bill to the ditches and watercourses of municipalities as well as private parties ?

Mr. COWAN. It applies to all the municipal drainage of the province, both of the private individual and the municipality.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In reply to my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) I may say that I have examined the Bill myself and have submitted it to the officers of my department, and we have come to the conclusion that there is absolutely nothing in it which is not quite within the powers of this parliament.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing :

1. All contracts awarded by the Department of Railways and Canals during the year ending 30th June, 1901, in which the 'Current Wages' clause was incorporated, and the amount of such contracts.

2. The number of such contracts in which the schedule of wages was prepared by the fair wages officers.

3. The number of such contracts in which the schedule of wages was prepared by the contractors and accepted by the department.

4. The number of such contracts which were unaccompanied by schedule of wages.

5. The number of contracts awarded by the Department of Railways and Canals which did not contain either the 'Current Wages' clause or a schedule of wages.—Mr. Puttee.

Copies of all applications for water powers and other similar rights on or connected with the Soulanges canal, and all correspondence with respect thereto, and all reports, letters, and communications of or from engineers or other experts respecting the same. Also, all leases granted to any person, firm or corporation of water powers or other similar rights on or connected with the above named canal.—Mr. Bennett by Mr. Clarke.

Return for copies of all contracts made during two years past between the government of Canada and all steamship companies with whom it is agreed that a subsidy, bonus or grant of any kind shall be given by the government of Canada for services to be rendered in connection with Transatlantic, Transpacific or West Indian business.—Mr. Smith (Wentworth).

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 4.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 4, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company.—Mr. Cowan.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 25) in further amendment of the Railway Act.

He said : As the matter dealt with in this proposed amendment is somewhat involved, this may be as suitable a time as any to offer a few words in explanation of the scope of the Bill. The object of the Bill is, if not to prohibit, at least very greatly to limit the power of a railway company operating under a Dominion charter to contract itself out of its common-law or statutory liabilities to its employees in the case of injury resulting from the negligence of the company or its servants. The whole trend of modern legislation upon this point, as regards employers and employees, is strongly in the direction of safeguarding the right of the workman, and to prevent any contract or agreement from proving a bar or hindrance to the recovery of compensation by the workman. While the Bill which I have asked leave to introduce is wide in its terms, and will, if passed, affect all railway companies operating under Dominion charter, yet, as a matter of fact, the only company really concerned at the present time is the Grand Trunk Railway Company. This arises from the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway has, in years past, obtained certain special legislation from the parliament of Canada, and I have not been able to ascertain that any other railway company enjoys similar privileges.

The difficulty which it is sought to remedy had its origin as far back as 1874, when the Grand Trunk Railway Company obtained the passage of an Act to enable them to set aside a fund, and to form a superannuation and provident society for its workmen. They were entitled, under this Act of 1874, to formulate a scheme, to formulate rules for the transaction of the business of the society, and for the government of the members of the society. In 1878, they obtained further legislation authorizing them, in addition to their superannuation fund and provident fund, to establish an accident and life insurance fund, and to conduct the business of life insurance and accident insurance, with regard to their workmen, and in connection with their superannuation society.

Then in 1880, the Great Western Railway Company obtained similar legislation. In 1884, after amalgamation of the two roads, this superannuation and insurance society was applied to the whole system of the Grand Trunk Railway. This was again confirmed by an Act of 1888. Now the difficulty which presents itself is this: Under authority of these various special Acts the Grand Trunk Railway Company has formed a society known as the Grand Trunk Railway Insurance and Provident Society. They have passed rules, regulations and by-laws for the government of the society and the members of the society. Rule number 5 provides that every workman, the moment he enters into the employment of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, becomes a member of that society, and is bound by its laws. Rule 66 provides that all rules and regulations of the society shall be submitted to the Grand Trunk Railway Company and approved by them. But the most objectionable rule, or by-law, of the society is by-law 15, and it is under that by-law that the difficulty arises. By-law number 15 provides:

> In consideration of the subscription of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to this society, no member thereof or his representatives shall have any claim against the company for compensation on account of injury or death from accident.

Under these various Acts the railway is empowered to grant certain money to this fund. I have heard it stated in open court that they do grant annually $12,500, and as they have approximately 25,000 workmen, they pay 50 cents for each man into that fund, and as a result they claim they have absolute protection from all common law or statutory liability towards there workmen. Now they do provide some insurance, but they charge the workmen for the insurance at the rate of 40 or 50 cents a month; for the vast majority of their 25,000 men the rate is 50 cents per month, or $6 per year. For this they provide, in case of sickness, an indemnity of $3 per week for 26 weeks in the case of permanent disability, a sum of $100; and in the case of death, a sum of $250. They do not give as much as can be obtained by workmen doing similar work, from any one of the score of friendly or benevolent societies doing business in Canada to-day.

Now this matter has lain dormant for many years. I think it is only within the last eighteen months that the question has really arisen. During that period it has been decided by a trial judge in the province of Quebec, by a trial judge in the province of Ontario, and I think likewise by a trial judge in the province of British Columbia, that under that by-law 15 the workman is absolutely precluded from recovering against the railway company, even in case of the negligence of the company or of its servants. If I were to venture my own opinion in the matter, I would have no hesitation myself in saying that by-law 15 is not authorized by any enabling of the Acts; but it has been decided otherwise by trial judges. The difficulty of the situation is this, that where you have as plaintiff a disabled or injured railway man, or the widow of a deceased railway man, they are not in a position to carry this matter further and get the decision of a higher court upon it. As long as the matter is involved in doubt, or as long as the present decision stands, these 25,000 workmen in that company are absolutely debarred from recovering damages against the company in cases of injury resulting from negligence. The Bill which I have brought in is framed largely on the lines of clause 10 of the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Act and a similar clause is to be found in the English Act, the Employers Liability Act, and no doubt in other provincial Acts with which I am not familiar. It does not preclude agreements between the employers and their employees, but it simply provides that no agreement shall be allowed to prevail as a defense unless, in the first place, there is consideration on the part of the workman for entering into such an agreement other than the mere fact of his being taken into the employment; and unless the agreement is reasonable, just and adequate in the opinion of the judge who tries the case; and unless, in the opinion of the judge who tries the case, it is not improvident on the part of the workman. The onus of establishing the reasonableness and the adequacy of the consideration is thrown upon the railway company. That, Mr. Speaker, is in brief the Bill which I ask leave to introduce this afternoon.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. WILSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say that I made some inquiry a few days ago about some matters moved for in the House, and so far as I know they have not been brought down yet. I am particularly anxious to get the correspondence between the depart-

ment and Mr. Devlin relative to what he said about members of this House, also about the number of immigrants that were brought to this country for the last ten years, also about a report with reference to the work of the Experimental Farm, also with reference to the Belleville post office and the dismissals that took place there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I presume the hon. gentleman refers to Orders of the House which have already passed ?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) is not here to answer, I will see that the officers of his department are communicated with at once on the subject.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that the information the House ordered in regard to the Experimental Farm has been already sent to the House through the ordinary channels.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Public buildings in Nova Scotia—Arichat—reconstruction of public building, $1,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the position there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). There is a building there over fifteen years old, which is in bad shape to-day. It will take about $400.

Halifax—new public building, $50,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have bought a site for the building. The plans are prepared, tenders are now being called for, and in a few weeks they will be in.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it for an elevator ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We want elevators elsewhere.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The building is a customs-house, and will probably be used for other purposes as well.

Mr. WILSON. Would the Minister of Finance please tell us for what other purposes besides a customs-house ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. While the main purpose is to transfer the custom-house from the present building to the new one, other public purposes of the city of Halifax will of course be served by it. If there should be any spare rooms, some other branches of the service may be placed there. While it is called a custom-house building the department would not want to confine it absolutely to customs purposes if any other branch could be accommodated within the same building.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the estimated cost of this building ?

Mr. WILSON.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We expect that the cost of the building will reach $300,000, with the site, furniture, heating system and so on.

Mr. CLARKE. What will the site cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $24,000.

Mr. CLARKE. And the building $275,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We expect the building will cost about $250,000. There is in addition the expenditure entailed in supplying the heating system, fitting up, fencing, wiring for electrical purposes and so on.

Mr. CLARKE. Wire pulling ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been none. Both sides have agreed that this building must be erected.

Mr. BELL. Who was the land purchased from ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From Mr. Frederick D. Corbett, merchant of the city of Halifax. It is on the site of the old city market building, right opposite the existing Dominion building.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it intended to have the work done by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, tenders are called for.

New Brunswick—Marysville public building, $9,500.

Mr. CLARKE. What is this building for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract now, the contractors being the Messrs. Simmons, and the contract price is $6,842. Besides that we have paid $1,000 for the site, and there is the fitting up and so on.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that the total cost of the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the whole cost of the building.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the population of Marysville ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Marysville is a thriving town in New Brunswick. The population, which is increasing every day——

Mr. GIBSON. The population is about 2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And increasing rapidly.

Mr. GIBSON. And increasing rapidly. A lot of people are coming from outside towns to work there. About 600 people work in the cotton factory there who live a mile or two away. We have supplied the government with a building for post office purposes for the last 35 years, and I think we are entitled to a post office.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works whether the

hon. gentleman or the government has some fixed policy in expending money without taking into consideration only the population and the general prospects of the place. It is a very easy matter now for any hon. gentleman to state that he has a thriving village or town; in fact, if my memory serves me, the hon. Minister of Public Works always has a thriving town where he is putting up a building. Perhaps it would be convenient for the hon. gentleman to state whether he has any policy upon the question of putting up any public buildings in all the small towns and villages in Canada. If that gate is opened I am sure there are many hon. members on both sides of the House will be able to supply a similar reason; if it is not open, the hon. gentleman should explain why he has given this reason.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In former years there was in this parliament a gentleman who was the Minister of Finance in a Conservative administration. That gentleman was called the Hon. George E. Foster. He was representing the riding of York, New Brunswick, and when he was the member for that riding he placed in the estimates an amount of money for the erection of a public building at Marysville. I have simply inherited the obligation of expending that sum of money. I am spending it. I hope that I will spend less than Mr. Foster would have done, because he was known to be a very expensive man. In other words, joking apart, I found in the estimates when we took office a sum of money for the erection of a building at Marysville. Now, I am simply carrying out the pledge that was given under the late administration, and the wisdom of which I fully recognize.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman's memory appears to be very clear about one part of it, but there is another part of it which the hon. gentleman has forgotten. Does the hon. minister not know from the same source that he obtained the information in regard to an estimate being put in for that public building at Marysville when Mr. Foster was Minister of Finance and represented the riding of York, that the people of Marysville were to contribute half the cost of the building? It was explained to this House on a former occasion that the people of this town or village, whichever it may be, were to contribute a portion towards the erection of a public building there. Now, the hon. gentleman states that he has undertaken the whole cost, so that he will find no reason for the explanation he has given in the promise that was made in the past, as the circumstances are different. He should now offer some explanation of his policy.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no trace in my department of any promise or engagement whatever by which the town of Marysville undertook to pay half the cost of the building.

Mr. GIBSON. I have never heard of any promise being made such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has referred to, to contribute half of the cost of a public building at Marysville. I think if there is any place in the Dominion of Canada that deserves a public building, it is Marysville. We have a large cotton mill which gives employment to 750 hands and we pay out in wages $45,000 a month. This is not a village; it is the town of Marysville of which I have the honour to be mayor.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand the hon. Minister of Public Works to give as a reason for this estimate that the Hon. George E. Foster had made an appropriation while he was in office. I do not understand the hon. minister to give us any other reason for placing this amount in the estimates. The information I understand this committee to desire from the hon. minister is the ground upon which he can justify the expenditure of this money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that my hon. friends are a little too exacting in asking for reasons now, for erecting a building which was approved by their friends in office when a vote is placed in the estimates. While I do not hesitate to say that it is a good thing to have public buildings in thriving towns and villages provided they are not too expensive, yet we must not spend too much. It shows that we are progressing and it gives confidence to the country. I believe it is a good argument to say that when the faith of the country has been pledged by the late administration, as far as it could, we should recognize that pledge when we think it was wise to give it.

Mr. CLANCY. It is very extraordinary that the minister will not answer the question put to him. The minister cannot say that since he has presided over the Department of Public Works he has carried out all the grants that were put in the estimates by the former government. Therefore, his argument on that score does not amount to much. If the hon. gentleman says that he is making a special exception in this case that might be an answer to the question put to him; but if he is not making a special exception in this instance, then we desire to know if it is the policy of the government to erect public buildings in all towns similar to this. The hon. gentleman knows that this policy will lead to a very great expenditure. There is no hon. gentleman on either side of the House who would not think it very nice to have a public building in the principle town of his riding; but, if the Minister of Public Works commences to pick up places here and there we will have a just cause to complain. If the hon. gentleman carries out that policy then I can present to him a couple of places

where the reasons for the erection of a public building are quite as strong as they are in Marysville.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Each case should be judged on its own merits. I do not think there is a general rule which can be applied. It depends on many things.

Mr. INGRAM. Politics.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) must not forget that when his party were in power there was a lot of politics done.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes ; I did a lot of it with them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And when they are on this side of the House again they will do just the same thing ; in fact they will do worse than we do. The principles then will be the same that govern us to-day, and each case will have to be judged by itself. This is a most meritorious case. The Hon. Geo. E. Foster is a witness to that, and I cannot call a better witness to my aid. I am willing to say that we must not erect too many public buildings. But my friends do not forget that a great many public buildings were erected in the past, and we have some members on this side of the House that have their two eyes open to the magnificent public buildings that were erected in the Conservative days. They have placed their claims before me and if I were not an energetic man I would have to ask for a great deal more money than I ask now. But I face the music manfully, and I only decide to give money to meritorious cases like this one.

Mr. INGRAM. When I mentioned the word 'politics' I had in mind the arguments used by the supporters of the government when they were in opposition and which were very similar to the arguments used by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) to-day. The Liberals when in opposition charged the Conservatives with allowing party politics to have more to do with the investment of money in public buildings than the circumstances would warrant. The principle pursued by the Conservative government is being pursued to-day by the present government. If it was wrong then it is wrong now, and if it was right then it is right now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was right then.

Mr. INGRAM. Oh, very well.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the site been purchased for this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. CLARKE. It was not given by the municipality ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the cost of the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One thousand dollars, which has been paid.

Mr. CLARKE. From whom was it purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From the Gibson Company who are the sole owners of the whole town.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The whole town ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nobody can buy a piece of land outside of them.

Mr. CLANCY. This is a donation to the Gibson Company, and if they owned the whole town they will necessarily own the post office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was not a donation.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister has practically said so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a donation to public opinion.

Mr. CLANCY. It was hardly worth while to go to the form of conveying the land to the Crown. You might just as well have built the post office and donated it to the Gibsons.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the population of that town ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The population is 2,000 souls now.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the postal revenue of the town of Marysville ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1890—it will be more now because we have made a great deal of progress during those two years—the postal revenue was $1,398.92.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was that the gross revenue ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. With reference to this building in Mr. Gibson's county, I would like to ask if there has been any conveyance of the site upon which it stands ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the sight has been conveyed to us.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that it was against Mr. Gibson's policy to sell any land.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, but I declined to do anything before I got the deeds.

Richibucto public building, $5,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this as meritorious as the other case ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I should think so. The site has been bought for $805 and we intend to erect a commodious and cheap building costing about $6,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the population of Richibucto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 3,986 souls. It is a large town.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, apparently the larger the town the smaller the appropriation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a good deal of French population in Richibucto and they are very modest indeed. They do not ask for more than that.

St. John's Dominion Public Buildings—Improvements and alterations, $3,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What public buildings is this vote for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS The customs-house, the post office and savings bank.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the total cost of the improvements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount which is voted in the estimates.

St. John immigrant building, $10,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What is this building for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For immigration purposes. During the present winter, although the building is not completed, we have had several thousand immigrants in it. My hon. friend does not forget, I am sure, that St. John is a terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is our winter port, and the building is a most useful one.

Mr. CLARKE. How much has been spent on that building altogether ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $33,000 all completed.

Mr. CLARKE. Including the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes.

Mr. CLARKE. What has the site cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been given to us by the city.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the building being built under contract, and if so, what is the name of the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, by J. H. Pullen, of St. John.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there an immigrant building in Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes.

Mr. CLARKE. What did it cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give the exact cost of it to-day. If my hon. friend wants the information, I will take a note of it, and give it to him later.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask what the exact purpose of the building is ? Do you keep the immigrants there for a short time after their arrival, or is it for shelter ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. Some ships which have arrived there during the past winter have carried a thousand immigrants.

Mr. CLARKE. Were they for the United States or for Canada ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some for Canada and some for the United States.

Mr. CLARKE. In return for the accommodation afforded to immigrants going through to the United States does the government require the steamship companies carrying them to pay part of the cost of the maintenance of this building; or is it the policy of the government to pay all the cost, both of erecting the building and of maintaining it for the accommodation of these people ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the past the transportation companies have not been called upon to pay any share of the maintenance of the building. I admit that the immigrant trade, if I may call it so, is a good one for our transportation companies and for our towns and cities. It is a trade, just as much as any other trade; and thus far the government have not asked the transportation companies to contribute anything towards the erection of these sheds. St. John being a winter port, the government thought it was a good thing to equip it with all the implements of civilization.

Maritime provinces generally—Dominion public buildings—renewals, improvements, repairs, etc., $12,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much was expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $11,163.

Quebec—Dominion public buildings, renewals, improvements, repairs, etc., $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the same vote as before.

Mr. MONK. How is that divided ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is spread all over the country, in various small sums of $300 or $500, for repairs which are not of such importance as to call for a special vote in the estimates.

Mr. MONK. Would the minister state how much was expended in Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the Montreal custom-house $59.25; on the post office, $396.50. We had a special vote for Montreal.

Mr. MONK. Are we supposed to spend that sum every year—$12,000—neither more nor less ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and generally we are short.

Mr. MONK. I know that apart from this you vote special sums for repairs in Montreal, Quebec and other places.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, other votes cover large expenditures. This vote is to cover expenditures for small repairs wherever they may be required.

Drummondville public building, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Under contract to complete.

Mr. MONK. What will the total cost of this building be when completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $15,000.

Mr. MONK. I think there is a great deal to support the contention of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) that we ought to be informed what is the policy of the government in regard to these public buildings. I have no objection to the erection of a public building in Drummondville; but there are many other places in the province of Quebec which could rightly claim a public building. What are the conditions to which they have to conform ? Elect Reform candidates ? That seems to be the rule in our province. I think we are entitled to a statement from the government as to what their policy is in this regard, and what are the conditions to which parties must conform in order to obtain the erection of a public building. I heard the case of Marysville discussed a few moments ago. The hon. minister will remember that last year I called his attention very particularly to the town of St. Laurent in the county of Jacques Cartier—a large place, whose population is increasing more rapidly than that of Marysville, and where the necessity of a public building has been felt for a long time. It has very large educational institutions, is a distributing centre for postal matter and is a place which in every respect would warrant the government in erecting a public building there. My hon. friend did not fail to recognize that last year and promised to look into the matter, and I called his attention to the fact that there was a public building there, which had cost a great deal, and was available to the government at a low figure. I have no objection to a building in Drummondsville or Granby, but when there are other places equally as well if not better entitled to consideration, we ought to know the policy of the government. Must the localities furnish the site or any of the money and what should be the population and conditions of trade ? We should have a fixed rule, and the localities which conform to that rule should be able to obtain a hearing from the government. Otherwise it becomes simply a question, as the hon. minister said a moment ago, of deciding each case on a different principle, and the locality with the strongest pull is the one that will get the public building. That is a very bad policy.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are all of the same opinion with regard to fixed rules, and that is that they are no good. There is no business man who will say that he has always acted on fixed rules.

Mr. MONK. Then general principles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The general principle I endeavour to follow faithfully is to listen to every representation made to me and then make up my judgment without too much bias. My hon. friend is right in what he says about St. Laurent. Only we have so many things to do that we cannot do them all at once. St. Laurent is a fine village, and I have no doubt the time will come when it will have a magnificent public building. But that does not take anything from the merits of Drummondville. The merits of St. Laurent are one thing and of Drummondville another. When the building at Drummondville is completed, let us hope that within a short period we will have the pleasure of going to St. Laurent and seeing a public building there.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the population of Drummondville ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Over 2,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What will the building cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $15,000 all told. Drummondville is a town which is coming to the front very fast indeed. There is a prosperous wave in that locality, several manufactories have been started, there is a good water power in operation, and the government of Quebec is doing a great deal to make the place progress.

Mr. OSLER. What is the revenue of the post office ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The postal revenue in 1899 and 1900 was $2,322. There were money orders issued for over $15,000, and this year instead of $15,000, $22,000 of money orders are issued.

Granby, public building, Quebec, $11,000.

Mr. MONK. What is to be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $14,987.

Grosse Isle quarantine station, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is required for some extensive improvements. There were no water works or bath or electric lighting and we are equipping the station with these, as it ought to be. This

sum will complete the work, and this station will be not only the best in this country but on the continent. I am informed that during the last five years we spent about $60,000, and a much larger amount was spent the preceding five years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many immigrants in the course of a year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Only those who are sick are quarantined there.

Mr. CLARKE. How many were quarantined there last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are not now on the question of quarantine, and I am only the contractor for the improvements.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not say off hand, how many people were quarantined, but every year a certain number must be quarantined. I have not got the data here, but will have all the information when the quarantine item comes up for discussion. In the course of a year the average is 40 or 50, but there must be accommodation for a great many more because sometimes we will have to land a shipload of immigrants, 1,200 or 1,300, at a time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. During last season one ship was quarantined which had on board over 2,000 souls.

Mr. MONK. We have spent about $60,000 for the purpose of accommodating between 40 and 50 immigrants.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is an unfair representation of the facts because although we may not have on an average more than I have stated in a year, yet at any one time we are liable to have more than one shipload of immigrants in quarantine. On one occasion there were 2,100 people in Grosse Isle.

Mr. MONK. On the ship ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They had to be landed on shore and were kept in quarantine for over a month.

Mr. MONK. What ship ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot remember. It was a year and a half ago. The same thing occurred at Halifax on another occasion. The two ships came in one after the other and probably over 1,500 had to be accommodated at one time or another. Generally we have nobody there but are liable any moment to have this large number coming in on us, and we must supply the accommodation.

Mr. MONK. I would like to know which of these hon. gentlemen is correct. The hon. Minister of Public Works told us that the place cost about $60,000. We asked the hon. Minister of Agriculture how many people there were retained there last year, and he did not know, but said that there were forty or fifty the year before.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What I intended to say, and what I think I did say, was that there was an average of about forty or fifty a year.

Mr. MONK. Then, what was there incorrect in what we stated ? If we paid $60,000 and also the amount necessary to maintain the station, that being under the direction of the Minister of Agriculture, I do not think we misrepresented the facts when we said that we were paying dear for the immigration we get.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is not a question of immigration. I am sure that when he thinks over the matter, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) will not insist upon the position he has taken. Would he wish to have small-pox brought into the country ?

Mr. MONK. We do not want immigration to cost so dear as this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If we have a quarantine, that quarantine must be equipped. Suppose that a ship comes with one or two thousand or even three thousand souls on board, you must have an equipment capable of handling that number. I have personal knowledge of cases when a thousand immigrants were located there. What would the country say and what would parliament say if a ship loaded with people, including some smitten with dangerous diseases, should come to our shores and no proper system of quarantine were provided ? In every part of the world there are quarantines. And I make bold to say that, under the late administration, there has been half a million dollars spent there. There are quarantines at St. John, at Halifax—there must be at every great port in the world.

Mr. COCHRANE. What has that to do with the question under discussion ? We are talking about this quarantine station and about this proposed expense, not about what has been done elsewhere or in years gone by. The hon. minister finds it very convenient, when he gets into a hole, to say : You did the same. That is no argument. There is only one question to be considered, and that is whether this is not an enormous sum to spend, considering the public benefit derived. What information is it to me for the hon. gentleman to say that a great deal of money has been spent at Halifax and at other places ? Do we need to spend this amount of money at this particular station ?—that is the question. If it can be shown that the money can be spent in this way to the public advantage, we have nothing to say.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We require to equip our quarantines better than before, because we have a larger immigration than before. This is necessary to protect the health of the country. I think my hon. friends will admit on thinking it over, that their objections are not well taken.

Mr. MONK. Are these immigrants assisted immigrants ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That has nothing to do with the vote of $10,000 for quarantine. I do not know whether these immigrants are assisted or not. The Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), who will be in his place in a few days, will be able to answer as to that.

Mr. MONK. I think we are entitled to an answer to that point either from the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) or from the minister in charge of immigration. Another thing we are entitled to know is whether any means are taken on the other side, whence these assisted immigrants come—immigrants who cost us so dear—to inspect them before they leave port.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) will see that it is not competent for me to answer his question. The quarantine for which I am asking money is the only one on the St. Lawrence route during the summer months, and that quarantine I am equipping. When the immigration vote comes up, the hon. Minister of the Interior will be able to answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But, in order to know whether this is a proper amount to vote or not, we should have the information which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asks for. How are we to know whether such a large sum of money ought to be spent at this station unless we know under what precautions assisted immigrants as well as others are taken on shipboard for Canada. If it is only for immigrants that this is desired——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, not only for immigrants.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is mainly used for immigrants, I understand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, not principally.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) must be mistaken.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A good deal of the expenditure is necessary on account of immigrants, of course.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is used, as I am informed—and I say it with all deference to the hon. minister—mainly for immigrants.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Quarantine work has no reference to immigrants or any other particular class of passengers arriving there. All passengers whether immigrants, or those travelling first-class, are quarantined exactly alike. As a matter of fact, I suppose, a larger number of those arriving by vessel arrive in the steerage than first or second-class. In that sense, it may be said that we are dealing principally with immigrants. But, if a thousand first-class passengers should arrive, this accommodation would be required just the same as for a thousand immigrants. The accommodation is required to be more extensive than is commonly used, because we must provide for contingencies. This was done by our predecessors, just as it is done by us. As to this vote and the votes of the last year or two for equipping our quarantine stations, I may say that our requirements have increased. We have been recommended by our medical authorities to provide more bathing accommodation for the people who are retained there. It is due to this that not only at Grosse Isle, but at other quarantine stations, the expenditure for equipment is greater than it used to be.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In cases of this kind I am only a builder. The Department of Agriculture sends me a statement of the work to be done ; that is discussed with my chief architect and other officers, and I simply carry out the work for the Department of Agriculture. I trust my hon. friends will not persist in their objections. The season is about to open and this work has been begun. The quarantine must be equipped. It costs money, no doubt, but that is unavoidable. This vote is to complete the equipment of this important station, which is necessary to protect the health of the country.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, the expenditure on this station in the past has been enormous. It must represent a total of about $600,000 or $700,000. If I remember rightly, it is only a few years ago that nearly $120,000 was expended for fumigating purposes. There was a demand from the Department of Agriculture also for a wharf at Grosse Isle to accommodate vessels drawing twenty-eight or twenty-nine feet of water.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That has not been built.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. So I understand. But a demand upon the government for such a wharf was made by the Department of Agriculture. The construction of that wharf would involve an expenditure of about $120,000. This question arose with the government at that day, and I suppose it has been considered by the Minister of Public Works since, whether it would not have been better to abandon the station altogether and to take up another station which has been recommended as nearly as good, and where the expenditure would not be nearly as large. This seems to me an enormous sum of money for the small number of immigrants and passengers coming to this country who need to be accommodated there. It is not only on the buildings, but it is on the staff required at that particular place. I know that the duty of the Minister of Public Works is only ministerial, and that he has to carry out the request of

the Minister of Agriculture, who states that his officers have demanded this large expenditure there for the safety of the country and the prevention of epidemics. The expenditures have been very large in the past, and it behooves this House and the Minister of Public Works to look very carefully to see that no useless expenditure is made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think this will be the last expenditure we shall ask for. I may add that the expenditure we are incurring now has been decided on only after complete discussion between Dr. Montizambert, who is a very experienced officer, and my chief architect, and a good deal has been struck off the sum originally proposed.

Mr. CLARKE. What do the improvements consist of ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were no waterworks, and no sewerage. Indeed the quarantine station was in a very bad condition. The ventilation was bad, there were no water closets in the building. It was in an awful state when I was there myself two years ago.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it advisable to land immigrants at a place like that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that the quarantine at Grosse Isle as well as that at St. John, when I saw them, were both in a very bad condition. It is because the buildings were in a dilapidated condition, and because we thought the quarantine station in such a condition constituted a danger to the country, that we felt obliged to ask for this large expenditure.

Mr. MONK. The Minister of Public Works excuses this very large expenditure by saying that he is only the builder. I think that is a very good excuse, and that the blame rests entirely on the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture told us a few minutes ago that in order to complete arrangements there it was necessary to provide bathing accommodation for these immigrants. Well, surely, a lesser sum than $10,000 would be amply sufficient to provide bathing accommodation for these gentlemen, unless their bathing is much more expensive than that which we resort to ourselves. I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works, upon whom such large demands are made by the Minister of Agriculture in favour of these immigrants, what is the work that remains to be done. Last year we had a discussion on a similar item and we had the same explanation—there were no waterworks, the buildings were in a dilapidated condition. We have the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that we must provide baths for the immigrants, and it is going to cost $10,000. I think $5,000 would be amply sufficient, unless the Minister of Public Works gives us details now showing that it is not sufficient. I would like to know whether that work has been let by contract after tenders called for in the newspapers; if not, I am disposed to move for a reduction of that item.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) overlooks the fact that this quarantine station is not only for immigrants but it is also designed to protect the whole country from disease coming in on the crews of ships. Last year a steamer was detained there forty days with over 300 immigrants on board. I believe the negro stoker on board the steamer had small-pox, and as a consequence 400 people were detained there over forty days. Several cases of that kind happen in the course of a year.

Mr. MONK. We do not refuse money that is necessary, but we want to know what it is used for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The member for Jacques Cartier who spoke a moment ago ought to know better than to speak like that. What is the use of a man who is one of the leaders of the House saying that immigrants should not take expensive baths ? We know that. Our baths are not quarantine baths. But we all know what a quarantine is, the hon. gentleman knows what a quarantine is, and what is the use of his trying to throw dust in the eyes of the public by speeches such as that.

Mr. MONK. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that is in order. I do not think it is in order to say that I am throwing dust in the eyes of the public.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, if the hon. gentleman had not done so, I certainly would not have referred to it. But I won't do it again. But we all know that a quarantine station does not provide bathing for gentlemen, there is a vast difference. The expenditure last year was divided up among the following items: We have arranged for the installation of an electric light plant which is to cost $11,868. The grounds are very extensive grounds as my hon. friend knows. This is an island on which there are twenty-five buildings. We have built a new dwelling for employees, costing $8,000; water service, $2,260; repairs of building for police, painting, &c., $1,299; sidewalks, $1,275; dynamo building, $1,664; repairs to building for medical officers, $934; general repairs to buildings, $5,740. These are the largest items.

Mr. CLARKE. I should judge from the figures just presented by the minister that the sanitary condition could not have been as bad as he pointed out a few minutes

ago. If I caught his figures correctly, he only spent $2,000 for waterworks. There could not have been a very urgent case for sanitary improvement when only $2,000 or thereabouts were spent for waterworks. I did not notice in the figures the minister read any expenditure for drainage purposes. Now, first-class sanitary arrangements would require a first-class water supply and first-class sewerage. If the sanitary condition was as bad as the minister says, a very small sum has been expended so far to improve that condition. We were discussing this matter a few nights ago, and if I may be permitted to refer to it, we were told then, under the immigration estimates, when we wanted to get some information, that we should wait until we discussed quarantine; while to-day when quarantine is up for discussion we are told that we cannot discuss immigration matters. I would like to ask the hon. minister, if it is in order to ask it now: Would it not be a better plan to have a more rigid inspection of immigrants before they leave Liverpool, or the point at which they embark to come to Canada? I would also like some specific information from the hon. Minister of Public Works as to the amount that has been expended during the last two years for drainage purposes and also on account of a proper waterworks system.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to say, about the inspection of immigrants before they leave the point of departure, that even if that were undertaken, it would not relieve the department of the responsibility at the quarantine stations to any appreciable extent. Immigrants and other passengers would still have to be inspected at the quarantine port of debarkation and in case of disease occurring between one port or the other, immigrants or any other passengers would still have to be examined and would still have to have all this accommodation to receive them at the quarantine station, whether they had been inspected before leaving the ports in the old country or not. I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman and to the committee that the proposition, while a fair question of debate, in regard to immigrants, as far as quarantine is concerned, would not relieve the quarantine station of any responsibility, and I do not think of any expense. In regard to the demand for this vote, while I have not the details of the matter in the way that the hon. Minister of Public Works has, I would say that all these propositions were laid before the director general of public health, Dr. Montizambert, who has been for thirty-three years at the head of that service, practically, ever since the service was inaugurated and who has made far greater demands on my department and on the Public Works Department than have been complied with. There has been the demand which the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) spoke of in regard to a wharf. There has been a demand for a much larger wharf at Grosse Isle, for one which would cost $75,000 or $100,000, but we have preferred to go on and try to do the work without that expenditure. The work is done just as effectively but not quite so conveniently as it would be with the wharf. But, we believe that it can be done effectively without that expenditure, and the hon. Minister of Public Works has so far refrained from asking the House for that and some other expenditure of the same kind. In the case of an expenditure which involves the safety of the public health we would not have felt ourselves justified in refusing to take such precautions as the director general of public health deemed necessary for the safety of the public health.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he would give some more extended information as to the necessity of this building on which $8,000 was expended to provide accommodation for the employees on the island. Is there a larger number employed by the government now than formerly? How were they housed previously to the erection of this building which has cost $8,000? I would like also to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture if the demands made by Dr. Montizambert for the improvement of the sanitary conditions at the station have been complied with? We have pointed out to the hon. Minister of Public Works that in the estimates only $2,500 or $3,000 has been expended for the purposes of drainage and the improvement of the water system.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is not that at all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The items of this expenditure were before me while in consultation with the director general of public health some months ago, and they were then sent over to the Department of Public Works. I cannot carry the details of them in my mind, but there is no doubt that they are in the department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just put my finger on the detail of the expenditure that was incurred last year. During the fiscal year of 1901 a system of waterworks and drainage was installed in the sick division.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the amount of the cost. I am simply giving a summary of the work that has been done.

Mr. CLARKE. You gave us some figures a few moments ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two tanks were housed, and a new pump

building was erected in connection with this work.

Mr. CLARKE. What did that cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year we had a vote of $30,000, out of which we have spent $21,000. There is no minister who can carry in his mind all the details of these expenditures.

Mr. CLARKE. You gave an expenditure $20,000, $8,000 for the building and $12,000 for other things.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Baths, basins, sinks and water closets were put into the hospitals and officers' dwellings. A new forge was built. The large hospital and the small-pox hospital were reshingled; the first class detention building painted. Repairs were made to the telemeter, disinfection building and to the fire pot of the boiler for pump. Repairs were made to the wood, paint, plaster and other works of the different buildings. Some carpets and furniture were supplied. The steamer 'Challenger' was overhauled and painted. Plans and specifications prepared by this department. The waterworks and drainage superintended by Mr. John Cowan, an old employee of the department, and the remainder of the work was supervised by Mr. Beland, the contractor for waterworks and drainage were Messrs. O. Picard & Sons. We have spent on these works up to the first of February $28,000 out of the $30,000 that were placed in the estimates. We are asking for $10,000 additional to complete these works.

Mr. MONK. I do not think the hon. Minister of Agriculture has been quite fair to this committee, and I think the hon. Minister of Public Works has been placed in an unfortunate position by the statement made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture that this money was required to fulfil the requirements of the health authorities in respect to baths. We spent last year over $20,000 and in that expenditure, which is found detailed at page V—68 of the Auditor General's Report, we find that everything that is required under the head mentioned by the hon. Minister of Agriculture was furnished during last year, and that is why I think this committee is entitled to know what the $10,000 additional is wanted for. I can understand that every detail of the expenditure cannot be kept in mind by the head of the department, but it seems to me that such an item as $20,000 for the instalment of waterworks should remain in the memory of the ordinary man for at least a few months. We had, last year, such expenditures as these: two Brussels rugs at $27, two Axminster rugs at $38, one mattrass, $18, one chamber set, $55, and in connection with the water accommodation we had sinks at $23 each and bath tubs, 4 at $45 apiece, which seems a very large price to pay. Of course, I suppose, that the better class of immigrants, or perhaps the employees, or the minister himself when he goes down to pay his annual visit required needle and shower baths, two of which were purchased at $145 ; flusher closets, 2 at $32 apiece and lavatory basins, 7 at $168. If we look over the expenditure we find that there is no ground whatever, as far as we can see, for granting an expenditure of $10,000 for the reason which has been given by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I am ready to admit with the hon. Minister of Public Works that we must have a properly equipped quarantine station, but, when we see these extravagant expenditures, and are asked to vote $10,000, and are merely asking the head of the department to tell us what it is for, the department should have some information upon the subject.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) should know that these shower baths are used by the immigrants. They cost more than the ordinary shower baths. It seems to me that in this case the House will not lose sight of the fact that we are dealing with a large quarantine station and not with an ordinary private house. I have already explained that out of the $30,000 voted last year we have spent $28,048.57 for water works, for drainage for baths, for new pumps for basins and sinks and water closets in the hospital and officers quarters. The large small-pox hospital has been re-shingled. I made a mistake in giving the details. What I read from my notes was work that was to be done and not work that had been done. We made a contract for electric lighting amounting to $11,868, and we have paid to the contractors $5,500, leaving a balance due of $6,363. That will be taken out of the vote of $10,000. In addition to that there is $1,000 for electric light fittings not included in the contract. There is for water service $2,160 and for repairs $1,299. What I read first was a list of works which had been asked for and practically granted but for which we had no money.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood from the minister that the quarantine station was in a very unsanitary condition and that there was not sufficient drainage. The minister states that there is $2,160 for water service and for electric light $12,868. What I want to know is how much will be spent in drainage to put the buildings in a sanitary condition

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that about $4,000 has been spent for drainage, and that we are doing work now that will cost $3,160.

Mr. CLARKE. Where are the figures for that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect has given this information to me. These sums have been paid out of the vote of $30,000 of last year.

Mr. CLARKE. How much did the director general ask for these sanitary improvements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know how much he asked for.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The director general asks that certain sanitary improvements should be made, and it is left to the Public Works Department to say what they will cost.

Mr. CLARKE. And the sanitary improvements asked for by the director general have been made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Most of them have been made but there is a certain amount still necessary to finish the whole plan of improvement. The amount which is now asked for is to pay for the work which was asked by the director general of public health. The vote taken last year did not quite meet the requirements, and we have to have a supplementary vote this year to cover the balance. That work is not absolutely finished although it is very nearly finished, and when it is finished I believe the station will be in a thoroughly good sanitary state.

Mr. CLARKE. Had the minister no idea of the cost that would be entailed on the public by carrying out the demands made by the director general of public health ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These estimates were made by the Public Works Department.

Mr. CLARKE. Was there no estimate made by the Department of Agriculture ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We do not undertake to make estimates.

Mr. CLARKE. And the Department of Agriculture had no idea of what expenditure would be entailed by the improvements asked for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We discuss that with the Public Works Department and we leave it to that department to make the estimates.

Mr. CLARKE. We have not yet been able to get the information that we have asked for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think I gave all the information that was asked for, but I will give all that is in my possession. We spent $28,048.57 up to the first of February out of the $30,000 which was voted last year.

Mr. CLARKE. How much for drainage ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $4,000. We owe to the contractor for electric light, $6,668 ; we require electric light fittings to the amount of $1,000 ; to complete our water service we require, $2,360; and for repairs, painting, drains, &c., we require $1,190. Other demands have been made upon us, but for these I am not asking for money. I made a mistake is saying that part of this $10,000 was to erect an $8,000 building. The $10,000 is to be employed for the objects which I have mentioned.

L'Assomption public building, $5,000.

Mr. MONK. Has the site been chosen for this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have bought a site, for which we have paid $1,150.

Mr. MONK. Who from ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From a gentleman of the name of Vital Racette. I do not propose to ask for an expensive building. I do not expect to expend more than $5,000, including fittings and all. L'Assomption parish contains a large population, and I may say that I have some love for the place.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the population ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two thousand six hundred.

Mr. MONK. Is the work given out ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the plans are not yet made. We have simply bought the site.

Mr. MONK. I suppose the work will be done by tender publicly called ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MONK. I have no objection to a public building being erected at L'Assomption, but I reiterate what was first mentioned here by the hon. member for Bothwell, that I think we should know what are the general principles—the minister objects to the term fixed rule—which govern the government in the distribution of public buildings throughout our province. I am glad to see a public building proposed for L'Assomption, which is an important place; but there are other places which I think have equal claims. I could mention a place in my own constituency. Take Côte St. Paul, which has a large manufacturing population, which is situated on the Lachine canal, and which is just as important as this place. Then, there are very important factories situated in the neighbourhood of Verdun, which is a growing locality. I believe there is a public building at Laprairie, but there is none at Longueuil, nor at Chambly, both of which are important places. I think we are entitled to know what are the conditions we should fulfil in order to lay our claim before the minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the plea which the hon. gentleman has made for St. Laurent might well guide

me in this case. St. Laurent is an important place; it has a college. L'Assomption also has a college, one of the largest in the province of Quebec; it has eighty stores, six hotels, a telegraph office and two convents, and it is a shire town. I cannot give public buildings to all the towns which should perhaps have them; but the expediency of not spending too much money cannot be lost sight of. L'Assomption is an old village, it has not received anything in the past, and we thought we might vote a small sum for a public building there. I would like very much indeed to give public buildings to other towns as deserving, but their time will come.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the revenue from that place last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total revenue from the post office was $916. The money orders issued were $4,881.

Mr. BLAIN. Would it not be very much cheaper for the government to rent a building which is already constructed, instead of putting a large amount of money in a new building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are many places where we rent buildings; but I may say that there are not merely dozens, but hundreds of demands for public buildings in my department. When I hear speeches in the House against public buildings, I would like some of my friends to persuade their own people not to ask for buildings. It is very well to preach economy here, but our pigeon holes are full of petitions asking for public buildings; and when I have plans prepared, I would like to see around me economical people, such as I see here, advising me not to have expensive buildings. The life is almost taken out of me sometimes because I decline to erect expensive buildings. I have to face a good deal of pressure on account of the numerous demands made upon me, and because people want fine buildings. They say, we are erecting fine houses for ourselves and fine stores, and you want to pursue a cheese-paring policy in regard to public buildings.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps some of the hon. gentleman's difficulty arises from a circular which the hon. gentleman's colleague the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) sent out in the spring of 1900, calling on his friends to make suggestions for the construction of public buildings ; and I have no doubt that the hon. minister has reprimanded his colleague for taking that step in his absence, because at that time the hon. gentleman was in Paris. Of course, if he had been here it would not have been done. That may to some extent account for the difficulty which the hon. gentleman has in denying the demands so frequently made upon him now.

Mr. MONK. I think it is a pity that the Minister of Public Works puts an improper construction on what I said. I am not opposed to public buildings, but I want to know what is the proper path by which we can reach the heart of the Minister of Public Works when we want a public building. This circular, which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has alluded to, never reached me. I never got one, although two or three public buildings are required in my constituency. If the Minister of Public Works would only tell us that there are absolutely necessary conditions precedent, without which he cannot entertain a demand for a public building, we will know where we are. But as a man of business, he will admit we ought to know what are the principles that guide him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I frankly admit that if I had been here I would not have felt under any necessity to advertise that I wanted applications for public buildings. My hon. colleague, as a prudent man, wanted to know the needs of the country, but if he had been a little longer in the Department of Public Works and had read as much of the correspondence as I have, he would have known the needs of the country quite well enough not to require any more knowledge. I can assure my hon. friend that I have not a bad heart, and if he will approach me in one of his good moments, and when I am not in a bad humour, we might agree.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman takes the case of Marysville as the standard by which he intends going on granting public buildings. If that be the case, I think he had better make some further inquiries, and he will find that he is not living up to that standard. Take my own county, which is perhaps a fair average of the counties of this Dominion. It has four towns, and I will give the hon. gentleman the gross postal revenue in each, which ought to be a fair indication of the business done and the necessity for a public building. In the town of Marysville the hon. gentleman tells us that the gross postal revenue, according to the last returns, is $1,398. Compare that with the four towns in my own county. The town of Wallaceburg, with a population of 2,700, has a gross revenue of $3,207, as against $1,398 in the town of Marysville. The town of Dresden, with a population of 1,600, has a gross revenue of $1,948. And the town of Thamesville, with some 900 of population, has a gross revenue of $1,680. Then take the little town of Bothwell, with about 800 inhabitants, its gross revenue is $1,678, as against $1,398 in Marysville. And I venture to say the hon. gentleman would not dream of erecting a public building in any one of these three places.

Let me go a little further and take the money orders issued and see how Marysville compares with the towns I have mentioned. In Marysville the number of money orders issued was 56, and the gross sum in-

volved only $748. But in Wallaceburg, which has been asking for a post office since many years, the number of money orders issued is 1,204, and the gross sum involved $14,523. Take Dresden, there were 852 money orders issued as against 56 in Marysville, and the gross sum involved was $13,411. Then in Thamesville, 376 money orders were issued and the sum involved $5,876; and finally in Bothwell, which has only 800 inhabitants, there were 1,250 post office orders issued, and the gross sum involved was $14,909.

Now, let us take the number of orders paid. In Marysville the number was only 64 as against 653 in Wallaceburg, 552 in Dresden, 286 in Thamesville, and 352 in Bothwell. Take the gross sum involved in each:

Marysville..	$ 555
Wallaceburg,..	9,431
Dresden,....	7,256
Thamesville,..	3,816
Bothwell....	4,444

If these returns indicate anything they certainly indicate that the hon. gentleman has chosen one of the least deserving places in this Dominion in which to erect a public building. I know of no more vicious case than this one to show the utter want of regard for the public needs and the public weal which dictates the hon. gentleman's policy. The sole principle which guides him is party necessity. Wherever there is an election to be gained, wherever it suits the purposes of the government, he is quite ready to put up a public building, regardless entirely of the needs of the public or the requirements of the locality.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are certain ridings which are unlucky, and the riding represented by my hon. friend is one of them. He has explained that in his riding there are four towns which ought to have had public buildings long ago. Well, that riding was represented in parliament by a Liberal, the Hon. David Mills, for many years, and no public buildings were then allotted to it. The chances of war have given us my hon. friend, but he is on the wrong side.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want to misrepresent me. I was not saying whether there should be public buildings there or not, but I was pointing out that there should be some broader ground of public policy in determining what places were entitled to public buildings than what the hon. gentleman has given us.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend gave us the names of four towns, each of which, in his opinion, is better entitled to a public building than the town of Marysville. Well, I was simply reminding him that the riding of Bothwell was for many years represented with great ability by one of our friends, the Hon. David Mills. During those years my hon. friends opposite were on these government benches, and yet it never occurred to them that any one of these four towns was worthy of a public building. I do not see, therefore, how they can find fault with us. We have given ridings represented by opponents public buildings. I do not say—because I am not in the habit of saying what I do not believe to be true—that the representative of a riding has no influence at all; that would be a foolish thing to say. Now that hon. gentlemen on the other side have supplied all their ridings with public buildings, they must not be surprised, if we, on coming into power, pay some attention to ours. That is the position I take without hesitation. Let us be fair to our hon. friends on the other side, but—we should be great fools if we did not think of ourselves. If hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side, they would say exactly what I say now. Of course, we must not squander public money on useless buildings—we all agree to that. I do not object to being criticised; I do not object to the brake of the opposition being put upon any minister—far from it. But there is reason in all things. The Liberal party has been long in opposition, and ridings that have been for so long neglected by the government have rights that I, for one, will endeavour not to forget. As to the item of Marysville, I would remind my hon. friends opposite that their reproaches come not merely with little grace, but with no grace whatever. I found a vote for this work in the estimates when I took office, a vote put there by the late Minister of Finance—and I have simply carried it out.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood that the policy of the late government was to distribute these expenditures for public buildings upon a principle based upon the revenue and population of the town.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not much.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps I could give these hon. gentlemen quotations from their own speeches on that point. Here is the policy as it was explained by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland). This is from the debate on the Richmond post office.

An hon. MEMBER. What year was it?

Mr. BLAIN. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite will understand that they do not occupy the same position now as they did then. This was the year 1894. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) said:

I know that the hon. ministers and members on that side—

that is the conservative side——

Voted that public money should be expended upon these buildings on some principle based

on the revenue at the points where these buildings are being constructed and the population to be served.

Then another distinguished gentleman on that side (Mr. Charlton) said :

In a little place like Richmond, with a moderate revenue it strikes me the economical plan would be to rent quarters. And the accommodation might be had at a cost of $200 a year.

The policy of the Conservative party as described by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in marked contrast to the policy of the present administration, who say that it depends upon what the county does in sending a representative to support the government, how it shall be considered in the distribution of money in the construction of public buildings.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Unfortunately, in that, as in a good many other cases, the practice was vastly different from the precept avowed. I have the honour to represent one of the richest, oldest and most populous constituencies in Ontario, and my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) represents another. Ingersoll and Woodstock, the chief places of these two very large and wealthy constituencies, remained for very nearly forty years without a public building of any kind, sort or description, while, almost within sight of us, was the village of Cayuga, with 150 families, which was thought worthy of a public building. That was a very fair sample of the way government favours were distributed during the period which the Conservatives were in office.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The argument of the hon. Minister of Public Works, which was hailed with such delight by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock), and the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), amounts simply to this—and it is well that we should understand it—the constituency represented by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), we will say, was not treated fairly by the late Conservative government because it was represented by an opponent of theirs, Hon. David Mills, and so went without public buildings in places that were much more deserving than is Marysville ; and now, because that constituency happens to be represented by a gentleman who is opposed to the present government, that injustice must be continued.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is what the hon. gentleman's argument amounts to. He says that the Conservative party treated that constituency unfairly in the past, because it was represented by an opponent of theirs. Then the Minister of Public Works very frankly tells us in this House—what has been said by himself and his colleagues on many a public platform—that the representation of a constituency is not without its effect in the distribution of public moneys. The public moneys, under this administration, are not to be distributed according to the public requirements, but according to the political complexion of the gentlemen who represent the constituencies —at least, that is to be taken into consideration. Now, if there is one principle which is more unworthy of the government than another, or more unworthy of the Minister of Public Works, it is that which he defends to-day, and which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has defended.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I simply called attention to the discrepancy between Conservative practice and Conservative precedent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), in my humble opinion, would have done better to have stood up and told his colleagues that when this party of purity came into power public moneys were to be distributed according to the needs of the country and not according to the political complexion of the representatives of the constituencies. From the record in the past of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce we might expect some repudiation of the views expressed by his colleagues to-day. But, instead, he merely throws a taunt at this side of the House with regard to what was done by Conservative administrations in the past. The conduct of Conservative administrations is not the question here. The question is, what is right and best to do to-day ; and, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce has no better ground for defending the present administration than to say that some such thing was done unjustly in the past, it seems to me, with all deference to the hon. gentleman, that it would be better for his own reputation for him to keep his seat. I say again that the argument of the Minister of Public Works is a most vicious argument. Let us concede even, for the purpose of this argument, that the Conservative government did wrong in the past. What has that to do with the question of what is right and best at the present time. Because previous governments did wrong, does that fact of itself justify the present government in following their example ? I venture to say that, whatever has been done in the past with regard to the distribution of public money, the standard in the future should be that the money expended in this country for public works should be expended on some broad and systematic policy according to the needs of the constituency, and absolutely apart from the question as to whether a constituency happens to be represented by a supporter of the government or by a gentleman on this side of the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will say this to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that, for a period of nearly thirty years, the Liberal party was treated, systematically and deliberately, by the predecessors of the hon. gentleman with the grossest injustice. And one of the first duties that fell upon us when we assumed office was to see that justice was done to our supporters and to those constituencies which had been deprived of their rights for a great many years. When I gave the illustration of the counties of South Oxford and North Oxford, I gave those because they were extremely notable illustrations of the systematic injustice that had been dealt out to Liberal constituencies for no worse crime than returning Liberal supporters. Now I am glad to see the hon. gentleman's education is beginning. I daresay after they have spent eighteen years in opposition, as they are very likely to do, they will come to something like a glimmering understanding of the principles on which governments ought, in an ideal fashion, to be conducted. I do not disapprove of the statement he makes that it is desirable that regard should be had in all these cases to the amount of the population, to the amount of the revenue, and to various other things which we have often pointed out as having necessarily and properly a large influence on such questions as the erection of public buildings. But I have to tell the hon. gentleman that, as I have said just now, it is the duty of a party which has been long in opposition, when they get into office, to rectify the injustices which were deliberately inflicted by the party in power.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that the hon. gentleman has improved very much upon his predecessors. According to him, the first duty of a party coming to power, after being out of power for eighteen years, is, not to conduct the government in the best interests of the country——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I did not say that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But he said it by implication—but to look after the interests of the party that had been in opposition. Now this is the gentleman, if I mistake not, who preached political purity and high standards of government for eighteen years. Now we understand that his ideal is this, that when his party gets into power the first thing to be looked after is, not these high standards about which he told us so much during eighteen years, but the interests of the Liberal party. Well, he has looked after them pretty well in some respects, I believe. But still possibly principles of that kind, even if they are professed by hon. gentlemen on the other side, had better not, for the credit of the country, be too loudly proclaimed in this House. I think it would be better to put on some semblance of political decency with regard to this matter, and not to say in this House that because a constituency has been represented by a Liberal in the past and therefore has not received justice, it shall, because it happens to be represented by a Conservative now, receive, not the justice which it should receive, but the continued injustice which it has received in the past, and that for no better reason than that it happens to be represented by a gentleman on this side of the House. That is the argument of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad I have been able to provoke so vigorous a disclaimer from that hon. gentleman, and I trust that when he thinks the matter over a little more calmly he will come to the conclusion that it is not wise in this House to lay down the doctrine of party spoils in so open and flagrant a manner as he has just presented it to the House to-day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Politics are indeed a very fine game.

An hon. MEMBER. It is a bluff game.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we have a proof of it just now. For over twenty-five years I have seen the game from the press gallery of this House, and history repeats itself. When the Conservative party was on this side of the House the Liberals said a great many things that the Conservative opposition are saying now. Now, if my hon. friends opposite will excuse me for saying it, they do not always feel very comfortable at the present time. They are afraid of the war, and after the speeches that my hon. friends opposite are delivering to-day, they will not feel any more comfortable in the event of their resuming office in the future. As I say, politics is a fine game, it is an amusing game. My hon. friend has taught me a lesson, he has invited me to decency. Well, I have a good deal of respect for him, but I have always tried to have some respect for myself; and I am quite sure that in what I have already stated to the House, and which will be read by the country, I have not been transgressing decency. I have said this much, and I say it again, that the representatives of the party in power have naturally more influence with the government than the representatives of the party opposed to the government. That is very clear, and what is the use of denying it? I do not make any personal allusion, but what is the use of resorting to hypocrisy? People do not take any stock in that now, it is too late in the day. The government in power is very largely guided

by the advice of its own political friends, because those political friends represent public opinion for the time being. But that does not mean that the public interest must be ignored because that interest happens to be located in a riding represented by a member of the opposition. Nobody has intimated anything of the kind. There are to-day very large public works going on in ridings represented by supporters of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. We have not been hard towards members of the opposition. In point of fact we have been reproached many times by our political friends with being too kind to Conservatives. Several times I have been accused myself of being an old Tory because I did not do what some of my Liberal friends wished me to do, because I did not give them enough. Responsible government is the government of the people by the representatives of the people, by the majority of the people. Our friends opposite must not be offended if we invite them in the most kindly way to take their medicine patiently. They are in opposition, they are doing a useful duty in criticising us, they are doing it well; but they must not forget that the party which is in office to-day represents a majority of the people in the country, and that part of the country represented by the majority has to be attended to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is just one interesting observation of the hon. gentleman which I would like you, Mr. Chairman, to note. He states that criticisms of this kind were very frequently heard some years ago on this side of the House from gentlemen who now sit on the government side of the House; and then he tells us in the same breath that he does not like hypocrisy. I do not know what the hon. gentleman had in his own mind when he made that statement to the House. We are not putting forward these criticisms without meaning them—if that is what the hon. gentleman desires to suggest. We are putting forward in all earnestness the principle that the public money of this country should be distributed according to the public needs of the country. I do not know whether my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works agrees with that; apparently he qualifies it by saying that the principle must be modified by the question as to whether the member representing the particular constituency supports the government or not. With regard to that principle we entirely disagree. I will not say anything further about it except to state that so far as I am concerned I do not believe that is good policy for the country. It is a policy which was not supported by hon. gentlemen in opposition, but it does apparently have some weight with them now since they have acquired the responsibility of power.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think we are indebted to the Minister of Public Works for several confessions. Not long ago he took the public into his confidence, in Montreal, I think it was, when he told them that the cabinet was largely engaged in fighting each other like blazes. To-day he announces that the supporters of this government, and this government themselves, adhere to the doctrine that to the victors belong the spoils. I suppose most of their time is taken up, since they have no legislation for us to consider at this session, in fighting among themselves for a share of the spoils.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have only one thing to say, I shall never make any more after dinner speeches.

Mr. OSLER. So far as I can see there is absolutely no public interest to be served in this vote. If there ever was a vote purely and simply meant to serve a local interest, a political interest, it is such a vote as this, and such votes as we have had on several of these items this afternoon. What public interest is there to be served by an expenditure of $5,000, $10,000, $15,000, or $20,000 of public money in a village on a post office where the whole revenue is under $1,000 ? Can it be justified in any way except as a pure and simple expenditure of public money for party purposes ? There cannot be any more glaring deviation of public money from the right channel than in such a vote as this. It was rather refreshing to have from the various members of the government, as they one after another got up to justify this vote, the admission that when they were in opposition and objected to such votes, they were ideal statesmen. They never thought for a moment of putting into practice their ideals when they came into power. I do not think, in the whole list of estimates, there are better subjects for criticism than these items of expenditure of large sums of money in small places where they are not required and where they can only be made because of some local political influence being brought to bear.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if the department is in the habit of preparing plans and specifications for public buildings when they are undertaken ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We generally prepare the plans, but on some occasions when we are busy we employ outside help.

Mr. INGRAM. There is another important matter in connection with the construction of public buildings that has not been discussed to-day. While I do not differ with the government as to their satisfying their friends by erecting public buildings, it seems to me that when the department prepares plans and specifications, it should also arrive at some conclusion as to the time it should take to construct a public building.

We have a large number of public buildings constructed in this country from time to time, and there is no stated rate of pay for the architects or clerks of works employed by the Department of Public Works, because I find in the Auditor General's Report and referring to Vancouver, that the architect and clerk of works get $120 per month. I find that in Woodstock the architect receives $100 a month; I find that in Nelson the pay is $7 a day, and I find that in Toronto as high as 7½ per cent, 7 per cent, 3½ per cent, 1 per cent, and large lump sums are paid to an architect for superintending public works. If the government does not pay some attention as to the time that it requires to erect a public building, it will be paying all over the country, in every town, city and village, in which it constructs a public building, large sums of money to these architects for a useless waste of time in superintending these public works. Therefore it is not in the public interest that these men should be continued for these long periods. Take the Auditor General's Report to-day, and you will find, under the heading of 'Public Buildings,' from the 1st of July to the 30th of June in the following year, twelve months' pay for an architect for superintending a public building that ought to be constructed in at least six months' time. These items, taken altogether, are very important, if the hon. gentleman desires to satisfy his friends by erecting public buildings. For instance, in Wallaceburg, for a building that may cost $8,000 or $10,000, an architect is paid $2,000 for superintending it. Perhaps this practice has been abused under the Conservative regime and if it has it is certainly being abused under the present administration, because it is not a proper thing to do.

Lévis cattle quarantine station—renewals, improvements, repairs, etc., $3,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much was expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Five thousand dollars last year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is it for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No special work, but just for general repairs.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these expenditures being made on the advice of somebody ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, always on the advice of the Department of Agriculture. In this case, as in all other cases, I am simply the builder. Demands are made upon me.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. minister to say that he spent $5,000 last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. And that he proposes to spend $5,000 this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, $3,000 this year.

Mr. SPROULE. That would buy all the buildings on the place.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These buildings were erected twenty years ago and they require a good deal of repairing.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you require $8,000 to repair buildings not worth $2,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They were built a long time ago, and they are always requiring repairs.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are they for—cattle ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To what extent do we import cattle ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The list that has been sent to us of the work that is to be done this year includes two new stables, $1,250; rebuilding fences, $1,793; repairing roads, $1,000; superintendent's office, $308; other employees' residence, repairs, $275; repairing old stable, $60; sidewalks, $287; small repairs, $266. The whole amount that we were asked for was $5,500, but we have cut it down to the amount I have just asked for now.

Mr. LENNOX. What are the roads on which it is proposed to spend $1,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are roads communicating between the different buildings. I have been there often. There are at least ten or twelve acres of property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is for thoroughbred stock that is imported ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As a matter of fact, there is very little stock imported except thoroughbred stock, but all stock arriving has to be quarantined for ninety days, and the accommodation is required for this stock. There has to be a yard for each particular lot of cattle with a space between, so that the animals in one yard cannot come in contact with, or even within easy reach of the animals in the adjoining yard. This fencing has been in very bad order, and last year a report came that it was necessary to replace it. The buildings which were erected twenty years ago have had very little done on them for many years, and were in such a very bad state that the importers were complaining.

Mr. MONK. What quantity of stock was imported last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking from memory, about 1,500 or 1,600 head of cattle, sheep and swine.

Mr. MONK. Were they all imported from Great Britain ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One lot I think came from France, but all the rest came from Great Britain.

Mr. SPROULE. This appears to be an enormous sum to replace fencing on ten or twelve acres of ground.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring over the details to the hon. gentleman and he can see for himself what the cost is.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not see how you can spend all that money for fencing a plot of twelve acres.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Speaking from memory there are forty acres in the lot, so that it is erroneous to say that it contains only twelve acres. The buildings have to be placed at some distance apart and have all to be fenced around. It is a rough piece of ground and we have to grade roads so that provender can be carried to the cattle. For a long time there were no roads and the inconvenience was found to be such that the importers requested that we should make these improvements.

Mr. SPROULE. You would appear, by these estimates, to intend to build sidewalks on the streets of the town.

Th MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not on the streets of the town. There is some planking necessary around the grounds to enable the attendants to go dry shod from one building to another, and that is called a side walk.

Lévis public building, $5,000.

Mr. MONK. Is this work under contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. No site has been purchased and nothing has been done.

Mr. MONK. Why are we asked to vote the money then ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because I expect to go along now.

Mr. MONK. Has the minister made choice of any site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. There are some changes to be made by the Railway Department and I was in expectation of being able to secure the old freight shed for a site. No choice has been made yet, and I do not know whether I will be able to get the freight shed site as I have not been able to confer lately with my colleague who has been away practically for the last three months.

Mr. MONK. Of course the contract will be given by public tender when the building comes to be erected.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Montreal examining warehouse, $15,000.

Mr. MONK. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That building will have to be changed altogether inside, and we are adding another story to it. It is too dark and cannot accommodate the trade which is increasing every day. I went there a month ago with one of the architects and Mr. Miles, the President of the Montreal Board of Trade. My officers believe they can carry out the work for $30,000. The estimate is as follows :—Addition to building, $6,000 ; altering main building inside, $12,000 ; fittings, $4,000 ; light, $500 ; furniture, $1,000 ; heating, $1,000 ; contingencies, $500. Although I am not an architect I am about sure that the addition will cost a little more than $6,000.

Mr. MONK. I would like to have the assurance of the minister that these repairs, if absolutely necessary, will be carried on by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work cannot be carried on that way.

Mr. MONK. Why not ? There is very keen competition in Montreal among builders and I really think we are not getting the worth of our money in the repairs we have been executing on public buildings in Montreal during the last four or five years. I feel convinced that if the minister will make specifications of what repairs are necessary, and will invite tenders fairly and publicly he will effect a considerable economy. Why should not the government do that ? Private individuals and companies do that. We have architects in Montreal—and the minister has some of them at his disposal in his department—who are continually making repairs under such a system as that. We will vote the money at once if the minister gives us the assurance that there will be specifications deposited where contractors can see them and tenders invited fairly and publicly.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WOKS. In the case of work like this no railway company, or no other company would think for one moment of calling for public tenders. Neither would a private person do it. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) himself owns houses and when he has repairs to make he does not call for tenders. When you start out on work like this you never know what you will have to do. There is not a man in this House who owns property who will call for

tenders for such repairs. I have tried that system in repairing wharfs and breakwaters, and I have always found myself in deep water because it is impossible to know before hand the extent of the repairs.

Mr. MONK. You are adding a story to that building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is only a small part of the work. The Canadian Pacific Railway is improving their station in Montreal and there was no tender asked for.

Mr. MONK. I beg your pardon, it was done by tender and contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. MONK. Yes, I know the contractors.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The material may be obtained by contract, but the work is done by day's labour. In this case I believe that I will spend less money if I do the work by day's labour. I cannot understand the argument that has been made often in this department that the government cannot carry on work by day's labour, just the same as contractors can. I decline to admit that because experience has proven that it is not true. I say more: It does not give him any pleasure to carry out works by day's labour; it gives him trouble. But I say that the system of the public tenders as carried out in this country is a bad system. If tenders were asked from a picked list of contractors as is done in Germany and in France it would be well and good; but when everybody who can find a deposit is allowed to send in a tender as is the case here, that is the worst possible system. I say, after five years of experience in the department, that the poorer the contractor is the lower tender will he send in. He does not know his business; he will try to buy his material on credit. Several important works are to-day delayed because they are in the hands of men who should not have been allowed to tender. What is the position of the minister when an incapable or unworthy contractor does not carry on the work properly? If I take the work from him, I have to ask for new tenders, which means two or three months of delay. The system of public tenders which we have is a bad one, and every time we have repairs to be made, I do not hesitate to say to the House on my responsibility that it should be done by day's labour. Of course, large works, like the Halifax public building, for instance, I would not wish to do by day's labour.

Mr. CLARKE. If the principle is a sound one, why not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see why not. I have to educate the public and parliament first—that is the whole trouble. I do not hesitate to say that the work which we are carrying on at Sorel, building cars and dredges, is better carried out than it would be if it were done by contract. The government has no interest except to do the work well. The contractor expects to realize a profit of 20 per cent, because he has to buy his plant, &c., but when a government has the plant, it can put into the work the profits which any contractor would wish to make.

Mr. MONK. I am very sorry to hear the hon. Minister of Public Works enunciate that doctrine, because I believe that in the city of Montreal repairs amounting to $15,000, and consisting principally of putting an additional story on the examining warehouse, ought to be given out by public tender. The law requires it, and in the city of Montreal no institution nor individual would think of carrying on such works without inviting public tenders. The hon. gentleman has mentioned the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is well known that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have accredited contractors who sometimes undertake alterations without submitting the price; but they are really clerks of works, and they usually exact contracts from those under them. The hon. gentleman has referred to the extension of the Windsor Station in Montreal. I repeat that in that case there were large contracts for plumbing and heating, given to Lessard & Harris by tender.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do the same thing. While carrying out the work by day's labour, I ask for tenders for plumbing or steam fitting.

Mr. MONK. If the hon. gentleman will make specifications for these repairs and invite public tenders, he will find that he can get the work done by able and responsible contractors for half the cost at which it will be done by day's labour or by calling on two or three friends of the government for prices. Now, we spend about $30,000 a year on repairs in Montreal, and I venture to say that there is no city in the Dominion of Canada where the service of the government are so badly accommodated as in Montreal. If we spend so large an amount annually on repairs and improvements in Montreal, we ought surely to be able to get something better than we have at present. If I had the time, I could show, by reference to the public accounts of last year, that money could have been saved if the minister had followed the plan which is followed by everybody else in Montreal, of asking for public tenders. I regret that the minister evidently intends dealing with these repairs, for which he asks $15,000, without the condition of calling for public tenders. If he would attach that condition to the vote, I would be ready to concede it at once, because I know that the improvements are necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am dealing with the repairs in Montreal in the same way as my predecessors have done, and they are under the charge of the same officers. Mr. Desjardins is an old officer whom I left in office, although not a political friend of mine. He was appointed by my predecessor Mr. Ouimet, but I left him in office, because I believed he was an honest man, and I believe so still.

Mr. MONK. You are not to be bound by everything that was done by the previous government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am fully responsible for what I am doing; but I say that the repairs are being carried out on the same system that prevailed in the past, and it is the only system on which they can be carried out. We have in Montreal the examining warehouse, the custom-house, the inland revenue office and the post office. Now, how could you possibly ask for tenders for every small work costing $50 or less—for a little painting or to repair something that has got out of order ? It is practically impossible to find out in advance all the repairs that may become necessary. We are nearly all owners of houses, and there is not a man here who does not spend a large amount of money on his houses. Can he tell to-day how much money he will have to spend during the coming year ? He cannot. My hon. friend is altogether unfair to the officers in charge of the work in Montreal. I follow them closely, and I say without hesitation that they carry out the work cheaply and well. I think my hon. friend is right when he says that the post office is not in good shape. The reason is, if I may say so, that there has been, in the past, a division of power. The Postmaster General's Department has done part of the cleaning and my department has done the rest. That has caused a very bad state of affairs—I grant that. We have arranged to put a stop to that. I have provided for a lodging upstairs, for a caretaker for the building. In future, I think we shall have better results, while expending less money.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. minister please say what is the result, usually, of carrying out these public works by day labour ? Does he find that the estimates are exceeded or is the work done within the estimates made by his officers ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At times, the estimates are exceeded. That is the case, for instance, in the addition made to this building. Any one who knows anything about repairs knows how that may easily be. When you start, you think the structure is good, but may find you are mistaken. In this case the architect was obliged to go to a depth of fifteen feet for his foundation. He could not have foreseen that—nobody could. In cases like that, it is impossible to carry out the system of tender and contract. As a rule, the estimates are found to be all right.

Mr. CLARKE. In the specific case of the post office at Montreal, I understand that there was a division of authority and that the results were not good—which is quite likely. But, in that case, what was the difficulty ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was no difficulty. I understood my hon. friend to complain that the Montreal post office was not kept clean. That was true. I explained how that was and that I had provided lodging for a caretaker who would have responsibility for the whole building.

Mr. BENNETT. The expenditure of $10,000 or $15,000 in the Montreal post office without the formality of calling for tenders is a very trifling matter compared with the startling announcement that the minister has made within the last few minutes. Practically he has told us that, from this out, he intends to confine himself to the principle of getting tenders from his friends without the formality of public competition. The Department of Marine and Fisheries introduced that method under the late minister to a certain extent, and perhaps it is to be the rule now in the other departments of the government. Last session, I called the attention of the House to the fact that the Minister of Public Works was spending vast sums of money at Sorel without calling for tenders. I am not going to say that the work done at Sorel costs more or costs less than it would have cost under public tender and contract. But I am surprised that some hon. gentleman on the other side has not stood up and told the hon. minister that he must call a halt on this line of procedure. What is the minister doing at Sorel according to the last Auditor General's Report ? It will be news to some hon. members of the House, and perhaps to some hon. members of the government, that, at this place, the Minister of Public Works employs an army of men, the expenditure for whose work runs not merely into the thousands but into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Have we come to this pass, that the Minister of Public Works can employ hordes of men, building and repairing boats as he pleases—for there is no explanation up to this time as to what has actually been done ? According to the last Auditor General's Report the minister spent about $125,000 in this way. Last year I brought to the attention of the House the case of the construction of a tug at a cost of about twice what was really necessary. The machinery was on the upper lakes, having been taken out of the old hull. A new hull was built at Sorel and was then towed around to the upper lakes. The cost would have been fifty per cent less

if the hull had been built at Midland and the machinery placed in it there. Here at page V—19 of the Auditor General's Report, we have some account of the expenditure at Sorel, amounting to this enormous sum of about $125,000—and it is an enormous sum to be expended at the sweet will of the Minister of Public Works. What is the procedure at Sorel ? I will be bound to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bruneau) who represents Richelieu, in which riding I understand Sorel to be, simply turns on his party friends in season and out of season. To do what ? To work at whatever work can be provided. The principle of competition is set at defiance. Yet, not an hon. gentleman on the other side rises to call the minister to account. That hon. gentleman, this afternoon, has made the startling announcement that he does not intend to be held to the system of tender and contract in a matter involving the expenditure of $15,000 or $20,000. Then what is the hon. minister going to do with the case of the French River canal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be all open.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BENNETT. We heard before recess from the Minister of Public Works, who is nothing if not candid, the frank and exultant avowal that he had initiated a new system of dispensing with calling for tenders for government contracts, and had thus secured control of an amount of patronage undreamed of by his predecessors. From his point of view the hon. minister is rather to be congratulated on the success of his experiment. During the past four or five years in which he has been at the head of the Public Works Department he has taken the bull by the horns, and certainly can have no cause of complaint of the result. We on this side probably have not as much occasion to quarrel with the hon. minister on that score as some of his colleagues. Those who were in this House in the last parliament will remember how the House was startled when the Drummond County deal was taken in hand by the hon. minister. On that occasion there was question of the adoption of a line of policy involving a large expenditure, and coming naturally under the control of the Minister of Railways and Canals, but that unfortunate minister seemed to have been pushed to one side and in his place the Minister of Public Works conducted the negotiations and brought the deal to a successful issue. True the scheme met with rather a mishap when first presented, but on the second occasion, thanks to the vigilant care and attention of the Minister of Public Works, it went through. The hon. gentleman who, I am glad to see to-day enjoying such good health, had occasion to absent himself one session, and his place was taken by the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock). I am sorry that some of the ministers from Ontario are not in their places to-night, because I should like them to hear what I have to say, even at the risk of offending them, regarding the invidious distinction that the Minister of Public Works enjoys to-day in the province of Ontario. In the riding I have the honour to represent, we tendered a banquet last year to that hon. gentleman, in which all joined irrespective of politics, and I think he was well pleased and so were we. But I have not heard of any banquets having been tendered any of the ministers from the province of Ontario. Were the Minister of Public Works to pass down any street in our town, he would be recognized at once by every one, but I cannot say the same of his colleagues from the province of Ontario, with the exception of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), whose doleful countenance, by reason of his picture having been before the public for the past twenty years, is rather familiar to our public. But were the other ministers from the province of Ontario to pass down the street of that town or any other towns on the shores of Georgian Bay, I doubt whether they would be recognized any more than any ordinary stranger. If there is a town in the whole country that has done honour to the Minister of Public Works in the shape of banquets, it is Owen Sound. Go to Collingwood, and you will find the same treatment accorded the Minister of Public Works there. Even if you go to that centre of Conservatives in Ontario, Toronto, you will find that the Minister of Public Works is really the only man in the public eye there to-day. The chief reason is that he is the power behind the throne, and both political men and the people recognize the fact that without his assistance we cannot hope to get anything in that great province. It is true that the ministers from Ontario have not much patronage at their disposal. There is first the Secretary of State (Senator Scott), who dispenses out the tape and the sealing wax, and whose countenance would be perfectly unknown, except by very few, were he to pass down King street, Toronto. He has no patronage at his disposal at all. Then we come to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who wanted to let the House know that he was still alive this afternoon, and broke for a few moments into verse. Perhaps he wants to spend the last of his days in this House because last session he and the late Minister of Justice were consigned to oblivion even by the back-bench members opposite. It was said last year that the Minister of Justice was soon to disappear from the scene, and now it is on the cards that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is about to be shelved into the lieutenant governorship of Ontario.

So that the great province of Ontario, which pays the bulk of the taxes of this country, is practically without representation in the cabinet, at least in the matter of patronage. Take the two great toll gatherers, the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock), and the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), whose daily duty it is to see where and how they can best exact taxes from the people—neither of these two has at his disposition any patronage at all. The Postmaster General is deserving of our special sympathy. Here is the Minister of Public Works taking the stand that it is within his power to give out contracts by days labour, as he does in Sorel to the tune of $125,000 per year, and yet the Postmaster General is helpless to give even a penny increase to a mail carrier. He has appeals from the letter carriers in all the great cities of the province, and he cannot move hand or foot. Yet the Minister of Public Works can deal out patronage by the hundred thousand dollars, aggregating in the year to millions of dollars, without any vestige of tender, and not a question is asked by hon. gentlemen opposite as to whether or not there is to be public competition for these loaves and fishes. Occasionally an hon. gentleman opposite will make a protest, and sometimes the kick results to their benefit. Why, I recollect that last session the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), in a moment of audacity, dared to remonstrate with the Minister of Public Works with regard to one of his expenditures. What was the result? With a good deal of finesse, the Minister of Public Works managed to get him out of the way by having him appointed to a judgeship.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He was not treated very badly.

Mr. BENNETT. That is what I am pointing out. There are some gentlemen behind the Minister of Public Works to whom this example may be an incentive to go and do likewise. If they will only rebel against some of these expenditures they too may be slated for positions. I saw the other day that the junior member for Hants (Mr. Russell) is soon to be translated to a judgeship. It might be wise for him to make a spasmodic kick against the principle just laid down by the Minister of Public Works and obtain his reward all the sooner. Then, if the newspaper rumours are correct, the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Sutherland) is to be given a judgeship at an early day in order to smooth away some political troubles in his riding, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Justice promised the other day that there was to be a house-cleaning in the Ontario judiciary, and that a number of county court judges were to be retired, there is a vista open for the gentlemen of the legal profession on the other side of county court judgeships if not of Superior Court judgeships, and it would be well for them to take time by the forelock.

I congratulate the Minister of Public Works on the stand he has taken. In the first place, he has usurped the prerogative and rights of the Department of Railways and Canals. He went into the arena and tilted against his colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals, and dispossessed him of what was most valuable in the Railway Department. And this summer the hon. gentleman made an incursion into the Department of Canals. The newspapers were filled with the accounts of the trips taken by the Minister of Public Works up French river with the view of bringing about the construction of a large public work there. The hon. gentleman really seems to bear a charmed life. He can do whatever he pleases. When the fight gets a little warm he simply smiles serenely, and the First Minister comes to his assistance. A few years ago, in Montreal, when a great political club, the Club Letellier, demanded that the head of the Minister of Public Works should be placed on a salver——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was not.

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly not. The minister sits there and smiles and knows that neither the premier nor any one else can put him out of his position. The papers have lately been discussing the separation of a pair of twins, which operation was performed in Paris, with the disastrous result that one of the twins died. The right hon. the First Minister will no doubt bear that in mind whenever there is any suggestion of his severing himself from the Minister of Public Works. In that event the consequences, I am afraid, would be even more serious, for, I believe instead of one they both would die.

But the Minister of Public Works was not content. Knowing the weakness of the Ontario ministers, he went to Ontario and ousted them from their own ground. When the party suffered such a defeat in the province of Ontario in the last election, when it came back with so many empty saddles, the Minister of Public Works decided that he himself would look after any future elections. He went up to North Bruce, but I did not hear of his being in West Durham at the last election. Perhaps it was because of the North Bruce defeat.

There is not a single matter that the Minister of Public Works brings before this House in open defiance of this cabinet that he does not put through. And he has proved that in the past. What happened in relation to what was known as the Kettle River Bill? Here was the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in connection with an American company, which was pressing down to the border on the southern side of British Columbia. Day after day that

question was debated in the Railway Committee. It was a question of policy on the part of this government whether lines should be constructed from the American side into Canadian territory. A day was fixed when the Minister of Railways and Canals was to make a statement, and he stated at the time that the policy of the government was that the line should be constructed. That was directly adverse to the wishes of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Hon. gentlemen who were in the House at that time, will remember that memorable scene. The House voted, the yeas were called for on the Bill, one after another minister stood up on that side of the House and voted that the Kettle River Bill should be granted. But when it came to the Minister of Public Works he voted against it; and when the back benches were looked at, behold, to the humiliation of the premier, the Minister of Public Works had actually stolen from the premier himself his best and strongest supporters. Hon. gentlemen here remember that night when the Canadian Pacific Railway magnates were sitting in the gallery, and the Minister of Public Works kissed the tips of his fingers to them as much as to say, I am the whole government. There is not a doubt he was the whole government on that occasion.

Now there is great jealousy in the province of Ontario of the Minister of Public Works, and when by chance, owing to the illness of the Minister of Public Works and his absence in the old country, the Postmaster General was assigned to discharge his duties, what did the Postmaster General do on that occasion? He caused to be sent out all over the province a famous circular asking what they required in their different ridings. Well, I think there can be no doubt that a great many answers were given to the Postmaster General. Whether the Postmaster General's information was acted upon afterwards I know not, but I do know that the Minister of Public Works was not at all pleased with the action of the Postmaster General on that occasion. For what did we see? Why, we saw the Minister of Public Works threatening to do, what? When the Postmaster General said it was the policy of any country, at least in modern times, to combine the postal and telegraph departments together, what did the Toronto 'Globe' say? Why, it said that that was right, and that the Postmaster General should have charge of the telegraph department. I would like to ask the minister of telegraph lines, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works, if there is any prospect of the Postmaster General getting control of that department. Why, everybody knows that the Minister of Public Works has this matter right under his thumb, and that he has the whole control of this department. Yet, Sir, there is not a minister from the province of Ontario who will dare to stand up in his place and condemn this principle, the principle that, while they were in opposition, they demanded should be carried out in its entirety. The Minister of Public Works snaps his fingers at them, and he expends, as he does at Sorel, $125,000 in day labour, and here is $15,000 at another point.

Now take the question of dredging, and that is rather a tender point with some gentlemen on the other side of the House; because, while none of them are owners of dredges—because if any gentleman on that side of the House owned a dredge he would be contravening the Independence of Parliament Act were he to engage in the work of dredging—the result is that some of them are owned by very near relatives of members of parliament. It may be avoiding the Act; but the general public don't think conduct of that kind is altogether free from reprehension. Now, what does the Minister of Public Works do on the question of dredging? This dredging work is not let out by public tender at so much a day, these dredges are hired for a time, and the work is given in that way. I am not going to say the work is not properly done, because I am not in the possession of information to justify me in making that statement. But I do say the whole principle is wrong, there should be public competition in all these matters, even when it is a question of this paltry $15,000. But it is the broader and greater principle that the minister has taken up this afternoon, that he for the future intends in his department—and I assume it is to spread in other departments—to act on his own will and pleasure, and is going to let out the public works he likes at public competition and open tender, but such as he does not like, he proposes to let out in the other way.

I quite agree with the statement of the Minister of Public Works, made, I think, in the city of Montreal, about the cabinet fighting like blazes. I think they should. I think when a Minister of Public Works infringes as he does on the departments of these other ministers, when he, in open day, red-handed, comes in and takes up the work of their departments, it is high time for these gentlemen to make a protest, as the Postmaster General made a protest, and as the Minister of Railways and Canals has made a protest too. In all this fighting, in all this tearing of hair, so to speak, that is going on, there comes up one feeble voice, and that is the voice of the Minister of Railways and Canals. Now, the Minister of Railways and Canals has caused to be published in the papers within the last day or two a statement that he is not going to retire from the cabinet. Well, it may be he is not going to retire of his own free will, but it must need be that the Minister of Railways and Canals believes that he is standing on slippery ground, or he would not pay so much attention as he does to the rumors that are

sent around the country to the effect that he is to be deprived of his position.

I am surprised that some gentleman on that side of the House don't enter a feeble protest. The other day, they had taken a minister away from the province of Prince Edward Island, there was a gentleman who came here who had held the rank of premier in Prince Edward Island. Yet despite the fact that the bulk of the representatives from that province are in accord with this government, in the most brutal way, this portfolio is taken away from that province. Then there is the great province of New Brunswick. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) came in here only last session with a great flourish of trumpets. He was to occupy a seat in the cabinet, but instead of his having the seat, the only gentleman who does occupy a seat in that cabinet is being assailed from behind, and he finds it necessary to rush into print in order to define his position while he is out of the House.

Now I hope that the Minister of Public Works, for the good of the country, will retract, or at least soften a little the statement he made this afternoon. I hope the Minister of Public Works will not alarm the public, because this statement will alarm the public. If the people of the whole Dominion are to be told that the Minister of Public Works is about to bring down large sums of money to be voted away, and that he is not going to ask parliament to harness these grants with the condition that open tenders shall be asked upon them, then I say it is going to be a matter of much comment and of great surprise to the people of the country. But how much greater will be the surprise when, from the great province of Ontario, with five ministers, there is not a single word of protest made by any one of them; and how much greater still the surprise that, with the array of talent from that province, there is not a single gentleman on the other side of the House who will stand up and protest against that principle. I have recalled the case of the late member of Kingston having made a remonstrance, and from the fact of his remonstrance having been beneficial, it may perhaps prompt some other gentleman on that side of the House to do the same. It is the principle that is being followed to which we object. I see my hon. friend from West Northumberland (Mr. McColl) who came into this House on a narrow majority, and if what I am informed is correct, his presence in this House was due greatly to the fact that a large public institution in the town of Cobourg just at the time of the general elections was being constructed by day's labour. This pernicious principle, this principle that hon. gentlemen have contended against in the past, is a principle that I hope, and still hope, some gentleman opposite will rise and condemn in its entirety.

Mr. McCOLL. I understand the subject under discussion is as to whether public works should be done by public tender or whether, in certain cases, they should be done by day labour. It was said by an hon. gentleman this afternoon that in the city of Montreal there is very keen competition among contractors and that from that fact no doubt public work could be done with a large saving of expense by putting it up to public tender rather than by doing it by day labour. If that be true and if there is any saving by doing this work by public tender, you will often find that the saving in that way is at the expense of the labouring man and that is something that I do not think any hon. member of this House would wish to see. Now, independently of the question as to whether absolutely new works should be done by public tender or not, I submit that in the case of repairs to old buildings and the like of that it is far better to do it by day labour. Any one who has had experience in the matter knows how very difficult it is when you undertake to remodel or improve a building or to make additions to get plans and specifications with sufficient detail to provide for all the work that has to be done. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) who has just spoken, referred to the work which the provincial government has within the last two years been carrying on in Cobourg. It was known by many hon. members that some years ago the provincial government bought the old Victoria College building and that within the last two years they have been refitting that building for the purposes of an asylum. The way the work was done was this: the provincial architect made plans and specifications so far as he could of the changes that were necessary. An efficient man was put in charge of the work. The work was done by day labour, and while that work was going on I had an opportunity of visiting the place from time to time and what did I see? I noticed that in many cases changes had been made even after the work had been commenced. A door would be changed to another location from the place it had been originally designed to occupy, showing clearly that it was impossible in a case like that to keep to the plans and specifications though they were prepared in the best manner possible. The architect would come down every two weeks, or every month, look over the work and suggest any changes that he considered necessary and proper. I have yet to hear any complaint, even among Conservatives, to say nothing of Liberals in that riding, as to the way in which that work has been carried on. The principle of tender was to a certain extent carried out. When materials were wanted, where it was practicable to put them up to tender, that was

done, and the materials in that way were purchased at the lowest price. I believe that on account of this work being done by day labour it has been far better done and at no greater expense than if it had been done by tender.

An hon. MEMBER. And you were elected.

Mr. McCOLL. It has been said by one hon. gentleman that I was elected by a narrow majority. But I see the hon.member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) in his seat, who lives in the adjoining riding, and he will know that my majority did not depend on Cobourg. True, I succeeded in getting a majority in Cobourg, but my total majority was 135, showing clearly that I was not elected on account of my majority in the town. Perhaps that will be considered a very narrow majority in a close riding such as this is, but we think it is a very good majority because my opponent had been elected in the riding, the same gentleman, since 1881 and during that time he had a number of by-elections and in every instance his majority was under one hundred, in the majority of cases ranging from 30 to 50.

Mr. SPROULE. If there was any argument needed to strengthen the conclusion that the system of doing work by day labour is wrong, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McColl), who has just taken his seat, has furnished it in his closing remarks that his riding has been represented since 1881 by his opponent and that this is the first time in the history of the constituency that it was carried by a Liberal, associated with the fact that at this particular time there was this work being done by day labour by the hon. gentleman's own friends and the admission that he makes himself that he frequently visited the work. Put these things together and he comes here as the result of it. Alluding to the admission that the system is a good one, it certainly is a good system for the purpose of manufacturing votes and sending the hon. gentleman down here. I think the hon. gentleman, when he reflects, will wish that he had not spoken, because, instead of doing his cause any good, he has done it very much injury. I was surprised at the announcement made by the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). I have always given him credit for being a very clear-headed man, and I have no very strong grounds to change that favourable opinion of him ; yet, when he announced that the system of constructing public works by tender was objectionable, and could not safely be carried out, I could not agree with him and I think the country will hardly agree with him. He said that if work were done, as it is done in England, or in France, it would be all right. Is he not here to adopt the English or the French system, if they are better than ours, of doing work by public tender. Surely, if he discovered that there were objectionable features about our system he might have eradicated those features and improve the system of letting contracts by tender. If he found it serviceable and that it resulted in an economy of public funds he should have done it. But, he does not attempt to adopt this system. On the other hand, he has come to the conclusion that the letting of contracts by public tender is all wrong and that it is preferable to do work by the day labour system. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) places in my hand the Auditor General's Report and he gives me an opportunity of presenting to the House and the country an example of the benefits of the day labour system which the hon. Minister of Public Works has adopted. I have here the exependitures that were made down at the shops at Sorel. That is a place where the hon. minister spent last year over $125,000 by day labour. It was not as the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. McColl) recently said to patch up an old building at all. There may be some excuse if you are repairing an old building for not letting the work by tender, but this was not the patching up of an old building. It was building dredges and doing other work in connection with the shipyards at Sorel. Many of these works could easily have been let by tender because plans and specifications for them could have been got up beforehand and any one who understood the business might have been given an opportunity of tendering, with a reasonable hope of doing the work and knowing what he was doing. I find that there is no less than six hundred day labourers employed at Sorel. Imagine for a moment that there is a contest going on to elect a member, the same as there was in the riding of the hon. member for West Northumberland, where there was a public work going on which was so useful to him, imagine 600 men in a riding employed under a government foreman, and what chance has the opposition candidate to be elected ? The Minister of Public Works has great ingenuity and great resources, and much stratagem while he is engaged in an election campaign, and no man better than he can use 600 voters under such circumstances to support the government candidate. Every one of these men are paid agents—I do not mean that they are paid in a wrongful way by being bought—but they earn their daily bread because of the employment afforded by the Minister of Public Works, and they are, to a certain extent, at his mercy, and we know that they have to vote as he wishes. Therefore, in such a constituency the opposition candidate has to start with a vote of 600 against him, not to speak of the relatives and friends of the workmen who may vote with them. The Minister of Public Works tells us to-day that the carrying on of public works by day's labour

is the better system, and that the contract system has been a failure, but if he finished the sentence with the words which no doubt come to his tongue he would have added that the contract system was a failure—when he wanted to carry an election. Those men are employed on the work at a good round wage, and their work may not be very hard, but there are always a large number of applicants for any vacancy, and so the whole thing is engineered in order that every man who is working as well as every man who desires employment must be friendly to the government. The Minister of Public Works has spent $125,000 of the people's money in one year by the day's labour system, and let any ratepayer in the Dominion look over the pay sheets, and he will see the condition of things. The minister tells us that that money was economically and properly spent, but in my judgment the very reverse is the case. The announcement of the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that the tender and contract system has been a failure will be startling news for the country. When these gentlemen now on the treasury benches sat in opposition, the principle to which they most pinned their faith was that all public money, no matter how small, must be expended under the tender and contract system. They told us that was the only guarantee that the public expenditure would be safeguarded, and that those who were not friends of the government would have a chance of sharing in any public works. But the Minister of Public Works has changed his view on this point since he got into office. I believe that the people of the country will not endorse the Minister of Public Works in the views he has expressed to-day on this matter. I believe that the people of the country will say that the tender and contract system is the best means that has yet been devised to safeguard the expenditure of public money. I believe further, that a very large percentage of the ratepayers of Canada will differ from the minister on his day's labour theory. We have had unfortunate experience of the day's labour system all over the country. Look at that vote for building fences around the Lévis quarantine station. I went all over that ground at Lévis and I saw these fences, and I believe that any practical farmer will tell you that these fences, for which a vote of $1,000 is asked, could be put in proper order for $200. Last year we spent $5,000 on this quarantine station, the year before we spent $5,000, and we are going on increasing our expenditure year after year. Under what system is that money expended ? It is expended on the day's labour system, that beautiful system that the minister has declared to the world to be the most economical and to give the best results. We are entitled to know how many rods of that fencing is to be done, of what material the fences is to be made, and what are the specifications. The minister handed me over his book, but the chairman was so anxious to call out that the item was carried that I did not wish to cause delay. I am now sorry that I did not read out the information in that book to the House and thus do what the minister himself ought to have done. I remember very well that some years ago, when there was a vote for a post office in Renfrew or in the adjoining county, and when the Liberals were in opposition they took the whole night and a part of the day censuring the government for building a fence and a piece of a sidewalk. They wanted to know whether the fencing was hardwood or pine, what was the height, how much the lumber cost, and whether it was done by day's labour or by contract. They spent a whole night on that, and now it comes about that the Liberal government is spending five times as much in building sidewalks and fences around a piece of land twelve acres in extent, and they cannot or will not tell us what kind of fencing this is. As I said, I went over the ground at Lévis last year, and I believe if they asked between $50 and $100 for this work, instead of $1,000, they would have plenty of money to repair the fences. But I rose specially to call attention to the fact that the minister of the great spending Department of Public Works, has declared that the tender and contract system is a failure, and he gave us to understand by implication, although he did not say it in so many words, that he intends in the future to spend the public money by day's labour as much as possible. Well that is what he is doing at Sorel. If he carries out his intention he will have an army of his own friends engaged on public buildings in many of the constituencies throughout the country. If there is a by-election he will be sure to manipulate all that patronage for his own benefit. The government always manages that business very nicely. It was so in West Durham, it was so in Quebec, it was so in North Grey when they were trying to carry an election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. In West York.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt from what I heard that the government were preparing for that kind of work in West York. The hon. member (Mr. Campbell) told the people that he was going to get them a post office and do numbers of other things if he only was elected. The reason he gave was that the Minister of Public Works and he were on friendly terms, and that his opponent did not enjoy that distinction. It was something like what Mr. Hardy said at Owen Sound when he promised to get the people hot justice rather than cold justice. The election in West York was carried by such plausible promises as well as by other means, and it certainly was not carried by prayers, because the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) tells us that elections are not carried by prayers.

We want to know now, is the Minister of Public Works going to carry out the promises made by the member for West York (Mr. Campbell) during his election. The people of the country are getting a little sceptical of the promises made by the government and its supporters and they are anxious to see the goods delivered.

Mr. COWAN. You did not stay very long in West York.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not notice my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) there at all. I was told that if he ventured to come there it might be too hot for him. I was in hopes of meeting my genial friend there, but I have no doubt he found it more convenient to stay outside the limits of the county. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I am still in favour of letting contracts by public tender. I believe it to be the best system if it is properly carried out. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has referred to a matter which is of considerable importance. In looking over the various portfolios held by the ministers, coming as I do from the province of Ontario, it is deplorable to find what little say the ministers from that province have in the management of the country, and in the expenditure of public money.

Look at the different departments. The fisheries were declared by the Privy Council to belong to the provinces; therefore the Department of Marine and Fisheries is comparatively speaking only an artificial department to-day with very little money to spend and very little patronage; and the hon. member for North Oxford (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) has that department. Then, the Department of Trade and Commerce is held by the hon, member for South Oxford (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). That also is one of the artificial departments, which the hon. minister himself a few years ago declared to be practically worthless, and to be retained only in order to provide a place for a friend of the government, though he manages to occupy the place very nicely and to draw the salary attached thereto; but there is no money spent and no patronage in that department. Then, there is the Department of Customs. It is true, the Minister of Customs has some patronage, but he spends very little money. The Postmaster General has a very valuable department, but he spends very little money, except in the way of giving contracts for carrying the mails. The Department of the Secretary of State is another artificial department. On the other hand, look at the great wealth of the province of Ontario, which is very properly called the first province in the confederation.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Next to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, out of deference to my hon. friend, we will except Prince Edward Island. But the people of the province of Ontario furnish a great portion of the money that is spent by the government—that great province which is numerically so strong, and also so strong in its enterprise and ambition; and yet Ontario is not represented in this cabinet by a single minister who has control of the spending of any considerable amount of money. Where has it gone ? To the other provinces. Let the people of Ontario consider this. Why, the ministers from the great province of Ontario are relegated to about the lowest positions in the cabinet, where they have no money to spend, while the spending is left to the ministers from the other provinces, principally to my genial friend the Minister of Public Works, from the province of Quebec—and he loves to spend money. If there is one thing more than another that seems to be prominent in his nature, it is his disposition to spend.

An hon. MEMBER. Except electioneering.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the next best thing he likes. I will, by way of parenthesis, say one thing in his favour, that I believe he makes a great deal of his expenditure where money ought to be spent—I give him credit for that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Hon. gentlemen opposite, travelling over the great desert of their political lives, are ready to jump at the slightest scintilla of anything that is redeemable in his character; for they cheer before a sentence is half out. I was about to say that he has made a great deal of expenditure in the province of Ontario that meets with the approval of many people, because it has done a great deal of good there, and we do not object to his doing that, and we desire to give him credit for it; but we object to the way he spends the money, for we think the same amount of money could be made to go a great deal further. He sometimes maps out schemes which we think a little wild; but he has his strong convictions and he imagines he is correct; but the great difficulty is that the bulk of the people do not agree with him. But I want to draw the attention of the people of Ontario to the humiliating position their province occupies in this cabinet to-day, in the fact that there is not a minister of the Crown from the province of Ontario who is at the head of a department where there is much patronage or the power to spend much money. The Minister of Railways is from one of the smaller provinces down by the sea—a very important one in its way, and I am saying nothing against it. Look at the Minister of Public Works from the province of Quebec; look at the Minister of Agriculture, also from the province of Quebec; while the ministers from the great province of Ontario are relegated to the mean-

est positions in the cabinet. I want the people of Ontario to take note of this, and at the proper time to send in their remonstrance against a state of things which I believe they will agree with me is unsound and unjust to that great province.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would ask the hon. members to confine themselves as nearly as possible to the resolution before the committee.

Mr. PUTTEE. For my part, I entirely dissent from the oft-repeated statement made this afternoon that the day labour principle is a wrong one or a bad one. It is easily conceivable that the administration of a principle may be wrong, and if the gentlemen wish to put it in that way, that would be a fair question for discussion; but to say that the principle is bad is not borne out by the facts. Evidence has been fast accumulating in the last few years endorsing the position that has been taken by the hon. Minister of Public Works when he stated that he believes he could do work better and cheaper by the system of day labour, or the direct employment of labour, than he could by the contract system. Since the city of London about twelve years ago went wholly into this method of doing its work, most municipalities in the old country and the progressive municipalities in this country have taken hold of it, and it has been successful almost without any exception. Hon. gentlemen speak as if there were no drawbacks to the contract system—as if it were all perfectly satisfactory. I will venture the opinion that at least half the contracts which have been carried on under this government, whichever party is in power, have been unsatisfactory, resulting in more trouble and expense than you could imagine under any other system. The Minister of Public Works this afternoon, in speaking of the additions that have been made to this building, stated that they had been done by the day labour system, and that their cost had exceeded the estimates. He also said that circumstances had arisen which they could not see beforehand. If that work had been done by contract, what would have become of those matters which were unforeseen ? Would the contractor have attended to them for nothing ? He would either have been paid extra for them or the work would have been slighted. In the doing of work by contract, the contractor has to make money, and he has either to make it out of the labour, or out of the material, or out of the government. I do not by any means believe the statement that the people of this country are opposed to the direct employment system. Every trades council of this country—and there is one in nearly every city—is on record many times in favour of this system; the Dominion Trades Congress, which represents them all, is also on record in favour of it ; and these are the men who do the work —not the men who farm it out, but the men who actually do it, and these are the men who feel the pinch when the contractor has to make his profit. I want to tell the Minister of Public Works that if he puts this system into more active operation throughout this country, he will have the support of the people. The question of the direct employment of labour is very closely allied to that of public ownership, and I believe the public ownership idea is taking a strong hold of the minds of the people of this country. When some of these remarks were made this afternoon, I took from the mail an official communication from the city of Winnipeg, in which it is proved by figures that in the last few years that city has been performing one large public service which it took over, at 60 per cent less than it cost before, and another important service at 45 per cent less than it cost before; and all who have been in the city of Winnipeg know that these services are better carried out and the public are better served than ever was the case under the contract system. I firmly believe the people of the country are willing, even if the members of this House are not, to support the Minister of Public Works or any other minister who puts this prinicple into more general use.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I listened last session with a great deal of interest to what certain hon. gentlemen opposite had to say on the system of doing government works by day labour, and have followed their remarks this session with no less interest. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) gave two reasons why he objects to the principle of day labour. The first was that the men employed by the government got bigger wages and had a better time, and the second was that that method was cheaper and brought greater political benefit to the minister in charge. Well, I believe in the principle of day labour, and I desire to say that the Minister of Public Works, in carrying out this principle to the extent he does, is doing what the trade unions and labour organizations all over the country have been asking him to do for many years. What hon. members opposite have to prove, it seems to me, is not whether the government are deriving political benefit from the system, but whether or not the country is being deprived of any benefit and is suffering any injury by it. What does it matter to me if the government gain votes by conducting public works on the day labour principle ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Hon gentlemen are laughing rather to early in the day. What does it matter to the country if the government does gain votes, provided the work is well done and economically done. The Minister of Public Works has repeatedly told us that the work is better done, that it

is in every way more satisfactory, and we must accept his statement until his critics prove the contrary. As a matter of principle, I believe that so far as practicable the day labour method ought to be adopted, and let me tell the hon. minister that in adopting this method he is carrying out the views of organized labour in this country. When he sees that the labouring men are paid good wages, under the supervision of competent men, who will see that they give value for the money, he is doing what the people will support him in doing. I quite understand that it is not possible to carry out all the operations on government works by the day labour system, but there is a large percentage of that work which can be done on that system with great advantage to the country, and the greatest possible advantage to the people. So far as the views of organized labour are concerned, I can assure the Minister of Public Works that in the methods he has adopted he has the support of the people of this country.

Mr. SCHELL. During the discussion this afternoon, it was frequently stated that no evidence has been brought by the Minister of Public Works or by any one supporting his policy to show that the day labour system is cheaper and better than the contract system. Let me cite to the House some facts which will show that the position taken by the minister is in the interests of the country. I take my particulars from Vol. 2nd of the Auditor General's report, page V—212. Up to the present, the question has been one of sentiment rather than of fact, and the opinion which has prevailed in the country has been that the day labour system was not as cheap or as satisfactory as the contract system. Well, every one judges by his own experience and personal knowledge, and I have some sympathy for hon. gentlemen opposite who speak from the knowledge they acquired when they were in office. It was they who built the Curran bridge, and they bulit it by day labour, and no wonder that system should appear to them very expensive when they look back to the history of that work. But I propose to cite two cases which will illustrate the difference between the cost of a public work done by day labour, when there was something to be made out of it for the boy, and one done by this government, when there was no question of anything of the kind. I refer to the building of two wharfs in the county of Glengarry—one at Summerstown by the late government and the other at Lancaster by the present government. The wharf at Summerstown was 85 feet long. The approach to the wharf was built of clay, shovelled up from either side, and simply dumping into the water 22 feet from the end of that dump, the cribwork was bridged over by timber on to the main pier, making actually not more than 63 feet and 22 feet of bridge work, or 85 feet altogether. The head of that pier was 22 feet wide and 120 feet long and the depth of water was 7 feet 6 inches.

At Lancaster, two years ago, there was another wharf built, 269 feet was the length. It was built entirely of stone. The stone was drawn from two to four miles, and there was not one load of earth in the entire approach. The depth of water was 8 feet 6 inches. The area of the landing head was about three times that of Summerstown wharf, the area of the approach was more than three times as long, and the cost of the wharf at Summerstown was $15,417, while that of the work at Lancaster was only $5,013. I submit to this House that here is a case that will stand comparison with any case which the opposition can bring forward. Here was the case of one wharf of less than one-third the size and built with a great deal cheaper material constructed by the old government, and it cost three times as much as this one constructed by day's labour under the direction of the present Minister of Public Works. There is no disputing these facts. It is not necessary that we should spend the whole afternoon talking about an abstract principle, when we have evidence to show what is being actually done. Because one administration did not, could not or would not, conduct public works cheaply that does not prove that this cannot be done by any administration. On the contrary, the fact is that these works are being done cheaply to-day, and the figures that I have given are proof of it. I venture to say that there is not a contractor who could see five cents of profit in that wharf at Lancaster, and the contractor wants to see a profit in every job he undertakes. If public works are conducted properly—and that is the kernel of the whole matter and I know that in my own county they are conducted properly—the principle at which we should aim is being carried out. If you have a foreman and an engineer to look after the work, this method of day's labour will give good results. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) complained that $125,000 was being spent for day's labour at Sorel. According to the figures I have given, the same work under the previous government would have cost $750,000.

Mr. BROCK. You had better make it more than that.

Mr. SCHELL. No, I will not go a cent more. The hon. member for East Grey assumes that this work is done improperly. I have as much right to assume that the figures I have given are a fair comparison of the two administrations.

Mr. BROCK. Will the hon. member (Mr. Schell) please explain how a work costing $125,000 under this government would have cost $750,000 under the old system ?

Mr. SCHELL. Because under the old system it would cost six times as much. I have given the figures——

Mr. BROCK. Give us the facts.

Mr. SCHELL. I have given the facts also, and I defy any hon. gentleman to controvert anything I have said. If the former government had done things at Sorel on the same basis as they did them in the county of Glengarry, this work which now costs us $125,000 would have cost us $750,000. Merely because this amount spent at Sorel $125,000 is a large sum, these hon. gentlemen hold up their hands in horror. But they have not shown that any of this expenditure was extravagant or wrong.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have listened to a very interesting discussion. The item under debate is $15,000 for the Montreal Examining Warehouse—addition to and alterations, including fitting, furniture, &c. The item seems very simple and clear, but the discussion has gone far beyond it. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has gone all over creation. I do not intend to follow him. I hope the province of Ontario will not be alarmed by what he says. The poor, down trodden province of Ontario, represented by such feeble men as Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Mulock, Mr. Paterson and others—men of such inferior calibre—and with only five representatives in the cabinet. Hon. gentlemen who have spoken have said that Ontario was ahead in everything. If they will look at the figures, they will see that Ontario is ahead in expenditure also. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) complained that last year I spent $125,000 for day's labour. The hon. gentleman has made a mistake. I spent about four times that amount. I would ask the attention of the House to what we have done at Sorel, and what we are doing there. I did not invent the shipyard at Sorel—it was there when we took office. The government is spending upon the channel between Quebec and Montreal, about $75,000 to $90,000 a year. When the ship channel was handed over to the government in 1888, there was handed over also an inferior fleet of dredges, stone lifters and other craft. With this outfit, the work on the channel was conducted at a great disadvantage. The trade of the country was expanding and the people insisted that we should develop the country's waterway. What was I to do? Was I to import dredges? Hon. gentlemen oposite are daily reproaching the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) because, having no equipment to build cars and locomotives, he has been obliged to import cars and locomotives from the United States. Was I to do the same? Not by any means. I did not take that course, nor do I intend to do so. Whether I am here for a long time or a short time, while I am here, every piece of work for my department that can be done in this country shall be done here. That is the policy I carried out in Sorel. We have built a magnificent fleet of dredges there. Ought I to have imported dredges as my predecessors did. There are three dredges in the maritime provinces, the 'St. Lawrence,' the 'Canada' and the 'George Mackenzie,' which were imported from England. These dredges cost in round numbers $120,000 each, and their capacity is not more than 1,000 yards a day. We have built at Sorel dredges with a capacity of 7,000 or 8,000 yards a day each and with less cost, built them by Canadian labour and of Canadian material as far as possible. If I am wrong, I am prepared to stand by the wrong I have done. The great work of deepening, widening and otherwise improving the channel between Montreal, Quebec and the gulf could not possibly be carried on without a shipyard. Anybody who has had experience in work of that kind knows that if you have dredges, stone lifters and tugs, accidents and breakages occur every day, and you must have a shipyard, just as every well equipped railway company must have a workshop for the repair of its locomotives and cars. I have done that, and my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) would have done the same thing. And where is the wrong of doing these works on Canadian soil, with Canadian hands? What wrong, I ask again, have I committed? I have done right, and my hon. friends opposite are mistaken in their criticism. We are carrying out a great public work. My hon. friend says we are employing in Sorel 600 hands. We are not employing quite as many; on an average we employ about 400 hands, sometimes less but never more, in building dredges, tugs, and in works of all kinds. Now these are Canadians, and as I say, the work is done on Canadian soil. Now if there is any other way in which that work could be done I would like to know it. I would like to know how the St. Lawrence can be deepened and widened except by having a shipyard in which to make the repairs that are necessary.

If my hon. friends will allow me to say so, they are altogether mistaken in saying that it is in the interest of a government to carry out works by contract. A minister who was not entirely honourable would make a lot of money out of contracts, and by giving extras. That could be done. He cannot make a dollar in giving out a work by day labour. He has no chance to do anything. The labour is paid every day, and the minister has nothing to do with it. Why, I ask again, should the labouring men of this country be deprived of their honest earnings in order that the contractor might earn millions? Politically there is nothing to be gained from day labour. But, on the other hand, the contract system gives a lot of

trouble. When a contract is given a minister always has a great deal of trouble. I say again, backed up by an experience of five years and a half, that on many occasions public works are better carried out by day labour than by contract. I do not lay down the rule that the system of tenders must be put aside. I never said that, I do not say it now. But I say that if I were able to find everywhere competent foremen I would not hesitate to carry out the largest work by day labour.

My hon. friends have forgotten past history. Doubtless the new members of this House are surprised to hear this debate. But this is not the first time a similar debate has taken place, we hear it every year. My hon. friends opposite forget their own past when they scarify me because I am asking $15,000 for some repairs in Montreal. The ex-Minister of Finance in the Conservative government carried out, in the city of St. John, works of repair and rebuilding a custom-house to the tune of $200,000, by day labour, and he did not lose the confidence of my hon. friends opposite. I gave to the House a day or two ago a complete list of all the works that had been carried out by day labour. I do not mean by any means to shield myself behind the example of my predecessor. I say again that on many occasions a public work can be better done by day labour than by tender and contract. My hon. friend asked me why I did not change the system since I did not find it good. I am not strong enough to do so; and my hon. friends opposite would not sustain me if I attempted to make the change, and if I attempted to make the system of tender perfectly safe.

Mr. SPROULE. I will if the hon. gentleman will convince me.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are days when my hon. friend is pretty hard to convince. Suppose I were to prepare a list of the contractors whom I would invite to tender for public works. What would be the result in this House? I never could get five cents of estimates through. I would be told that I had picked out a list of partisans. No, Sir, I am not strong enough to do that. In England, France and Germany the system has been established, and it works well. Now, Sir, compare the two systems of day labour and of contract. Where are the scandals in connection with day labour that we have seen in connection with contracts? There may be some mistakes, I do not say there are not. But if you look at what has been done in connection with large contracts you will find some pretty hard things.

I do not think that the time taken in this discussion has been wasted. My hon. friend said that I was extravagant in the expenditure of money. Permit me to say that he is wrong. I am not afraid of a wise expenditure of money. I am rather sanguine of the future of this country, and when I am convinced that an expenditure of money will promote the progress and prosperity of Canada, I do not hesitate a moment. One thing that this discussion will promote is progressive ideas. This century is a century of progress. When I happen to be Minister of Public Works, and have around me men of great ability, I do not like to be told that any contractor in Ottawa or Toronto is more able than I am to direct a great public undertaking. I do not like it. I do not like to be told that the Canadian artisan is not quite as able to do work by day labour under my direction as he would be under the direction of a foreign contractor. So I say time has not been wasted in this debate. The country will listen to this debate. That large and important class of workingmen will not lose sight of what has been said to-night on both sides of the House.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). This question has been discussed nearly all the afternoon, and I do not think I can throw much light upon it. But I am certain of one thing, and that is that all the work this government requires to be done cannot possibly be let by contract. There must be some work done by days' work. The messengers in this House, the pages, and all classes of employees around this building, must be hired by the day. So it is with a great deal of work which the Minister of Public Works requires to be done. I think a similar discussion took place last year, and I said then that I believed that work could be done cheaper and better by day labour in many cases than by contract. There is one trouble in day labour, and I think that is what hon. gentlemen on this side of the House complain of most. I understand that when the present members of the government sat on this side of the House they complained bitterly against the very thing that they are doing now.

Now, if that be true, they are not consistent, but the question is: Are they right? I think under the circumstances they are right, and I think that it would have been better for this country to have work done by the day, but they must see that they have good foremen, not political hacks, not men that are working for themselves and their job, but men that would see that the country is well served and when a man does not discharge his duty, no matter how good a politician he may be, he should be discharged. One trouble arises as the result of the government doing all this work by day's labour because the government have a strong pull on every man that they hire by the day, just the same as the manufacturers control their workmen, as we all know. There is another point to be remembered. We all know that the contractors are the most liberal subscribers to party funds, and the gov-

ernment will be deprived of this assistance if the work is done by day's work. Now, I think this discussion has gone far enough.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in reference to the illustration which was given us by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) and referred to by the hon. Minister of Public Works as an example of what might be done by day's labour. That was the Curran bridge, which was cited as a justification for doing work by day's labour. Why, that whole job was done by day's labour and the contention of hon. gentlemen who sat on this side of the House at the time the inquiry took place was, that the cost of the work was three or four times as much as it would have been had it been let by contract. The whole argument against the government was that they did not let it by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The labour was given out by contract.

Mr. SPROULE. On the Curran bridge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, St. Louis had the contract for the whole of the labour.

Mr. SPROULE. He was given a schedule of prices that would be acceptable to hire men at, and he made as much out of it as he liked, but the whole contention in that case and the whole force of the argument against the government was based on the fact that they had not done the work by public tender. Now, this is cited to-night as an example of what might be accomplished by day's labour. The hon. gentleman who just took his seat says that we cannot do all public work by contract. There is no person who ever contended that we could. The argument of hon. gentlemen now supporting the government, when on this side of the House was, that when the government departed from the principle of doing work by public contract they departed from a salutary and correct principle, and that just in so far as the government departed from that principle they did wrong. To-day, they are converts to another theory, the same as they are in many other lines, since they occupied the treasury benches. The hon. Minister of Public Works shakes his head. I never heard him advocating the adoption of the day-labour system before he became a minister of the Crown. But now, the hon. minister says that he has built dredges at Sorel and he asks if he had not a right to do it. So far as he could employ Canadian labour, put in Canadian materials and do the work at the proper price, I have no objection in the world, but I ask him, if that be correct, why he gave a contract to Mr. Bertram, of Toronto, for the building of a dredge, and will he tell us what that work cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The shipyard in Sorel was not well enough equipped then for the building of a big dredge like that, because our hands were full. We had too much work on hand.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us that he could have done that work cheaper than he had it done by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not say that I could have done it cheaper, but certainly as cheap.

Mr. SPROULE. The other feature of the argument which he presented was that he was employing Canadian labour. What did Mr. Bertram employ—American labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, Canadian labour.

Mr. SPROULE. What material did he put in ? Did he not employ Canadian labour and put in Canadian material just the same as the hon. minister did at Sorel ? Therefore, that argument amounts to nothing, because, although the contract was let by tender to a man in Toronto, he employed Canadian labour and put in Canadian material. I think if we were to endeavour to convince the country that the contract cost more than it should have cost, the hon. Minister of Public Works would be the first to defend his action and to say that it was the cheapest contract ever carried out in Canada. I am quite sure it was. He says that he never brings in American dredges. I do not like to bring to his attention an instance of where he did, but I think he brought one into Collingwood.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I did not say that I never brought in American dredges at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he did so. However, I am not going to make an argument out of that, because I think he did right there. It was needed, he had none of his own, he got a dredge where he could and he employed it. If there ever was an attempt made to educate the people of this country up to the belief that the proper principle of doing work was by tender and contract, it was made by the hon. Minister of Public Works and his friends, who are going back on that principle to-day. I only want to draw attention to the inconsistency of these hon. gentlemen in this particular, as in many others. I have a few words to say to the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith). He presented to us the most astounding principle. What does it matter, he says, if the electors are bought up when you employ them by day's labour. What does it matter if the members of this House are all elected by corruption ?

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I would like the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) to complete the sentence.

Mr. SPROULE. I took down the hon. gentleman's words. He said: What does it matter to the country if the government make votes by spending money in this way? What are they doing if they are making votes but corruptly buying them? What does it matter if this House is purchased and put here? What does it matter to the people of the country? We have too many evidences of corruption during the last few years. We are getting rapidly from bad to worse, and it is a question which may be very properly asked how much of the present system of spending public money is chargeable for the corruption we have in the country to-day? When the hon. member for Nanaimo advances that most astounding doctrine that it does not matter, I can tell him that the great moral sentiment of the country will not agree with him, that the great moral sentiment of the country is against that principle, because this country desires to be represented in an honest parliament, not a purchased one, not a venal one, not one bought with public money by day's labour. It does matter, it is a matter of very great importance not only to this House, but to the country, and we all hope the day is far distant when any other man will be found who will stand up in the House and defend a measure for buying up the electorate by spending public money in this way.

Mr. McCREARY. Before this discussion closes I would like to say a few words as I have had considerable to do in carrying out the principle of day labour. It was my experience in a western city, the city of Winnipeg, for five or six years, being in the city council, to know how this system has worked out. Most of our work during the years from 1880 to 1895 had been done by contract. It was found that most of the sewers were defective in construction and material; it was found that large sums were claimed for extras, and expensive law suits resulted from this contract system. The people asked themselves: Is there a better system to be adopted, and consequently the day's labour system was started at first on a small scale. It was found that it worked well. It was then inserted in all contracts given by the city that the minimum wage paid should be 17½ cents per hour. Some of the contractors tried to evade that clause, but finally they were compelled to carry it out, and so the work went on. Many of our wealthy merchants who at first objected to the day's labour system are now the strongest advocates of that system, and the consequence is that wherever work is done now in the city of Winnipeg it is done by day's labour. We were told that the asphalting of the streets could not be done by day's labour, but we said: Surely if the contractors can bring experts from St. Louis or Detroit, we can hire them just as well. To-day we have our own asphalt plant, we have our own experts, and all that work is done by our own men. We were told that we could not get the stone in proper shape, but we bought our own quarry, we built our own railway to the quarry, we got our own engines and cars, and at the present time we are laying streets in the city of Winnipeg as cheaply as anywhere in the United States or in England, (considering the cost of living), and in addition to that we are laying better streets. Then again, another good result followed. It was found that after the day's labour system was adopted we had no more defective sewers. There is no complaint to-day that sewers are caving in. I say, all honour to the Minister of Public Works if in this progressive age he is trying to carry out the principle adopted in the many progressive cities of the United States and of Great Britain—the principle of doing public works by day labour rather than by contract labour. There is another feature of this question that has not been alluded to. I refer to the charge made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I do not think he represents the Conservative party in that charge, because if he does it is one of the most disgraceful reflections on the workingmen of Canada that has ever been uttered in parliament. He said that the moment you employ a man and pay him $1.75 a day you buy him up politically body and soul for ever. Well, we have 1,500 men almost constantly on the pay roll of the city of Winnipeg, and we expend nearly $1,000,000 a year, and there is not a citizen of Winnipeg who will say that those men are bought in municipal or national politics, because they get a minimum wage of 17½ cents an hour. If you can corrupt workingmen by paying them $1.75 or $2 per day, how much more could you corrupt the contractor who would be at the head of these men if he got that contract. If it is buying up and corrupting men to pay them a fair living wage under the day labour system, then it would be buying them up and corrupting them wholesale under the contract system. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) cast a reflection on the workingmen of Canada that they will resent at the proper time, when he made the statement that workingmen employed by day's labour were bought up body and soul.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for East Grey did not make that statement. The member for East Grey did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. McCREARY. Here are your words. You said that when the opposition candidate goes to a riding where 600 men are employed on government works by day's labour

he starts out with a majority of 600 votes against him.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and I repeat it.

Mr. MONK. The discussion arose this afternoon on an item of $15,000 for adding a new story to the examining warehouse in the city of Montreal. It is on behalf of the builders and contractors of that city and of the labourers themselves that I appealed to the Minister of Public Works to adopt what is the right course, and to let this work out by contract after calling for tenders in a proper manner. That would give to every man in the city of Montreal who is a builder, and to every workingman of the city of Montreal a chance of taking part in that work. I have heard nothing in the discussion to change my mind on this subject. Since this government has been in power—I do not know, nor am I responsible for what occurred before—it is a well known fact in the city of Montreal where there is such keen competition among the builders and where there are such able workmen; it is a well known fact that only a certain clique of builders can get any work from the government. That is what we object to. It is a well known fact that these contractors, or those who have charge of work for the government are often obliged to employ men who are not first-class workmen. That is the abuse I protest against. There is not a corporation, there is not a business man in Montreal, or in Toronto, or in any of the large centres, who, if he had a story to add to a large building, would not call for tenders publicly and give the work to a contractor. I venture to say that the large amount of money spent by this government for advertisements, when it chooses to advertise for public tenders, might very properly be kept for other purposes, because I believe that if government works were properly advertised in the 'Canadian Official Gazette' every necessary opportunity would be given to contractors to tender, and these works would be executed for half what they cost under the present system. That stands to reason. Who is best qualified to erect an additional story to the examining warehouse in Montreal? Is it not the man who is accustomed to that work, who under proper conditions would be obliged to put his prices as low as possible in competition with other builders, and who would be obliged to do work of the first quality; or, is it the official sent down by the government who will start out on this work employing men who are half the time political friends of the government and half the time unfit for the work which they are set to perform? It stands to reason that when the work is given by tender under proper conditions, it will be better done, more expeditiously done and more cheaply done. I have heard a great deal from the Minister of Public Works in reference to the works he has executed at Sorel. I do not know that any member on this side criticised the establishment of the works at Sorel. It is very proper for this government which has so culpably neglected the navigation of the St. Lawrence notwithstanding the continuous demands made by the shipping interests and underwriters of Montreal; it is very proper that one of the members of this government who has had some energy should claim some merit for having established the works at Sorel. Nobody objects to that. Nor does any one object to the payment of the employees there fair wages no more than we would object to the payment of fair wages to those who are employed in Ottawa. But the principle which we condemn is that principle which leads the Minister of Public Works to purchase all the wood required in this ship-building yard without calling for tenders, and by reason for which we have to pay exorbitant prices for the supplies. It is undeniable that the minister could get wood of better quality probably, and certainly at a lower price if he advertised for tenders for the supplies required at Sorel. What we find fault with, and what we condemn also is, the purchasing of the hardware supplies without public tender. We condemn the system of placing these orders at exorbitant prices with favourites of the government and with men who are not even hardware merchants but who purchase the hardware required on commission. That is what we object to. In England and the United States when such supplies are required a list is sent to all those engaged in the trade, and each article has a fixed price opposite which the government will pay. Is not that a progressive system? Is it not a better system than which the Minister of Public Works has adopted of giving orders to political friends, without giving others engaged in the trade a chance to tender. We have many excellent hardware establishments in Montreal and why is not the same favour extended to all? As to dishonesty, I believe there is no question but that every opportunity is given to a dishonest minister or to a dishonest government to derive indirect profit from the expenditure of public funds under this system. The workingmen of Montreal are interested in seeing that public money is expended wisely and economically because they are contributors to the public treasury just as much as we are. The workingmen have to protect them the clause which insures that they shall be paid a fair wages, and does the hon. member from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) believe for a single instant, that when work is given out in the slovenly way in which it is given now, the workingmen will be surer to receive fair wages than if it was given out by contract to the lowest tenderer under a contract which includes the fair-wage clause. The hon. gentleman from Vancouver (Mr. Smith) and the

hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) have stated that all these public works should be done by day's labour, but if they think that now, why did they not take the same position at the recent meeting of the Trades and Labour Congress. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Smith) made a report to that congress and among the many things which he considered necessary for the welfare of the workingmen he made no reference to the disappearance of the contract system. I find his name as president of that congress signed at the foot of a report, which purports to mention the grievances complained of by the workingmen of Canada. There is not one single word in that report in support of the theory which the hon. gentleman is contending for to-day, that public works should be done not by contract, but by day labour. On the contrary, if the members of this committee will take the trouble to read that report, they will find that in it my hon. friend practically approves of the contract system, provided the fair-wage clause is inserted in the contract and observed.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Will the hon. member read the statement ?

Mr. MONK. There is at page 17, clause 8, a statement under the heading, 'current or fair wages on government contracts.' I will with pleasure read the whole clause, but I do not think I would be justified in taking up the time of the committee in doing so. The gist of the report upon that particular point is that the government system of giving out public works by contract has been satisfactory where the fair wage clause has been not only inserted but observed ; and the report goes on to say that in cases where that clause has not been observed, the matter has been brought to the attention of the government, and the claims of the labouring men have been recognized and paid by the government. The labourers under the day labour system will not be paid higher wages than the fair wage clause provides for, and if the work is done by contract and the fair wage clause is observed, the workmen lose nothing. But my hon. friend had other grievances against the government. He signed a report which stated that the alien labour law, which this side of the House strove last year to have amended, had not been properly observed. There is also a complaint against Chinese immigration in British Columbia. But there is not a single word on the question which my hon. friend this evening seemed to regard as essential. I believe, as the hon. Minister of Public Works says, that this discussion has not been useless ; and if it is a consecrated principle of this government that public works ought not to be done by public tender and contract——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No one has said that.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. MONK. The Minister of Public Works stated this afternoon that he believed as a general rule that works were better executed by day work than by public contract. I believe there are some works which cannot be executed by contract ; but the item to which I called attention this afternoon is just one of those cases in which, if he has prepared his specifications and the officers of his department estimate it at $15,000, I will find in the city of Montreal contractors who will do the work for a much lower figure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is the use of making so much noise over such a little affair ? My hon. friend has tried to prove that I should do by contract certain works in Montreal. What is the size of these works ? Building alterations and additions costing $6,000. On hearing him, the House would have concluded that it would have been more like a work costing a quarter of a million.

Mr. MONK. It is the principle.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Now, the chief architect of the Department of Public Works is one of the most practical men that any minister could have at his disposal. Mr. Ewart started life as a mason; he has worked in the ordinary way that workingmen do ; he has learned his trade, and he has climbed the hill by his labour, his ability and his honesty. Now, he has prepared all the specifications of these works, and that small work cannot be carried out for less than $6,000. It is composed largely of alterations inside the building—taking down walls and improving the lighting of the examining warehouse which is now too dark. That work cannot be done by contract, because no man who has any knowledge of building and repairing work could say exactly what it should cost. Then, there is $4,000 for furniture and fittings. These cannot be bought by contract. Surely the Department of Public Works can buy furniture and fittings to that extent. My hon. friend says that he does not object to the Department of Public Works having workshops at Sorel ; but he insists that all purchases should be made in an honest way. I share his view ; but I say that there are a sufficient number of traders and merchants in any party to afford competition. But I would say more than that. On many occasions at Sorel we have bought goods from firms who are not friends of this government. Of course, when my officers are able, all things being equal, to buy from friends of the government, they do so. That is not only their right but their duty. But when we cannot buy all things with equal advantage from friends, we go elsewhere. For instance, Fotheringham & Workman are not the friends of the government, but they are a reliable firm, and we have purchased goods from them. But I say that

where I am able to buy from political friends I do so, after having asked for tenders—not public tenders, but tenders such as all first-class firms ask for. Now, I am surprised that my hon friend, who lives in Montreal, does not remember what takes place there. I am not the only man who carries out large works by day's labour. The shipyards of Sorel are after all nothing compared with the large works which the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have in Montreal, and which they are carrying on by day's labour.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. minister think that they purchase wood or any other material without calling for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will come to that point. But my hon. friend cannot deny that the Grand Trunk Railway Company are building locomotives and cars in Montreal by day's labour. The Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway do not advertise publicly for their goods. I challenge my hon. friend to produce one instance in which the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway advertise for their supplies. They have a purchasing agent just as I have, who goes from firm to firm and asks for prices. I am doing what all the large firms do and what any sound business man would do.

Mr. INGRAM. Judging by some of the speeches made on the opposite side, we are charged with being opposed to a system of day labour. I want to remind the Minister of Public Works that some years ago the very position he now takes was taken by the Conservative government, and on that occasion he opposed the policy which he now advocates. I remember distinctly then making the statement, which I repeat now as a member of this opposition, that I was not opposed to day labour on certain works, because, in my judgment, you cannot on such works call for tenders and let them by contract. But on all new works, I take the ground to-night as I did then, that it is in the interests of the people to call for tenders and give the work out by contract. And in that contract there should be a stipulation compelling the contractor to pay the rates of wages ruling in the districts where the work is done. That was the stand I took then and which I take now.

Some hon. gentlemen have argued that the contract system is a very bad one, and that the day labour system has everything in its favour. But the minister himself says that the contract system has some advantage to the ministers and that the day labour system has none. From that statement I presume there must be some profit derived from the contractor who gets the contract, and I have yet to meet the contractor in this country who is willing to put his hand into his pocket and pay out his money for nothing. Unless there should be a minister whom he can approach in that way, in order to secure a very profitable contract, there would be no profit to the minister in giving a contract to any contractor who did not pay something in order to secure it.

With regard to the day labour system, let me cite an instance to show how it sometimes worked. Some years ago a fire occurred in the western block and there was an election in Pontiac county. Well, on the building injured by the fire there were workingmen as thick as flies in summer on a sugar mound, and the main object in putting them on that work was to secure their votes at that election. And I remember making in this House the statement with respect to that very block, that a certain supporter of the government had been passing with me and observed the workmen lifting a stone and taking nearly an hour to lift it, and that he remarked that he did not at all approve of that style of doing work. The Minister of Public Works challenged my statement. I said if he wanted one of his followers behind him to be a witness against him I was quite willing to state who the gentleman was. But the Minister of Public Works did not insist. It was a very strong supporter of the government who had found fault on that occasion with the way the work was being done.

Let me give another instance. Every hon. gentleman in this House has seen that little summer house in the square outside. Well, no less than eight painters were employed on that little building, and no less than $600 spent repairing it, which practical men in the House said ought not to cost $100.

With respect to the platform of the Trade and Labour Council, I am one of those who are not particular about the good opinion of that council. Let me tell you why. There are men in that Trade and Labour Congress in whom I have not much confidence as there are others in whom I have considerable faith. I am somewhat of the opinion of a delegate, who was sent as a representative from Toronto last year, and who in Toronto declared on his election card as his chief plank that he was opposed to government ownership of that congress. The manner in which that congress is usually conducted is not unknown to the public. It is well known that the congress is manipulated by government employees, who are there to protect the interests of the government in order to get the support of the workingmen of Canada. And these gentlemen entertain so high a regard for me that when an election is on in my constituency, they take the stump against me. Yet notwithstanding their efforts I have managed to retain so far the confidence of those I represent.

I do not think that my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) and my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Smith), who profess to be the leaders among the labouring men, entirely express the views of the workingmen when they say they are completely in

favour of the day labour system on all public contracts. Notwithstanding the plank in the platform of the Trades and Labour Congress, I maintain that there is a large number of workingmen who contribute their share of the taxes, and in whose interest it is that the public expenditure of the country shall be as little as possible. They are men who never expect to get employment on public works, and it is as much in their interest that these contracts should be let to the lowest tenderer, subject to a fair provision regarding wages, as it is in the interests of any other class of the community.

But how does that day labour system work ? In my constituency there is a public work being erected, but on that work not one Conservative workingman can find employment. I refer to the work at Port Stanley. That is not what the workingmen of this country want to be done. They do not want any distinction drawn between men of different politics. They do not want to see the employment exclusively given to Liberals and refused to Conservatives. For that reason, if for no other, I would oppose the day labour system entirely. I am in favour of doing by day labour work which cannot be given out to contract, but in the case of all new work I believe in the contract system.

My hon. friend speaks of the public works at Sorel, but there is a great distinction between those works and a public building, say in the county of Bothwell. Suppose there was a post office being erected at Wallaceburg, will any man pretend that you can put that on the same basis as the works at Sorel ? In the one case I should approve of doing the work by contract, in the other case, I should approve of doing it by day's labour. That is my position.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I do not want to take up the time of the House—I am not in the habit of doing so. But after what has been said, I think it is necessary for me to make some little explanation. This is not the first time that the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has attempted to depreciate officials of the Trades and Labour Congress who are not in a position to reply to him.

Mr. INGRAM. I have made no attack on them.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Last session, when similar matters to this were under discussion, the hon. member made special reference to men who were employed by this government as being representatives to that congress, and there is not an Ontario man in this House who did not know whom the hon. gentleman meant. Why should not an employee of this government be a representative to the Trades Congress ? Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) support the idea that, because a man labours for the government he ought not to belong to a labour association ?

Mr. INGRAM.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) wish me to answer ? I can tell him that if he would not support the government's interest he would not be the government's representative.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I have said before, and I say again, that it is something to say for this government and for the independent men who work for it that those men are at perfect liberty to be members of that congress and to take part in the discussions which are intended to result in good to the workingmen of this country. Now, I desire to say a word, in explanation, to the hon. gentleman for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). That hon. gentleman preached me a little sermon about the moral standards of this government. I would support that hon. gentleman or any other man in keeping up those standards. But I confess that I do not think much of the moral standards of an hon. member who will criticise the statement of a fellow member and will give the House the impression that he sets forth that statement when, as a matter of fact, he reads only one-half the sentence in which it is set forth. When the hon. gentleman read half the sentence and passed judgment on the proposition, he did as unfair a thing as any hon. gentleman could do.

Mr. SPROULE. I took down the sentence at the time and read every word of it.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I had to rise and request him to read the sentence, and it was not until I did so that he read it. I will read the sentence myself, as I want it to be put down. What I said was this : 'What does it matter if the government do get votes, if they get them as a consequence of money well spent and of good service to the country ?' Why, does not the hon. gentleman know that this is the principle that makes all votes ? The people of this country are voting all the time for a government that will give them good service and do good work. That was exactly what I meant. I repeat that the hon. Minister of Public Works has proven that the day's wages system renders to the people of this country good service, and, as a result, the people are sure to support the government. What objection would any one have to that ? I hope the hon. minister will maintain his principle, that he will take advantage of every opportunity to use it where it can be used with economy and with good service to the country. And I repeat again that the organized labourers of this country will support the government that supports that principle.

Public Works—chargeable to income—public buildings—Quebec—Montreal public buildings—improvements, alterations, repairs, &c., $8,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What repairs are these ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The general repairs to these other buildings, not the examining warehouse.

Mr. MONK. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the state of affairs in Montreal as regards public buildings. The hon. minister will remember that during the last parliament I showed the large amount that we spent every year for repairs to the public buildings in Montreal, and also the large amount in rentals for offices of Dominion government officials. This is not only expensive, but it means that the officials are separated, instead of all being in the same building. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) when he comes to Montreal, and the other members of the government when in Montreal, are obliged to use a room in the post office building. I believe that all this could be cured and money saved if the government would listen to the complaint that is made in Montreal as to the insufficient size of the post office. I really think that, as Montreal contributes such a large amount to public revenue, the government should seriously consider whether it would not be rendering justice to the people by listening to these complaints. If the government would build a new post office or enlarge the present one, I believe it could provide better accommodation for its officials, and at the same time save money and give satisfaction all round.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am obliged to confess that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is about right. The Montreal post office is too small. My hon. friend and colleague the Postmaster General has under consideration a system of sub-post offices which he hopes to bring into effect in Toronto and Montreal. In Toronto, the post office is even worse than that of Montreal. That is not my fault—I have not been in office very long. One trouble about carrying out the project of the Postmaster General is that land in Montreal is so dear. I tried a few days ago to get an option on certain property. I acted with all the secrecy possible, and I find that the prices asked are very high. I think the system the hon. gentleman suggests would not be a success.

Quebec Immigrant building on Louise Embankment and Breakwater, and King's Wharf Building, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The foundations of the building are giving away, and we have to renew them.

Quebec Military buildings—new iron foundry, inclusive of electric light plant and sundry machinery ordered, $7,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this matter I suppose I am doing right, because we are asking for tenders for this work and the one last mentioned.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you need a foundry there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for the cartridge factory. In this case I am building on plans approved and prepared by the Department of Militia and Defence. Military matters are calling for a good deal of attention of late years, and the Department of Militia and Defence require these works to be done. The money was voted last year, but we did not spend any.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this the only establishment for the manufacture of military material in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think so.

St. Hyacinthe drill hall $5,000.

Mr. MONK. Has a site been chosen for this drill hall ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, nothing has been done so far.

Mr. MONK. A part of this sum was voted last year, has nothing been spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we expect to spend up to the 1st of July $5,000.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is aware that the question of this site is causing a good deal of discussion in St. Hyacinthe. I am not acquainted with the details, but my hon. friend probably is. Is the city going to contribute a site for the drill hall ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. MONK. Does my hon. friend know where it is proposed to build ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not yet made up our minds.

Mr. MONK. I think before voting such a large amount—and we will probably have to vote considerably more before the drill hall is finished—we are entitled to know where it is going to be. My hon. friend must be aware that there is a considerable difference of opinion in St. Hyacinthe as to where the drill hall should be located. If he is not able to give us some information to-night, and as he expects to find out in a day or two, I would ask him to let the item stand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to insist upon that, because such an objection is never taken. We will take the money, and parliament has enough confidence in us, generally speaking, to let us choose the site after getting the money. I cannot accept that principle at all, because sometimes it takes considerable time to make choice of a site. I will consult with the military authorities, and I may have to go there myself. On several occasions I have gone and examined sites before making a choice.

Mr. MONK. I am not prepared to accede to the principle that we should be asked to vote an amount for a drill hall in a case where the site is in dispute, without knowing where that drill hall is going to be placed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How can you select a site without getting the money ?

Mr. MONK. That can be very easily done. My hon. friend says that the Minister of Inland Revenue knows something about it, as I know he does. Perhaps the Minister of Inland Revenue will explain to us the position of affairs as regards these two conflicting opinions in St. Hyacinthe.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue will certainly give me the benefit of his local knowledge of the facts, and it will be my duty and my pleasure to ask his advice. Before making up my mind, the matter will be thoroughly looked into. But my hon. friend must not forget that in questions of this kind I am not the master, I cannot buy a site without going before council, who will discuss the whole matter. I could not undertake to say that I will make choice of a certain site, that I would recommend this site or that site, because my colleagues might not agree with me. Master of the administration as I am, it may happen that my colleagues do not agree with me.

Mr. SPROULE. The usual course is to state what the building is going to cost. I think the minister is departing from a custom which prevailed during the time of his predecessors, of asking the town where an important building was to be put up, to furnish the site, or at least to pay a good share of the expense. That has been done in several towns in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What towns ?

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me it was done in London, I think it was done in Gananoque, and I think an offer was made by Brockville. But I know the previous Minister of Public Works made it a practice, when he intended to put up a public building in any city or town, to say to them : What are you going to do ? It will benefit your place, will you provide a site free, or pay a portion of the cost ? I think that might well be done. I think the minister is bound to give us the information in his estimates of what this building is going to cost, so that we may know to what we are committing ourselves.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to the site, I cannot possibly say where it will be. I quite grant that I may be asked to say how much we will spend. I think that we will not spend more than $20,000 or $25,000 on that drill hall. We have not many drill halls. St. Hyacinthe is an important district. There is a good military spirit now and I think it is only fair to give them a chance in developing it. That is the reason why a drill hall will be very well located there. I intend having plans prepared for a building costing about $20,000 or $25,000, a good deal less than some of the Ontario armouries cost. Perhaps we are spending a good deal there, but I do not think we should be reproached for that expenditure at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, I understand the hon. minister has not obtained his information from his architect, but that this is the amount that is in his mind.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we will spend that much and no more than $25,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That is based on the hon. gentleman's own judgment ?

Mr. MONK. I think we are entitled to some information from the hon. Minister of Public Works, or the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) on this question. Here is a question that has agitated the public mind in St. Hyacinthe for over two years. They are entitled to a drill hall and they know they would have had it some time ago had there not been a bitter discussion as to the site, and we are asked to-night to begin a work that will not cost less than $60,000 while leaving parliament and the people of St. Hyacinthe in the dark as to where that drill hall is to be located. If the hon. Minister of Public Works will allow me, I will read from the Liberal organ a short reference to that question, 'L'Union' of St. Hyacinthe of the 11th April, 1901. It says this :

(Translation.) The 'Courier de St. Hyacinthe' in its issue of the 8th instant published a short article which we reproduce here, for the information of our readers, who are anxious to be acquainted with all matters of interest to our city :

'From what has lately transpired, we have very good reason to believe that a sum of $60,000 is to be placed in the estimates for the erection of a drill hall on which work will be started this year in ward No. 5, and this with all due deference to Mr. Morison and other gentlemen who are opposed to it. It is further rumored that the sum of $20,000 will, within a few days, be voted, to begin the work. The Dominion military authorities understand better the pressing needs of this city than some self-seeking gentlemen do, who rather than seeing the only ward of the city that is likely to make any substantial progress benefited by this improvement, would wantonly deprive the city of this boon.

Mr. TALBOT—(Translation). Shame !

Mr. MONK. What is my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) saying ?

Mr. TALBOT—I said shame.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

(Translation). We congratulate our contemporary upon this authentic piece of news

which was, no doubt, drawn from the copious fountain of official news for the district of St. Hyacinthe ; and we, particularly congratulate him upon his promotion to the important position of official organ of the Dominion government. We have on former occasions pointed out the tendencies of this conservative organ.

With the 'Courrier' we rejoice in the fact that the government have at last made up their minds to spend public money in St. Hyacinthe.

As we could never bring ourselves to believe that there were to be found in this city self-seeking men who had an interest in seeing the city deprived of the important improvement which the 'Courrier' promises us on behalf of the Dominion government, we cannot endorse the following portion of the short paragraph published by our contemporary : 'We know that the only thing which did come under discussion was the purchase of a site by the city ; the intention being to give the municipal council the right of having their say in the choice of a site, the more so as the ratepayers of the city were being called upon to defray the cost of it. And to our mind, it was but fair and just that they should have done so.'

It seems to me that the subject of erecting a drill hall at St. Hyacinthe, which is entitled to that improvement, and there is no objection to it whatever, is one on which we should have clear and definite information. We are ready to vote the amount required and there will be no making mistakes. It is a large amount that will be required to complete the building. We are entitled to know on behalf of that important section of the population who require a drill hall where it is going to be built before we vote this amount.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has just read an article from a Conservative paper. I do not intend to be guided by the advice it contains.

Mr. MONK. Which paper ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 'Le Courrier'.

Mr. MONK. I have read from 'L'Union'.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 'L'Union' has simply reproduced an article published in 'Le Courrier'.

Mr. MONK. And confirmed it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very well ; 'L'Union', which is not very well pleased with some of us now, has thought fit to reproduce an article from a Conservative paper. I do not intend to be guided by newspaper articles in the choice of a site for a military armoury. I intend to be guided by the ordinary rules of business. I hope my hon. friend does not object to whichever site it may be built on. Has he a choice to offer me ?

Mr. MONK. Are not the government brave enough to come and tell us in parliament where they are going to build it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Bravery has not much to do with this case ; bravery is not in it at all. It is not a question of bravery ; it is a question of business. I will choose that site on the ordinary rules of business. I may have to go down there after the session is over. In the meantime I will ask parliament to have enough confidence in us to place this vote at our disposal. It is the first time since I have been in office that I remember of the opposition declining to vote money because a site was not chosen. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier belongs to the province of Quebec ; he should not ask us to deviate from the ordinary rules. The choice of a site is never made beforehand. I must get the money before choosing the site. I ask my hon. friend to think twice before placing any obstacle in the way of this vote. Suppose I were to go to council and to tell them that I had decided on a site. If council did not agree with me, I would be obliged to go elsewhere. Therefore, I am not in a position to state where the site will be.

Mr. MONK. I can understand the position of the hon. minister, but the government is not ruled altogether by the hon. Minister of Public Works, though I am prepared to admit that his views have very large importance. But, we have the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue who is from St. Hyacinthe, and who knows that this controversy has been going on for the past two or three years. I think we are entitled to know from him what his views are upon the site of the drill hall at St. Hyacinthe. It seems only fair. Why should he remain utterly silent ?

Mr. BROCK. May I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works why he treats this matter, which is a Quebec matter, differently from the way in which he treats a Toronto matter when it comes up. When a vote is asked for dredging in Toronto harbour, the Minister of Public Works, and I think very justly, wants to know what Toronto is going to do. Toronto must have its money to do its share before he will do anything. When a drill hall had to be built the people of Toronto were obliged to plank down $100,000, or, at all events, to provide a site, and this matter was arranged before the Minister of Public Works condescended to put in an appropriation for the building of that drill hall. I will ask him why he makes this difference between the two provinces ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not making any difference. It is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier who is himself making that difference. If my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) will be good enough to refer to the next page he will find several items for public buildings in Ontario, Clinton, Cobourg, Deseronto, Fort William, London, Sault Ste. Marie, Sarnia and Toronto Junction. In all of these cases the money is voted before the site is chosen. It is just as in this case. It is always done as I am doing it now. If my hon. friend who is a

sound business man will kindly remember what I am saying, my position is this. My recommendation does not always carry. Suppose I recommend one site in St. Hyacinthe and my colleagues say no, I would be obliged to go elsewhere. It is always done just as I am now doing it.

Mr. LANCASTER. While the hon. Minister of Public Works is speaking of proposed improvements in the province of Ontario perhaps he will not find fault with me if I mention the St. Catharines drill hall. In 1900 a contract was made and an amount placed in the estimates, which, however, was dropped on account of some such dispute as seemed to have occurred in St. Hyacinthe as to the location of the building. In that case St. Catharines bought the site and St. Catharines is paying for it. They are waiting for an appropriation in the estimates in order to take the deed. The city of St. Catharines is ready to hand over a cheque for $5,500 for the drill hall site, in order that the work may be carried out as contemplated by the item in the estimates for the year 1900. St. Catharines is in a border county, and is about the same size as St. Hyacinthe, and I am not unduly pressing the minister when I ask, why St. Catharines has not been treated as St. Hyacinthe has been. I think the drill hall site met with the approval of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) when he visited St. Catharines this last fall. He came there I believe on behalf of the Minister of Militia and Defence to inspect the site. Can the Minister of Public Works tell me if there will be a vote for the St. Catharines drill hall in the supplementary estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to the supplementary estimates I am in the hands of my colleagues. It is a question of money and in questions of money the Minister of Public Works has a good deal of trouble at times. I cannot say anything as to the supplementary estimates. They have not been discussed with my colleagues, not one word.

Mr. SPROULE. What was pointed out to the Minister of Public Works was that St. Catharines, Toronto, and Gananoque, have provided the sites whereas St. Hyacinthe has not done so. Why is one place treated differently from the other ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman will look at the list of public buildings in Ontario he will find that not one town of twenty furnished the site.

Mr. SPROULE. I have already cited three instances where towns supplied the site, and I am quite sure that I could find more if I went through the list. However, the principle is the same In one case the town is willing to provide the site and in the other case you do not even ask the town to do so.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It depends. Generally when the town gives the site the government is asked to give more money and it does not save us anything. I know all about it. When the town is very anxious to get a public building the people come and say : Now, Mr. Minister, if you are good enough, we will give you a chance to put up a fine public building and we will supply the site. You may rest assured that I am speaking gospel truth now. When they want an expensive building they make a pretense that they will give the site, and then it is not always the best site in the town. We save nothing by it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In reply to my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) I may say that I did not visit St. Catharines officially. I am one of the hon. gentleman's electors, and while in the city one day some members of the council asked me to look at the various sites. I quite agree with those who opposed the old site as chosen by the council and which was also declined by the minister. After looking at several sites which the council had in view, I certainly personally—if I can speak personally—approved very much of one or two of the sites shown me. I think they would make splendid sites for that building. I may say, as one of the hon. member's electors and knowing the importance of the city, that I would be very pleased indeed if the Minister of Public Works could see his way clear to give us a new drill hall. It is something that is needed in that city and district. I believe that the site which has been chosen by the council will be very suitable indeed, and that when a good building is placed upon it, it will be very creditable to the city.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). An armoury was built at Dundas, and just before the last election we were led to believe that a drill hall would be erected. I believe a start was made then, but after the election the matter dropped and nothing has been heard since. I would like to know if there will be a vote for that in the supplementary estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a general vote of $37,000 out of which the amount necessary to complete the Dundas armoury will be taken.

Thetford Mines—public building, $4,000.

Mr. MONK. Has the site been purchased?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Unfortunately I have been unable to secure a site. As in Marysville, the whole of the property is in the hands of the lumbermen and they have declined to sell me a site. They want me to take a lease for ninety years or something like that, but unless I can buy a site I shall not erect a building.

Mr. MORIN. Will that building be occupied only for a post office ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I intend there as elsewhere, to have a room set apart for an armoury. That is not a bad idea I think. There is a customs officer there and the building will be used by him.

Mr. MORIN. What will the building cost to complete ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I intend erecting a cheap building to cost not more than $5,000.

Mr. MORIN. What is the population of Thetford Mines ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Four thousand I think. I have the figures here.

Mr. MORIN. You may have the figures, but not the people on the place. The minister is a little extravagant in putting such a building in Thetford Mines.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The population is 5,000, if the census is not wrong.

Mr. MORIN. You may find them there ten years from now if the place keeps growing. At present you will find them scarce.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1891 the population was 3,314. Surely the French Canadian boys have progressed to 5,000 now.

Mr. MORIN. The population was more in 1891 than it was in 1892-3-4-5-6. The price of the mineral has been decreasing, and the people went away, but since 1898 they came back again.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is all right, then.

Mr. MORIN. It is all right, but they are not there.

Valleyfield public building, $10,000.

Mr. MONK. Has a site been chosen in this case ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it has not.

Mr. MONK. Is it the intention of the government to purchase for this building a property belonging to Mr. Loy, the late member of this House ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Surely the hon. member will not ask me to choose the site to-night. I may once more have to go to Valleyfield in a few days. But, joking aside, no choice of a site has been made as yet. Valleyfield is a thriving town, having to-day a population of 12,000. It is one of the most progressive towns in the province of Quebec, owing to the large industry which is so successfully carried on there.

Mr. MONK. Has the government received any offers of sites ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I have not received any definite offer.

Mr. MONK. Any offer at all ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Several suggestions have been made to me.

Mr. MONK. Has the property I refer to been suggested to the minister ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that Mr. Loy owns any property there. One site has been suggested across the river near the mills, and a couple of sites have been suggested to me on this side of the canal. I have not yet made any choice whatever. My mind is altogether free and unbiased.

Mr. MONK. Has the site I refer to been offered or suggested to the minister ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has not been offered to me.

Mr. MONK. Is the minister able to say whether it has been suggested to him ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will not swear.

Mr. SPROULE. How much will this building cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between $20,000 and $25,000. Valleyfield in a short time will be a city, and we must give it a proper building—not large, but decent.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest to the minister that he follow the salutary custom of his predecessor, and induce some of these towns to contribute part of the cost or at least to furnish a site. I think a large town like Valleyfield should do so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend should not say it has been the custom or the policy of my predecessor. It may have been done on some occasions, but that has been the exception.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not speaking of the present government ; but I do know that the hon. gentleman's predecessor, Sir Hector Langevin, as a rule—there may have been some exceptions—when an application was made from any town or village for a public building, almost invariably asked, 'what are you prepared to do ? furnish a site or contribute part of the cost,' and he generally got them to do something.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a statement in the department showing the number of public buildings in the country, and I make bold to say that when my hon. friend looks over that statement he will find that in not more than one case out of twenty have the towns contributed a dollar towards the cost of public buildings.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman bring down that information ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With pleasure.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there no public building in Valleyfield, with a population of 10,000 or 12,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, not one.

Mr. CLARKE. There seems to be more necessity for a public building in Valleyfield than in some of the other places which we have been discussing.

Public buildings, Ontario—Clinton public building, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A post office and custom-house. The population is 3,000, and Clinton is a thriving town.

Mr. BENNETT. According to the census, the population is 2,547, against a population of 2,635 in 1891. It seems to be one of the Ontario towns that are going backward. What is the building going to cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have bought the site there from a good opponent of ours, Mr. A. W. Wilkie. We will spend more than $8,000 on the building.

Mr. SPROULE. This vote is additional to what was voted last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it will be in the recollection of the Minister of Public Works that he told the committee a year ago that this building was to be erected on a new plan. It was to be not only a post office, but a residence for the postmaster, and the plan of erecting cheap public buildings was to be started at Clinton. He certainly did not give the committee to understand that he was going to ask an additional $5,000 to what was voted last year, when it was believed that a site could be purchased for $1,000 and a building of sufficient importance, a substantial brick building, could be erected at a cost of about $5,000. I do not desire to quarrel with the minister about the style or cost of this particular building. But as the minister had decided that this building should be erected on a new plan, so as to be a model of what we could do in the way of cheap buildings, we certainly looked forward to seeing how this plan would work. We were all interested in the success of this experiment, as many counties in Ontario and the other provinces hoped to secure public buildings at the maximum cost of $5,000 or $6,000. But I am afraid the minister has forgotten his good intentions.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am obliged to my hon. friend for he has just reminded me of what I forgot to mention. In this, as in the case of all public buildings we are erecting now, we intend having the postmaster reside in the building, which will be a great saving indeed. As to the exact cost of the building, it is difficult to say in advance. Last year I said it would not cost more than $5,000 or $6,000, but it may cost a couple of thousand more. The site cost more than we contemplated.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the postmaster to take charge instead of having a caretaker ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman make any saving in the salary of the postmaster by having him reside in the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We make a great saving by not having a caretaker. A caretaker costs generally $300 or $400 a year. When the postmaster acts as caretaker, we generally give him a small remuneration.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you propose to make him allowances for wood and light ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What process has a town to go through in order to secure a post office ? I find that we have voted $8,000 for a post office at Marysville. Also large sums for other towns, many of which have small populations as compared to Dundas, which has never had a post office yet. The postal revenue of Dundas amounts to $4,345, while that of Marysville is only $1,398. At Dundas the money orders issued amount to $11,064 and at Marysville they are only $748. In Dundas the post office orders paid amount to $9,395 and in Marysville they are only $555. Yet Marysville is getting a post office and Dundas is not. It seems to me the objections urged from this side tonight are very pertinent. Something more ought to be required of a town to entitle it to a public building than that it should send a representative to support the government. There ought to be some policy, based on population or revenue, which should be followed out, and not compel a locality to send a representative down to support the government if it expects to be given a public building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are not so exacting as that. My hon. friend, who shows a good deal of ability in debate, will have to find stronger reasons to convince the House that it is necessary to have a public building in Dundas. But is there not a public building there already?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Dundas has no post office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has an armoury, on which we have spent a good deal of public money in the past. There ought to be some fairness even in public life. My hon. friend has already a public building, which has cost the country a large amount of money, and he now wants another.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not erect a post office attached to the drill hall, and have the two in the one building ?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The armoury was just started a few weeks before the election. A few bricks have been laid and nothing else done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will no doubt be completed yet.

Cobourg towards construction of armoury, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What about that building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am trying to find a site, but so far have not been able. Not having the site, I have not spent any money, which must be pleasant to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the system of voting money every year without using it, is entirely wrong. Unless it is clearly shown to the minister that it is absolutely necessary a public building should be erected in the near future, the vote should not be taken. You keep that vote standing from year to year and do nothing with it. If by the accidents of life, that constituency should become vacant, you can use this vote to carry the elections and it thus has a corrupting influence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is impossible for any minister to spend all the money in the estimates. To do so would require an immense staff to prepare plans and no minister would undertake the work. Moreover we must not forget that we are only in the month of March, and the money was only voted last year. I have not had time to spend all the money which was put at my disposal.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is this for the erection of a new building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know. If I can get an old building which would suit our purpose, I would not build a new one.

Mr. COCHRANE. The minister ought to know whether he is going to put up a new building or purchase an old one. Has he entered into any negotiations with reference to the purchase of an old building in the town of Cobourg ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not negotiated with anybody but suggestions have been made and an old building has been talked of. I have not negotiated either for the price or the purchase.

Mr. SPROULE. What was it offered for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not say. I have not paid much attention to that work.

Mr. CLARKE. Then the site has not yet been selected ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. SPROULE. No, not yet. I want to say here that I think the Minister of Public Works ought to be prepared with more definite information before he asks us to vote money. He evidently has come to no conclusion beyond the fact that he wants a building. Whether he will purchase an old one or build a new one, and, if the latter, what the site is to be, he does not know. If the hon. gentleman were in opposition he would be loud in his demands for more specific information before the money was voted. It has been usual to give this information, and to fail to give it now is to depart from a very salutary principle.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think the hon. gentleman has put the case as fairly as he generally does. Suppose a gentleman living in Ottawa were to make up his mind to remove to Toronto. He might decide to own a house there, and, for that purpose, to spend, let us say, $15,000. If he could find a suitable house at a fair price, he would buy, but if not he would purchase a site and put up a building of his own. The Minister of Public Works is in the same position. An armoury is wanted by the military authorities. If I can buy a property already in existence, suitable and in good condition and the price fair, why should I not buy it ? If I cannot find a suitable building at a fair price, I will have to find a site and erect a building. It is not fair to ask a minister in advance what he will do in a case of this kind, because he does not know. I have not been there and do not know much about the matter. When there is any difficulty I generally go to the place, try to understand the case and settle it.

Mr. COCHRANE. I must confess that the minister is adopting a very strange course. I have been in this House a good many years, and have seen the Minister of Public Works in years gone by come here with plans and specifications and estimates, when he wished to get money for a new building. That system is being departed from and we are asked to vote large sums of money on the mere statement of the minister that he will decide afterwards what he will do with it. Why should not all these questions be settled before he asks us to vote these large sums of money ? It looks to me as

if there was a job in connection with it. I think we could turn to the files of the newspapers and show that the fact that there is a contemplated job is recognized by the editors of the papers in Coburg.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why should the hon. gentleman say, 'No' so emphatically, when he tells us that he does not know what he is going to do? I am afraid that some building will be unloaded on the country by political friends of the hon. gentleman. Why should the volunteers be put off with an old building? It is impossible that an old building can be as suitable for the purpose as a new one. No matter what friends the hon. gentleman may have who happen to have an old building on their hands, that does not alter the fact that the volunteers there are entitled to a new building that will give them proper accommodation. I think the hon. minister should furnish us with more definite information before he asks us to vote $10,000, with the probability that he will go up there and have an old building pawned off on him in exchange for the country's money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I venture to tell the hon. gentleman that it has never been the custom of the department to bring plans here when asking for votes of money. So, my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) is wrong in saying that this was the custom in the past. That point settled, let me say to the hon. gentleman also that I would not be a part to a job. I do not think the House can reproach me with knowingly having been a party to any dishonesty since I took office. I have tried to keep my hands clean, and I shall continue to do so in the future. I am sure that my hon. friend does not wish to import into the House party differences and difficulties and troubles? I have received clippings of newspapers warning me of a job in this matter. There will be no job. There may be an old building there that is thought too little for this purpose. I have not seen it. If it is no good I will not purchase it. There are two parties in this business, the Department of Militia and Defence—and I would not think of buying a building for their use without their consent—and my own department, each department with its own architect and its own minister. There is no fear that there will be a job.

Mr. WARD. Will the hon. minister say whether it is intended to provide an armoury alone or an armoury and drill hall combined?

Mr. COCHRANE (reading).

On Monday evening the estimates were brought down, and amongst the items we notice the sum of $10,000 for an armoury in Cobourg. This of course is a revote, as no expenditure has so far been made. This will of course bring up the question of a site, and also make the Tammany politicians more active in working off the old Sutherland building on the government at an exorbitant price. All sensible persons will agree that the south-east corner of the market property is the best place for the new building, which will require to be well equipped and up-to-date. This site—

Now, here is a very important point——

This site has we believe been offered by the town, is acceptable to the government, and will no doubt be the site, unless the speculating, grabbing politicians, who have been trying to work the Sutherland building deal, interfere, and fill their pockets with the public money, which was wisely intended for the benefit of the militia of this country in giving them a home and store-room for their arms.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that site offered by the town free?

Mr. COCHRANE. I understand so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I read a day or two ago the extract the hon. gentleman has quoted. It was sent to me. I am very thankful to those who take so much interest in me. The extract is from a Conservative paper. I understand that there are people there who would like to see an expenditure of $30,000 or $40,000 for the armoury and drill hall combined. Before asking parliament for such a large amount of money I shall pause. I am asking for the modest sum of $10,000 for an armoury, which the military authorities here in Ottawa would have to approve.

Mr. COCHRANE. The people are not so much interested in the hon. Minister of Public Works, perhaps, as in the proper expenditure of the public money for the purpose for which it is voted. I fail to see that he must bring himself so prominently before the public on every occasion, and complain that we are critising him. He is a servant of the people, and is there to spend their money for the people's interest. As far as I am concerned, I care but little where the money is spent, whether in a town in Quebec or in any other portion of this Dominion, if it is properly spent. I object to the people's money being spent for an old building belonging to any political heeler of this or any other government.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister is asking for $10,000, but he does not tell us what this building is going to cost including the site.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall not spend more than $15,000 for an armoury in Cobourg.

Mr. SPROULE. Of course he has no knowledge yet whether that will be used to purchase an old building or to build a new one.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will decide the case on its merits after I have carefully investigated it.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I think before we vote this money the government should investigate the question on its merits, and give us the information, otherwise we are not justified in voting public money on his statement. I say again that no opposition is justified in allowing a vote of public money to pass unless we have some specific information of what the cost is going to be. Supposing we vote that money to-day, and the site should cost $10,000. The minister can give us no information now as to what it is going to cost. If my understanding is correct, the statement I saw in that paper was to the effect that the site is offered free, but he is not prepared to accept it. But he wants so much money put at his disposal, and then he will use his own judgment.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am asking the House to vote this money on the ordinary rule we have always followed. My hon. friends are trying to make political capital out of this, they are reading to the House articles from Conservative newspapers. It is their right, I do not complain. But it is our right and duty to stand by the ordinary rules of parliamentary procedure. The money has always been voted on the same principle to my predecessors in the Department of Public Works. I shall not tie my hands. Indeed my colleagues would not allow me to make any definite statement here, because it rests with them as much as with me. Before buying a site, before accepting even a tender, I have to report to my colleagues, and an Order in Council has to be passed. I am binding myself to a definite statement when I say that I shall not spend more than $15,000. I say again that I am asking parliament to vote this money on the ordinary principle of getting the money first and then deciding on the site, on my responsibility to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says some Conservative papers are complaining about it. Does he pretend to say that overtures were not made to him with regard to it? He admitted a few minutes ago that suggestions were made. If a site is offered free, will he not tell us whether he will or not accept it, provided it is a good site and suitable for the purpose?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is an old Latin axiom which says: Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes. I fear there is some foreign influence at work in this case. I am suspicious of presents offered to me from the other side of the House. I want to look at them carefully.

Mr. McCOLL. The government have at the present time in the town of Cobourg a site on which was erected a drill hall many years ago, and which was burnt down some twenty years ago or more. The militia authorities say that it is not a suitable site now upon which to erect a new armoury from the fact that the ground is low and cannot be drained, and that consequently the dampness would injure the arms that would be stored there. Two years ago when this question first came up some persons in the town assumed that the town would have to give a site. The town now owns a piece of property near the market square. They said if that were a suitable site they would be willing to give it. But it is open to the same objection as the site the government now owns, because the militia authorities say that the new guns they expect to get would be injured if stored on that site. The government will have this present site to sell for what it is worth, and can apply the money on the purchase of a new one. This site the government now owns was given to them by the town of Cobourg many years ago, and at the same time the town gave a grant of money to erect a drill hall, the one that was burnt down. But the government that had charge of it did not keep it insured, and when it burnt down it was a total loss. The town has lost the use of an armoury and drill shed during all these years, besides the money they contributed towards it twenty-five or thirty years ago. They have been agitating several years for this armoury, which is admitted on all hands to be an absolute necessity. I remember that during the session of 1896, before the Conservative government went out of power, a deputation from the town of Cobourg came down and interviewed the then Minister of Militia about this armoury. I think the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) was present at the time; and I myself was a member of the deputation. We then received a promise form the Minister of Militia that an appropriation for an armoury would be given, and it was reported by my opponent in the election that in the supplementary estimates of that session an appropriation was made for the purchase of a site. Whether that was true or not, I am unable to say, because, as hon. gentlemen will remember, the supplementary estimates that were prepared by the government at that time were never presented to parliament, owing to the fact that the House dissolved before they had an opportunity of bringing them down. So I say that the preceding government was committed to the purchase of a site for this armoury and admitted that the old site was not a proper one. I may say that some of the arms that were stored in the old drill hall had to be moved before the place burned down because they were rusting on account of the dampness of the location. Now, with regard to these newspaper articles, I may tell the House what they mean. There is one local militia man who said to me: 'Don't have an old building under any circumstances, get a new one.' He said he had been told by officers of the department: 'You get the government started, and they will put you up a $30,000 building.' That is what they have in their mind, and

if the old building that is now suggested were purchased, then the total cost including repairs and equipment would come within the estimate, $12,000 or $13,000 at the outside.

Now, as far as I am concerned, I want no $30,000 spent for an armoury in my riding. I would not ask for it because I know the sentiment of the people would be against such an expenditure. I would consider it unnecessary. Ten thousand dollars for a building is what I would ask for and that with $2,000 for a site would be considered fairly sufficient. I realize that under present conditions it costs more to build than it did a few years ago. The Militia Department prepared a rough sketch some two years ago. It was handed over to the Public Works Department and it showed the accommodation they required in this armoury. If that is all the accommodation required, this old building that is referred to would give much more accommodation than the accommodation which they have pretented they require and it would not cost more than $10,000 or $12,000. The idea is a $30,000 building, but I do not think it is necessary to have any such expenditure.

Mr. COCHRANE. What has the old building been used for ?

Mr. McCOLL. In the first place, before we had the post office at Cobourg, part of it was used for a custom-house. It has been used since that time as storehouse.

Mr. BENNETT. For ice ?

Mr. McCOLL. No, for grain. An American firm came over a few years ago and started growing what are known as fancy peas and it has been used as a storehouse for that purpose. At the present time people are living in it and one large portion is used as a ballroom. It has an excellent floor. In regard to the question of a site for a public building of that kind in our town the number of desirable sites is very limited. We can get plenty of sites which all the military men object to because they are too far out of town. I had a man in my office on Saturday who had heard of this proposal and who said that he had a site for the building. It is a good and desirable site if it suits the military men, but these sites are too far out for them. They want something on one of the principal streets near the centre of the town and in order to procure a site of that kind the department would be obliged to buy up a dwelling or a store or other business place which would make it very expensive. The Militia Department sent up two officers to look after the available sites but they have not yet reported. Col. Montizambert, the district officer commanding from Kingston, and Col. Greer, of the 40th Regiment were the officers.

Deseronto public building, $16,000.

Mr. WILSON. How much money has been spent on this building and how much will it cost to complete ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was awarded for $25,687. The probable cost of the building with the site, furniture, heating system, &c., will be $38,000.

Mr. WILSON. The whole building finished will cost $38,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. And it is all under contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The fittings are not under contract.

Mr. WILSON. Is the whole contract given to one contractor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I have just said that the contract for the erection of the building has been given for $25,687. There is nothing else given out by contract yet, because the building is not completed.

Mr. WILSON. Is the remainder of the work to be given out by contract, or will it be done by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The heating will be given by contract.

Mr. WILSON. Who is the contractor for the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contractor is Mr. Richard Sheehy, of Peterborough. The contract was given on the 25th June, 1901, to the lowest tenderer.

Dominion public buildings, renewals, improvements, repairs, etc., $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the general vote for all public buildings in Ontario.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that include furniture and all that sort of thing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Fort William public building, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A site has been given to us but we have not been able so far to go on with the work.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Post office, custom-house, &c.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say frankly that I have declined to go on with the work because the people of that town who are enterprising have asked me to put up a pretty expensive building. I

have waited to see how the cat would jump. They are very aggressive.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Aggressive is a mild word. A site has been given. Every time that they approach me they say: We have given you a site; you must put up a large, fine building. I would rather not have a free site at times and have a little more freedom.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think because a town gives a site that should trammel the minister. I think he should have perfect freedom to exercise his judgment as to the needs of the place and keep it within that no matter whether the site be given or not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do. I had supposed that a building that would cost $15,000 would be sufficient for Fort William unless the country goes ahead very quickly. There are large works going on, I may say, at that point. At this very moment the two railway companies that are centering there are contemplating large additions to their elevating power which will necessarily bring in population. I supposed that a $15,000 building would suffice.

Kingston Royal Military College—additional buildings, namely: gymnasium and hospital $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is under contract and going on now.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought they had a gymnasium years ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the work.

London drill hall and armoury, $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the explanation of that?

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the question of the payment of architects fees. I notice the architect is paid 2½ per cent on the work. There is a difference all through in the amounts paid for architects and clerks of works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What place?

Mr. INGRAM. This is in the case of the London armoury. I was trying to get at the arrangements made for paying architects and clerks of works in different places. In London the architect is allowed 2½ per cent on the cost of the armoury. He receives much less perhaps for his work in that case than another architect would receive for a work that would not cost half the amount that this one will cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In what other places?

Mr. INGRAM. The architect for the London drill hall receives 2½ per cent on the estimated cost of $60,000, while the man in Nelson is paid $7 per day. It would be to that man's advantage to have the contractor employ few men in order to stretch the time for construction, because he is receiving $7 a day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say that in British Columbia, public works cost a fearful amount of money, nearly twice as much as in other provinces. It is the fact that the work in British Columbia is nearly 100 per cent dearer than in any other province, and it is not fair to make that comparison.

Mr. INGRAM. Well, take Vancouver, or Victoria, or Nelson, and in none of these places do you pay the same wages for the same services. In Kingston you pay a clerk of works $2.50 a day; in Sarnia $3 and in St. Thomas $3. On what principle do you make that distinction. The only proper way is to act on the percentage system, and pay a lump sum. In my own town the architect goes down in the morning and examines the building, and sees that the work is going on. He receives $3 a day and he does not complain that few men are employed because the longer the work is going on the more he will receive. He was also the architect of the city hall for which he got a percentage of the estimated cost, and he went to the contractors and said: You must put more men on the building, and he put them to the inconvenience of crowding the building with men in order that he might get his percentage quicker. The department is not taking the proper course here. They should first find out how long it should take to construct the building and give the contractors reasonable time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do so.

Mr. INGRAM. No one will pretend that in the city of St. Thomas it takes a year to construct an armoury worth $29,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It takes a year to construct a building like that.

Mr. INGRAM. Why, we have buildings there that cost a great deal more and they did not take half the time to erect, but the architect got a percentage on the estimated cost. These items that I have mentioned will amount to a very large sum all over Canada but other incidental expenses are incurred through a building not being put up within a reasonable length of time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that the hon. gentleman has convinced the House that when an architect is paid $3, he is paid too much.

Mr. INGRAM. What I am trying to impress on the minister is that the principle is wrong. I say that the architect should be paid a percentage on the estimated cost, and

that you should not have one rule in one place and another rule in another.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have had architects asking 4 and 5 per cent in some cases, and we are trying to make the best possible bargain we can in every case. The scale of wages prepared by the Department of Labour for the building at Nelson is $6 a day for foremen, and we are simply paying $1 more to the architect. It is not our fault that wages are high there.

Mr. INGRAM. You pay $7 to an architect in Nelson and $120 a month to an architect in Vancouver. I suppose the living expenses are about the same in both places.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman must not forget that Rossland and Nelson are in a new part of the country, whereas Vancouver is a large city, and the conditions are more settled there. The contractors are bound to complete the work within a specified time and the chief architect who knows his business will not grant them any more time than is necessary.

Mr. INGRAM. These architects who are paid $7 a day or $3 a day do not give their whole time to the work. The minister must not forget that. In my own city the architect goes to the building in the morning and he attends to his private business just the same as if he had not that work at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is always finding fault with the way we do work in his city.

Mr. INGRAM. I am objecting to the principle the minister follows, and I do not care whether it is in my own city or in any other place if I believe the system is wrong. I am not accusing the minister of doing something that has not been done in the past. I believe the policy has been pursued by both parties, and I am objecting to it on principle. It is not a personal matter with me.

Sault Ste. Marie public building, $10,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I observe the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment) is not in his place, and I regret it very much, when this vote is being considered. The minister must know the circumstances of this case very well, and I think he will admit that the town of Sault Ste. Marie has very great reason to complain that this public building has not been erected. I use language none too strong when I say, that the accommodation provided in Sault Ste. Marie for the post office is a disgrace to that enterprising town. I would not go so far as to say that it is a disgace to the government, but I do say that it reflects very much on the government of the day that they have not provided better accommodation there. I do not know what the reason can be. They have the money because it was voted last year, and why has it not been spent? Why has the money not been spent? Why has nothing been done? Why has a site not been secured? Surely there must be some reason, and the people of Sault Ste. Marie are wondering why they are neglected when other places are being accommodated with public buildings, especially as the parliament of Canada has voted money for the purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I altogether share the view which has been stated to the House by my hon. friend, that Sault Ste. Marie has a right to a public building. To all the 'whys' which he has asked, my answer is that we have moved on. The site has been bought, plans are prepared, and tenders will be asked for within a month. I am glad on this occasion to be backed by my hon. friend, who has the same confidence that I have in that thriving town.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think that the citizens of Sault Ste. Marie are aware that a site has been purchased. It is not known by the public men there, and I confess it is a matter of surprise to me to hear it. May I ask what the cost of the site will be?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not will be, but has been. It has already been bought and paid for. The site has been bought by an order in council of the 10th of January, 1902, for the sum of $9,600, from Messrs. J. Dawson and W. H. Plummer. It is situated at the corner of Queen and East streets. Its selection has been approved by all the business men whom I met when I was in the town about two months ago to see it, and it certainly is the best that could be secured.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the present vote of $10,000 is practically a re-vote; and if the site is costing in that neighbourhood, where is the money to come from for erecting the superstructure. It seems to me that the minister is simply putting the matter off again, and that the people of Sault Ste. Marie will find themselves twelve months hence in just about the same position they are in at present. If I am wrong in that, I would be very glad if the minister would put me right.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When these estimates were prepared, the site was not purchased, and that is the reason we have only a re-vote, but in the supplementary estimates we shall have to provide for an additional sum of money.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am sure that the people of Sault Ste. Marie will be sincerely thankful.

Toronto Dominion public buildings—improvements, renewals, repairs, &c., $7,500.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to inquire of the Minister of Public Works what the policy of the government is in regard to the Tor-

onto post office. It is well known that the facilities are altogether inadequate for the business done. It is the largest post office in revenue in the Dominion, and the building is not a credit to the country or to the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I fully recognize that the post office of Toronto is not what it should be. I was there a short time ago, and was not pleased with the state of affairs. The building is in a bad condition and should have been changed long ago. The Postmaster General, who is my 'boss' in matters of this kind, has under consideration a plan for sub-stations. He has already one in King street, and he intends building another in the western part of the city. If his plans succeed, and I think they will, it may not be necessary to enlarge very much the main building. Of course, we shall have to put it in better shape, and I will certainly ask my colleagues to place a sum in the supplementary estimates for that purpose. The sub-stations will be main post offices to which mail matter will be directed, and from which it will be distributed. The same system, I suppose, will be adopted in Montreal. When the supplementary estimates come down, we shall be in a position to make a definite statement as to the policy of the government in this respect in Toronto and elsewhere.

Mr. KEMP. There will be an item then, in the supplementary estimates for the Toronto post office ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose so, unless my colleagues turn me down.

Mr. KEMP. Then, we will be able to discuss this question again ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Will letters be addressed to these sub-stations ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose each one will form a postal district; but on that point I shall have to ask the House to wait until the Postmaster General is in his place. I know that he wants to adopt the system of dividing the cities into districts.

Toronto Junction public building, $5,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. This, I understand, is also a revote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it intended to expend that money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the work to be done by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, by contract, I think, although day's work would suit me.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the work is to be done by contract, how is the government going to implement the promise made in the West York election that certain men would have jobs on this building. If they are going to change their policy and go back to the contract system, how are they going to bind the contractor to employ certain men to do the brick work on this building, according to the terms set forth in the recent by-election ? I think the minister should allow a litttle more latitude, so as to enable the hon. gentleman to carry out his election promises. I believe that election promises should be carried out to the fullest extent, and if a man got a promise that he would have a certain job on a government building, I think the government should see that he gets that job. Why deprive him of the wage he earned by casting his vote in a certain way ? I think the minister should let the contract for this building in such a way that the man would get his job.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman insists on the work being done by day labour, I will carry out his wishes.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. gentleman selected the site yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not yet. I am going to send one of my best officers in a day or two to look for a site, and after he is back I will make a definite statement on the supplementary estimates as to the cost of the building.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it intended to be a combined building or only a post office ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Post office and custom-house—an ordinary public building.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12.00 a.m., Wednesday

---

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 5, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Quebec and Lake Huron Railway Company.—Mr. Malouin.

Bill (No. 27) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—Mr. Clancy.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE COMPANIES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 28) respecting Telegraph

and Telephone Companies. He said: As appears by the title of this Bill, it is applicable to telegraph and telephone companies. So far as telegraph companies are concerned, it is a mere consolidation of the law now in force with reference to these companies; and the only change with respect to telegraph companies is a provision for the control of the rates of telegraph companies by the Privy Council. This is a new feature in this Bill. The Bill, I may say, was prepared several months ago by my predecessor, and the intention was to introduce it in the early days of this session, but because of changes that took place, it was necessary for me to have some consultation in order finally to fix the terms in which the Bill is now introduced. In a word, the Bill makes applicable several of the provisions of the Railway Act to telephone and telegraph companies, and it also makes applicable to telephone companies certain provisions of the existing Telegraph Bill. The new features of the Bill are controlled by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, of the operations of the company and by the Governor General in Council, of the rates to be charged both by telegraph and telephone companies; and also, regulations for the exchange of business between the different companies. In order to make the Bill one of general application it was necessary to make special reference to existing telephone companies; that is to say, as the law now stands there is but one telephone company in Canada that is at the present time under the legislative jurisdiction of the Federal parliament, that is the Bell Telephone Company. My desire, as I said a moment ago, is to make this law one of general application, applicable as far as possible to all telephone companies in Canada, and provision has been made in the Bill for that purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman stated that the Bell Telephone Company is the only one that is subject to the jurisdiction of this parliament. I desire to point out to him that the Nova Scotia Telephone Company is also subject to the jurisdiction of this parliament inasmuch as it has a charter, not only from the Nova Scotia legislature, but from the parliament of Canada.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am obliged to my hon. friend for the correction. My information is gathered from the official in the department who was charged with the preparation of this Bill and who gave me the legislation in reference to it and the only company that we are aware the Dominion parliament has granted a charter to is the Bell Telephone Company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not quite sure. I may be altogether in error. It may be from the legislature of New Brunswick that this company also has a charter.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I speak subject to correction, but I think the hon. gentleman will find that I am fairly correct, because my information comes from a very reliable source. The attempt which I have made to have the provisions of this Bill applicable to all the telephone companies in this country, is one that will necessarily deserve very serious consideration on the part of the House. Therefore, it is my intention, when we reach the second reading of the Bill, to ask that the Bill be referred to the Railway Committee of the House, because it is apparent that there are interests involved which clearly ought to be heard and it will be desirable, so far as we are all concerned, to have all the information possible so as to be satisfied that we are legislating in the general interest without injuring any special interest.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not refer it to a special committee of the House?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is a matter for the consideration of the Railway Committee in view of the fact that we are adapting several provisions of the Railway Act to telephone companies. The Railway Committee therefore may be the best committee for this purpose.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the Bill be retroactive in its provisions as far as regards the regulation of rates?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No; the Bill provides that a company shall, within a certain time, prepare a rate of tolls to be charged. Then, these tolls are to be submitted to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and are to be determined within a certain other time. Then these rates are applicable throughout the whole Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the Bill apply to companies doing business now?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN. The public will be in a position at any time to bring the rates before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I would like to say, and I do not intend to take up any great length of time, that I must congratulate the government on bringing forward this Bill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I made a mistake in regard to the tolls. Of course, the tolls are not subject to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council but subject to the Governor General in Council.

Mr. MACLEAN. I must congratulate the government upon bringing forward this Bill and also upon the statement that they have had it under contemplation for quite a number of months, although there was no statement of it in the Speech from the Throne. The Bill is a good Bill. It is very much on the lines of one that I gave notice of and introduced myself. But, the government might have gone further. I think

that when the government were taking up a measure of this kind they might have investigated the subject more fully, and had they investigated it more fully on the lines of legislation in England, they would have made themselves familiar with the state of affairs as it is in England in regard to telephones. In 1898 there was a special committee of the English House of Commons in regard to telephones and the question submitted to it was this :

The reference to your committee is as follows:

To inquire and report whether the telephone service is, or is calculated to become, of such general benefit as to justify its being undertaken by municipal and other local authorities, regard being had to local finance; and, if so, whether such local authorities should have power to undertake such service in the districts of other local authorities outside the area of their own jurisdiction, but comprised wholly or partially in the same telephone area, and what powers, duties, and obligations ought to be conferred or imposed upon such local authorities.

The finding of that committee was as follows. I shall read two or three of the clauses of the report :

From the point of view of local finance, your committee are of opinion that a telephone service would be as successful as has been the supply of gas, water, tramways, and electric light by local authorities. Much of course depends in this case as in those upon the cost of constructing the service, and in all cases the local authority is perhaps the best judge of what is likely to be successful or not. It seems clear to your committee that a local authority should be able to construct a system at a price below that which from various causes the company have spent upon theirs, and this opinion is confirmed by the fact that the probable cost of such a service in the hands of the Glasgow corporation is based not upon estimates alone but on tenders actually received.

* * * * * *

On reviewing the whole of the evidence, your committee is strongly of opinion that general, immediate, and effective competition by either the post office or the local authority is necessary, and consider that a really efficient post office service affords the best means for securing such competition. We further consider that when in an existing area in which there is an exchange, the local authority demands a competing service, the post office ought either to start an efficient telephone system itself, or grant a license to the local authority to do so.

* * * * * *

With regard to areas in which there is no exchange, and districts which are not areas, we think some provision should be made beyond what is now offered by the National Telephone Company for giving a service when there is a reasonable local demand. In such cases the post office should either start a service of its own, or should grant licenses to the local authorities to do so, subject to proper regulations.

* * * * * *

Your committee in thus recommending a post office service assume that it will constitute a real and active competition, and that concessions to the company not required by the agreement will cease. Such a competition should, in their opinion, be carried on by a distinct and separate branch of the department, and in future be conducted under strictly businesslike conditions, and by a staff specially qualified for such a duty.

That was the conclusion arrived at by the committee of the Imperial House of Commons appointed specially to deal with this question of telephones. They recommended legislation on the lines of a public owned system of telephones, either managed in connection with the post office, or owned by municipalities. That conclusion was arrived at in England some years ago and they are carrying it out now. The finest telephone service in the world to-day is the public owned one in the city of Glasgow which is operated, as far as the exchange service with outside places is concerned, in connection with the post office system of the United Kingdom. While the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) has brought forward his Bill proposing to place the jurisdiction over these telephone questions in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, in England they have placed it in the Postmaster General. Because they have placed it there they have made it in a measure harmonize with the telegraph service which, like the telephone service ought to be owned and controlled by the state. I would like to see the telegraph system of Canada under the control of the post office and I would also propose that the jurisdiction in connection with the telephone service should be placed in the Postmaster General rather than in the hands of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I may say that within the past year there was a good deal of talk about taking over the telegraph lines owned by the government and placing them in the hands of the Postmaster General. I would like to see that carried out also and I throw out this suggestion now to the Minister of Justice that he should place the jurisdiction and control of the telephone companies under the Postmaster General rather than in the hands of the Railway Committee with the expectation that at an early date Canada intends to take over the telegraph lines and telephone systems of the country. The system adopted in England is this : When municipalities, or local companies, control local exchanges for the exchange of business with outlying places this exchange takes place over the trunk lines owned by the government and controlled by the post office. On the line of progressive reform and of public ownership I bring forward the suggestion to-day that this Bill ought to make provision, and that without delay, for the state taking over the telephone and telegraph lines and vesting the jurisdiction over them in the Post Office Department. If this is done in a short time we will have a system in this country on the same lines as that which they now have in England. Public ownership is in the air. More than that it is in practical effect in a great many places in the world to-day.

The public telephones in Norway and Sweden are the cheapest in the world and the service is the best. The best telephone system in Great Britain is the public owned system of the various cities in the United Kingdom. If ever we are to make a departure in this country in the direction of public ownership, here the opportunity presents itself. I would have thought that with the experience the government has had, and in view of the information they have collected during the last few years, they would have come forward with a proposal of public ownership of the telegraph and telephone systems of Canada. It will take very little money to do it; it will pay from the start and the public will get the best service. Public ownership is the best way whereby such public utilities as the telephone and telegraph can be distributed amongst the greatest number of people at the smallest possible cost. Another reason why I urge public ownership in connection with telephones and telegraphs is, that I want to see it come about in connection with the public ownership of the railways of this country. If there was nothing else to justify public ownership there would be sufficient justification in the fact that patriotism goes with public ownership.

Mr. CLARKE. Patronage you mean.

Mr. MACLEAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks that both go with public ownership, and may be they do, but public ownership tends to exalt patriotism as nothing else does, and railways, telegraphs, and telephones run by the state are run in the interest of the state, whereas under private ownership they are run in the interest of the corporations that own them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I find I was right in the suggestion I made to the Minister of Justice. The Act to which I refer will be found in the Statutes for 1888, page 263. It is not granting to the company a charter, but confirming a provincial charter and granting to the company certain powers which could be exercised anywhere in the Dominion of Canada.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They are not incorporated here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Incorporated in Nova Scotia, and has its provincial charter confirmed by this legislature which granted to it certain powers by the Statute to which I refer.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What chapter ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The chapter is not given in the index. The page is 263.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the Minister of Justice have an additional quantity of this Bill printed so that we may get some extra copies ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN. Do I understand the minister to say that the Bill will be referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraphs ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, so that the parties interested can be heard.

Mr. MACLEAN. The municipalities all over the country are interested, and there is an issue as to where the telephone companies cross the jurisdiction of the local legislature and the municipalities. They wish to be heard on that very point.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Certainly.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a first time.

QUESTIONS.

CANADIAN MILITIA—COURTS MARTIAL,

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

How many courts-martial have taken place in the Canadian militia since June 1st, 1901, up to January 1st, 1902 ?

What were the offences ?

What were the punishments ?

What is the total permanent force in Canada, classified by departments ?

What is the number of minor punishments recorded in the permanent corps for the period above named ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden) :

1. Eighty-five.

2 and 3. 1.—Drunkenness on duty, reduced to ranks. 2.—(1) breaking into barracks, (2) having in possession stolen goods, (3) conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline, forty-two days imprisonment with hard labour. 3.—(1) breaking into barracks, (2) having in possession stolen goods, (3) conduct to the prejudice, &c., forty-two days imprisonment with hard labour. 4. Absent without leave, reduced to ranks. 5. Absent without leave, fourteen days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages, $2.87. 6. Absent without leave, fourteen days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages, $2.88. 7. Attempting to desert, fourteen days imprisonment with hard labour. 8.—(1) absenting himself without leave, (2) disobeying a lawful command, (3) drunkenness on duty, (4) offering violence to superior officer, six months imprisonment with hard labour. 9.—(1) deserting His Majesty's service. (2) losing by neglect, &c., fifty-six days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages, $38.06. 10.—(1) deserting His Majesty's service, (2) losing by neglect, &c., fifty-six days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages, $2.75. 11.—(1) deserting His Majesty's service, (2) losing by neglect, fifty-six days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages, $1.20. 12.—(1) deserting His Majesty's service, (2) losing by neglect, &c., thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages, $3.15. 13.—Receiving stolen

goods, forty-two days imprisonment with hard labour. 14.—Receiving stolen goods, forty-two days imprisonment with hard labour. 15.—Absent without leave, reduced to ranks. 16.—Desertion and loss of kit, thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour. 17.—Desertion and loss of kit, thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour. 18.—Desertion and loss of kit, thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour. 19.—Desertion and loss of kit, ninety days imprisonment with hard labour. 20.—Drunkenness, reduced to ranks. 21.—Insubordination, forty-two days imprisonment (fourteen days remitted). 22.—Striking a soldier, reduced to ranks. 23.—Absent without leave, reduced to ranks. 24.—Drunkenness on duty, reduced to bombardier from corporal. 25.—(1) absence, (2) drunkenness, thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour. 26.—Offering violence to superior officer, twenty-one days imprisonment with hard labour. 27.—Absent without leave, reduced to ranks. 28.—Drunkenness, acquitted. 29.—Drunkenness, thirty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour and fined, $4.86 (twenty-eight days and $2.43 remitted). 30.—Deserting His Majesty's service, twenty-one days imprisonment with hard labour and reduced to ranks. 31.—Deserting His Majesty's service, eighty-four days imprisonment with hard labour and discharged with ignominy from His Majesty's service. 32.—Wilfully allowing a prisoner committed to his charge to escape, fifty-six days imprisonment with hard labour. 33.—Deserting His Majesty's service, one hundred and thirteen days imprisonment with hard labour. 34.—Deserting His Majesty's service, fifty-six days imprisonment with hard labour. 35.—Theft, one hundred and twelve days imprisonment with hard labour. 36.—Deserting His Majesty's service and losing by neglect regimental clothing and necessaries, forty-two days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages. 37.—Deserting His Majesty's service and losing by neglect, &c., twenty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages. 38.—Deserting His Majesty's service and losing by neglect, &c., forty-two days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages. 39.—Deserting His Majesty's service and losing by neglect, &c., fifty-six days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages. 40.—(1) Wilfully allowing a prisoner committed to his charge to escape, (2) Conduct to the prejudice, &c., fourteen days imprisonment and hard labour. 41.—(1) Breaking out of barracks, (2) Drunkenness, sixty days imprisonment with hard labour and discharged with ignominy from His Majesty's service. 42.—(1) Striking superior officer. (2) Using threatening language, sixty days imprisonment with hard labour. 43.—Conduct to the prejudice of, &c., twenty-one days imprisonment with hard labour. 44.—(1) Deserting His Majesty's service, (2) Losing by neglect, &c., fourteen days imprisonment with hard labour. 45.—(1) Drunk on duty, (2) Sleeping on his post, twenty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour (seven days remitted). 46.—Theft, one hundred and twenty-six days imprisonment with hard labour. 47.—(1) Drunk in barracks, (2) Insolence to a non-commissioned officer, twenty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour. 48.—(1) Neglect to the prejudice, &c. (2) Allowing a prisoner to escape, acquitted. 49.—(1) Absent from tattoo roll call, (2) Breaking out of barracks, (3) Drunk, (4) Losing by neglect, equipment, thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour, and fined $2.44 and stoppages, (seven days remitted). 50.—(1) Absent from parade, (2) Absent from defaulters' parade, (3) Striking a comrade, (4) Resisting the escort, twenty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour. 51.—(1) Attempting escape while a prisoner, twenty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour. 52.—(1) Drunk on fire engine party parade at tattoo, (2) Disobedience of orders, thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour. 53.—(1) Theft, (2) Receiving stolen goods, acquitted. (54) Drunk on guard, twenty-one days imprisonment with hard labour. 55.—Refusing to obey order, (2) Losing by neglect, clothing, &c., thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages. 56.—(1) Deserting His Majesty's service, (2) Losing by neglect, equipment, &c., thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages. 57.—Absent from tattoo, twenty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour. 58.—Absent from tattoo, thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour, (ten days remitted). 59.—(1) Feigning disease, (2) Disobedience of orders, thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour. 60.—(1) Attempting to desert, (2) When a prisoner, attempting to escape, (3) Losing by neglect, clothing, &c., one hundred and twenty-six days imprisonment with hard labour. 61.—(1) Breaking out of barracks, (2) Absence, (3) Losing by neglect, arms, &c., forty-two days imprisonment with hard labour. 62.—(1) Deserting His Majesty's service, (2) Losing by neglect, clothing, &c., sixty-three days imprisonment with hard labour. 63.—Deserting His Majesty's service, twenty-one days imprisonment with hard labour. 64.—(1) Drunkenness, (2) Conduct to the prejudice, &c., fourteen days imprisonment with hard labour, and fined $4.87. 65.—Disobedience of orders, thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour. 66.—Conduct to the prejudice, &c., fourteen days imprisonment with hard labour. 67.—(1) Drunkenness, (2) Conduct to the prejudice, &c., eighteen days imprisonment with hard labour and fined $1.83. 68.—Allowing a prisoner to escape, reduced to corporal from sergeant. 69.—(1) Deserting His Majesty's service, (2) Losing by neglect, equipment, &c., thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages. 70.—(1) Stealing the pro-

perty of a comrade, (2) Having the property of a comrade in his possession, twenty-one days imprisonment with hard labour, (seven days remitted). 71.—(1) Deserting His Majesty's service, (2) Losing by neglect, equipment, &c., thirty days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages. 72.—(1) Deserting His Majesty's service, (2) Losing by neglect, equipment, &c., (3) While prisoner under escort, attempting to escape, fifty-six days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages. 73.—(1) Leaving post as sentry, (2) Drunkenness on duty, twenty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour. 74.—Direct disobedience of orders, twenty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour. 75.—(1) Drunkenness, (2) Conduct to the prejudice, &c., thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour. 76.—(1) Deserting His Majesty's service, (2) Losing by neglect, equipment, &c., thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages. 77.—(1) Drunkenness, (2) When prisoner under escort, attempting to escape, twenty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour and fined $2.44. 78.—(1) Absent without leave, (2) Losing by neglect, regimental necessaries, reverted to the rank of private, deprived of six days pay, fourteen days imprisonment with hard labour, and stoppages (seven days imprisonment remitted). 79.—(1) Absenting himself without leave, (2) Losing by neglect, regimental necessaries, deprived of six days pay, fourteen days imprisonment with hard labour. 80.—(1) Deserting His Majesty's service, (2) Losing by neglect, equipment, &c., twenty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour. 81.—Drunkenness on duty, thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour and fined $4.87. 82.—(1) Theft, fifty-six days imprisonment with hard labour (seven days remitted). 83.—Drunkenness on duty, thirty-five days imprisonment with hard labour and fined $1.22, (seven days remitted). 84.—(1) Deserting His Majesty's service, (2) Losing by neglect, equipment, &c., twenty-eight days imprisonment with hard labour and stoppages. 85.—Drunkenness on duty, reverted to permanent grade, twenty-one days imprisonment with hard labour, (seven days remitted).

4. Total permanent force is as follows :

——	Officers.	Staff Sergts. and Sergts.	Rank and File.	Total.
Cavalry ..	10	19	80	109
C.M.R.....	6	12	42	60
R.C.F.A.....	12	33	201	246
R.C.G.A.....	11	25	173	209
Infantry..... ..	25	63	309	397
	64	152	805	1,021

5. 1,146.

Hon. Mr. BORDEN (King's).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—REPAIRS AT STE. MONIQUE STATION.

Mr. LEGRIS asked :

1. Is the government aware that the quite considerable repairs which the Department of Railways had caused to be done last summer at the Ste. Monique station, on the Intercolonial branch from St. Leonard to Nicolet, have not yet been paid for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Considerable repairs were made to Ste. Monique Station, and they have not yet been paid for.

2. The accounts with accompanying receipts were sent in about June last, and the chief engineer of the Intercolonial Railway wrote Mr. Charles Milot that the charges appeared to be excessive.

3. The question of payment is in a state of adjustment between Mr. Milot and the chief engineer of the Intercolonial Railway. The chief engineer has not yet been able to determine whether the total of Mr. Milot's charges should be paid.

FRAUDULENT SALE ACT.

Mr. SCHELL asked :

1. Is there any inspection under the Act respecting the Fraudulent Sale or Marking of the commercial commodities, white lead, or white lead in oil, with the view to ascertain if these goods offered in public sale to the people of Canada are pure or adulterated ?

2. If so, by whom is the inspection made ?

3. What is the result of such inspection ?

4. In case of adulteration of such manufactures offered for sale to the public in contravention of said Act, what penalties are provided to meet such cases ?

5. Are such penalties enforced, and, if not, why not ?

6. What methods are employed to prevent white lead manufacturers placing upon the market adulterated goods to the detriment of the general public ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier) :

1. Yes, samples were collected in February and March, 1901.

2. Samples are collected by food inspectors and analysis thereof made by district analysts and at the laboratory at Ottawa.

3. Out of ninety-nine samples collected and analysed, fifty-six were found genuine, nineteen adulterated and twenty-five sold as pure, but found to be adulterated.

4. The penalties provided by the Adulteration Act are the payment of the cost of procuring and analyzing the sample ($9) and if the vendor refuses to pay, proceedings are instituted through the Department of Justice for the collection of a penalty not exceeding $100.

5. Yes, penalties are enforced.

6. The collection and examination of samples as pointed out herein and the publication of a bulletin wherein the public is informed of the result of said examinations.

WELLAND CANAL WATER PRIVILEGES.

Mr. HOLMES asked :

1. What is the nature and extent of the water privileges on the Welland Canal enjoyed by the Riordon Paper Company ? What rental does it pay therefor ? Has it any privileges granted by a former government for which it is not paying the usual rate ? If so, how long has it had the same, and for what length of time is it yet to run ?

2. Has William Chaplin any water privileges on the Welland Canal for which he is not paying the customary fees ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The Riordon Paper Mills, Limited, has the use of water privileges and mill sites at locks 16, 17, 18, 19 and 21 on the old Welland canal at Merritton.

At lock No.17, in addition to certain lands the company has all the surplus water not required for navigation.

At locks 16, 18, 19 and 21 in addition to certain lands the company has water powers not exceeding 1,500 horse-power.

The rental at lock 17 for the lands and water-power is $200.

The rental at locks 16, 18, 19 and 21 for the lands and 700 horse-power is $240, with $2 per horse-power for balance of horse-powers used up to 1,500 horse-power.

Both of these privileges are held at the usual rates, which vary considerably on this canal.

At lock 17 the privilege has been held since the 21st February, 1870; at locks 16, 18, 19 and 21 the privileges have been held to a greater or less extent since October 1st, 1879; a lease granted on the latter date being superceded, on account of the indefiniteness of its term, by the lease of 28th May, 1896.

The privileges granted by the lease of 21st February, 1870, run in perpetuity without alteration of terms. The privileges granted by the lease of 28th May, 1896, run for four periods of twenty-one years from its date and thereafter, in perpetuity in periods of ten years, the rental being adjustable at the expiration of any period of renewal.

2. No, William Chaplin is paying $4 per horse-power.

THE YUKON—ABSENCE OF SHERIFF.

Mr. WARD asked :

1. From what date in 1901 was leave of absence granted to R. J. Eilbeck, Sheriff of the Yukon ?

2. For what purpose was such leave granted ?

3. When does such leave of absence expire ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll) :

1. From October 1, 1901.

2. Leave was granted upon his representations that after spending two winters in the Yukon, his health required the change, and that he wished to see his father, whose health was failing.

3. March 1, 1902.

OYSTER CULTURE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. What amount has been expended by the government up to the 1st July, 1900, in connection with the development of oyster culture in the harbour of Shediac ?

2. Were any oyster beds planted by the government in that harbour, and what amount was expended for the purpose, up to the date aforesaid ?

3. During the year 1900 who had charge of the oyster beds in the harbour of Shediac for the government ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Six thousand nine hundred dollars and fifty-eight cents.

2. Yes. No division of expenditure is shown between actual planting and general development. I might possibly get this information from the local parties if the hon. gentleman is anxious for it, but we have nothing in the department to show it.

3. William Beal.

STEEL RAILS FOR GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. How many tons of steel rails have been delivered under the contract entered into with F. H. Clergue, of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, and at what price or prices ?

2. Where were they delivered, on what dates, and in what quantities ?

3. Where were the rails, so delivered, manufactured ?

4. Has delivery been made of all rails contracted for ? If not, how many tons are still to be delivered, at what points are deliveries to be made, and at what price or prices ?

5. Are all future deliveries to be of Canadian manufacture ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). No steel rails have been delivered by Mr. F. H. Clergue. No arrangements have been made beyond those announced last session.

CANNED BEEF FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. BOYD asked :

1. What quantity of canned beef was sent from Canada to South Africa for the Imperial Government during the past year ?

2. Was any quantity of the said material returned to Canada by order of the Canadian government, and why was such an order issued ?

3. Was said material inspected after being returned to Canada, and what was the report upon said inspection ?

4. What firm or firms of canners prepared and furnished said material so returned ? And which firm's goods was found to be good, and which bad, if any, of the said material inspected ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). This being a matter of business of the War Office, I do not feel at liberty to answer the hon. gentleman's question.

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS OF CANADA.

Mr. BELL—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What was the aggregate amount of the manufactures of Canada during the year 1900 ?
2. What was the aggregate amount of the agricultural products of Canada, including animals and their products, during the same year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher.) The returns of the manufacturing schedules of the census have not yet been made out.

COLLINGWOOD, MEAFORD, OWEN SOUND AND WIARTON HARBOURS.

Mr. TOLTON asked :

1. How much money has been voted for improvements on Collingwood, Meaford, Owen Sound, and Wiarton harbours ?
2. How much of such several votes has been spent on each of said harbours ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte) :

1. For the year ending 30th June, 1902 :

	Voted.	Expended
Collingwood	$25,900 00	$25,161 39
Meaford	41,000 00	18,380 48
Owen Sound	28,500 00	28,456 28
Wiarton	14,500 00	13,516 20

2. Up to the 30th June, 1091, the amounts expended are :

	Harbour works.	Dredging.	Total.
Collingwood .	$280,203 61	$138,280 74	$418,484 45
Meaford	97,499 11	6,602 13	104,101 24
Owen Sound ..	262,693 00	39,104 35	301,797 35
Wiarton.	71,578 91	.....	71,578 91

PUBLIC HOLIDAY ON CORNATION DAY.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

Is it the intention of the government to provide that the day which has been fixed for the Coronation of His Most Gracious Majesty King Edward the Seventh, shall be proclaimed as a public holiday throughout the Dominion of Canada ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is under consideration.

BULWER-CLAYTON TREATY AND ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for :

Copy of all correspondence, papers, documents, memoranda and despatches exchanged between the British government and the Canadian authorities in reference to the Bulwer-Clayton treaty and the abrogation thereof, as well as in reference to the Alaskan boundary since the last adjournment of the Joint High Commission, appointed in connection with said boundary.

He said : It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very opportune time for parliament to become possessed of all the correspondence between our government and the home authorities, which preceded the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and equally opportune for the production of the correspondence which may have passed between them concerning the Alaskan boundary since the international Joint High Commission has ceased to sit. It is, I believe, a principle of constitutional law that parliament should be fully informed of all correspondence on subjects such as those to which my motion relates. In that opinion I am fortified by the words which fell from my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) at the time he saw fit to bring a similar motion to the notice of the House, but which motion he afterwards withdrew.

I shall be as brief as possible. In the first place, I would like to refer to the rule which prevails in England and that which holds here. On referring to the English rule practice, I find that unquestionably all correspondence of a diplomatic character must be produced in parliament, except in some very extraordinary cases, the principal one of which is when negotiations are still pending. This rule I find very well expressed in Todd's work on parliamentary government in England. At page 439 of that work, Mr. Todd says :

It is imperative that parliament shall be duly informed in every thing that may be necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government in any part of the empire ; and the fullest information is communicated by the government to both Houses, from time to time, upon all matters of public concern. For it is in parliament that authoritative statements are made, or information given by ministers, upon public questions ; and no action in parliament should be based upon declarations of policy made elsewhere.

Sometime a statement, by the minister who is specially responsible, is made in one House and not repeated in the other, the ordinary channels of information, i.e., the newspapers, being relied upon to give it general publicity. But such a course is inconvenient and objectionable. Much inconvenience having been occasioned by motions for papers having been agreed to in one House, and opposed by government in the other chamber, it is now understood that when papers are presented to one House they shall also be laid on the Table of the other.

Considerations of public policy, and a due regard to the interests of the state, occasionally demand, however, that information sought for by members of the legislature should be withheld, at the discretion and upon the general responsibility of ministers. This principle is systematically recognized in all parliamentary transactions : were it otherwise, it would be impossible to carry on the government with safety and honour. Whenever it is declared, by the responsible servants of the Crown, that any information sought for in parliament could not be supplied without inconvenience to the public service, or for other sufficient reasons, the House refrains from insisting upon its production.

And if the government object to produce any documents on the ground that they are of a

private and confidential description, it is not usual to insist upon their being furnished, except under peculiar and imperative circumstances.

Referring to the case of negotiations pending, Mr. Todd thus lays down the rule at page 355 :

It is a necessary rule that the substance of all personal communications between the representatives of the British Crown and the ministers of any foreign country, upon matters of public concern, should be committed to writing, in order that a fair and complete record of the transaction between Great Britain and other states may be preserved in the foreign office, and, in due course, submitted to parliament. The English constitutional system requires that parliament should be informed, from time to time, of everything which is necessary to explain the conduct and policy of the government, whether at home or abroad, in order that it may interpose with advice, assistance, or remonstrance, as the interests of the nation may appear to demand.

In 1810 the House of Commons passed a resolution of censure upon the Earl of Chatham (the Master-General of the Ordinance and a cabinet minister), who had commanded a military expedition to the Scheldt, on account of his having presented to the King a secret report of the expedition, without communicating the same to his colleagues, or causing it to be considered a public document. It was justly contended, that if such a proceeding were permitted, it would strike at root of ministerial responsibility.

It is unquestionably of immense advantage to the country, that the diplomatic transactions and proceedings of government abroad should be freely communicated to parliament, for thereby the foreign policy of the Crown ordinarily receives the approbation of parliament, and is sustained by the strength of an enlightened public opinion. This in itself confers an additional weight to our policy and opinions abroad. On the other hand, it is notorious that the English system of giving publicity to information obtained by government, in regard to occurrences in foreign countries, is viewed with great disfavour on the continent. A knowledge of the fact that all information procured by our foreign agents is liable to make public militate somewhat against their usefulness, and tends to place them occasionally in an embarrassing position. It induces towards them, moreover, a feeling of reserve on the part of the representatives of other governments ; and necessitates that our ministers should resort, more than they would otherwise do, to the practice of private correspondence.

After giving several cases in which motions for the productions of papers were negatived, Mr. Todd goes on to state cases in which papers have been laid before parliament while negotiations were still pending :

Thus, it is generally inexpedient and highly impolitic to communicate to parliament, papers concerning diplomatic negotiations which are still pending ; and nothing is more prejudicial to the action and efficiency of the diplomatic service than the perpetual motions for the production of papers, which are made by a certain class of politicians, who insist upon the fullest information on questions of foreign policy at unreasonable times.

It would appear from this enunciation of the doctrine as it exists in England—which enunciation, I find, is confirmed by all the other authors I have had occasion to consult on this subject—that the doctrine is that all correspondence with foreign powers ought to be subject to parliament, that parliament is the legitimate critic of the conduct of the ministers in their foreign policies, and it is only by the means afforded to parliament of having correspondence of the government before it that that assembly is in a position to justly and fairly appreciate the action of the ministers abroad. There is, in the short passage I have just read to the House, an explanation of the methods which render impossible, under certain exceptional circumstances, the production before parliament of the correspondence of ministers in order that parliament should be able to form an opinion. That is the difficulty that exists in carrying on the negotiations with a foreign power, and not only the difficult position in which the executive finds itself under these circumstances, but the courtesy, the rules of honour, if I may use that expression, which the home government is obliged to observe with regard to that foreign power. The rules of confidence which exist between individuals and exist, I may say to even a stronger degreee between independent powers negotiating with one another. And there is also the motive given where the object in view has not been obtained. Where, in other words, negotiations are pending, where the correspondence is expected to lead up to some definite result, it would be impolitic—not to communicate to parliament, if we were ruled by the olden usages which made the deliberations of parliament secret and private—but to communicate to the public at large the pending negotiation, and, in that manner, interfere, perhaps, with the success, the favourable issue of those negotiations. That is the rule which prevails in England, and, if I emphasize it, it is because I believe that if, to any degree, that rule can obtain here in Canada, it must only be applied with very serious modifications and restrictions. Why ? Because the correspondence asked for here is not an interchange of diplomatic notes between two independent powers, it is not a case of negotiations which must be covered by the principles and rules of propriety which I enunciated a moment ago and as explained by the authority whom I quoted ; but the correspondence we want is a domestic matter. It is a correspondence between the home government, a branch, if I may use that expression of the government, of the empire, and one of the dependencies. That is, strictly speaking, a domestic affair. What we wish to have, and what we are entitled to have at this stage—at this late stage—is the correspondence between the Canadian

government, which is a branch of the government of the empire, and the home government in regard to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. What we want to know is what inquiries were made of our government at the time of the negotiations leading up to the abrogation of that treaty, and what answers were given by the executive of this country. This is not, as I repeat, a question where it is absolutely necessary, in order to protect the rights of one nation against the other, to observe strictly the proprieties as pointed out by the authority I quoted as governing the relations between two independent powers. But we want to know what representations were made from this part of the empire before the home government—before the two powers concerned—arrived at the conclusion that the abrogation of that treaty was in the interest of both the contracting parties. Let me, for a moment, take up the time of the House to show, what, to my mind, is the rule which obtains here as to the interchange of communications between the home government and our own government. I believe that it can be laid down as a governing principle, such as obtains in England, that all correspondence passing between the Imperial government and the government of Canada should be submitted to the parliament of this country, except such strictly secret or confidential letters as are required by the Secretary of State in the Imperial administration, to be kept absolutely from the public gaze. And, even in the case of communications considered absolutely private by the Imperial Secretary of State, the government of the day in this country, in refusing to produce that correspondence must take upon itself all responsibility. In other words, since we have here a ministry responsible for every act, of every nature whatsoever, of the head of the executive, if the head of the executive in this country, under the instructions he receives from the Imperial government, judges fit to withhold from this parliament any part of that correspondence, he can do so. But he does it through his responsible ministers, and they assume the responsibility of that refusal. I find, Sir, that, under instructions which are made to accompany the letters patent establishing the function of the Governor General—under the Royal instructions which always accompany the issue of such an important document—dating back thirty years, to the 6th July, 1871, this is what has been laid down :

> The communication of the despatches passing between the home government and the government of this country are divided into three classes : Numbered despatches, secret despatches and confidential despatches.

Mr. Todd says in his book on parliamentary government in the British colonies, at page 126 :

> By Royal instructions, governors are forbidden to give to any person copies of despatches they may receive from the Secretary of State—or to allow copies to be taken of them—unless under a general or special authority from that officer. But where responsible government is established, the governor is considered to be at liberty to communicate to his advisers all despatches not marked 'confidential.' And by a circular dated July 10th, 1871, despatches are reclassified as follows : (1) Numbered despatches, which a governor may publish, unless directed not to do so; (2) Secret, which he may, if he thinks fit, communicate, under the obligation of secrecy, to his ministers, and may even make public, if he thinks it necessary. (3) Confidential, which are addressed to a governor personally, and which he is forbidden to make known, without express authority from the Secretary of State.
>
> In laying despatches and other papers before the legislature, the governor of a colony is bound by constitutional practice. In general, the governor in colonies with responsible ministries, takes no personal action, in this matter, in the case of 'numbered' despatches and ordinary papers, and is rarely even consulted. The ministers lay before the legislature any such documents, on their own discretion and responsibility. But it is generally a reasonable rule of the public service that despatches and other documents forwarded to the Imperial government should not be published until they shall have been received and acknowledged by the Secretary of State ; and that no confidential memorandums passing between the ministers and the governor should be laid before the colonial parliament, except on the advice of the ministers concerned.
>
> When advised to do so by his ministers, the governor should lay any numbered and not confidential despatch addressed by him to or received by him from the Secretary of State before the local parliament, unless there be some strong reason to the contrary, such as a pending reference to the Secretary of State.
>
> But the governor must first be advised by his ministers before taking such a step, and they must be prepared to defend his action if it be impugned.
>
> Ministers cannot relieve themselves from the responsibility of advising as executive councillors: nor is a governor free to act without or against ministerial advice, in cases not involving the rights or prerogatives of the Crown or Imperial interests.

The author goes on to quote several cases which I think make clear the principle which is laid down. Now, Sir, my hon. friend the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) not only made us acquainted with what many of us knew before but he made us acquainted, and to a certain extent the right hon. the Prime Minister did also, with certain facts which, to my mind, render doubly imperative the demand which we have made for the production of this correspondence, which we have a right to see, not only under the rule which I have just endeavoured to establish pertaining to the constitution of this House, but upon the principle that it is urgent that the correspondence which we now seek for as regards the two matters which are completed, are finished, should be placed in possession of this House in order that we may be in a position to appreciate the action which this government has taken during

the proceedings which led up to the conclusions of the treaty abrogating the Clayton-Bulwer arrangement; and also that we should be fully acquainted with what has passed, with what have been the res gestae of this government since the international commission, having under its charge the treatment of several most important subjects of vital interest to this country, has ceased to exist, or has adjourned, according to the statement of these gentlemen already submitted to this House, sine die. It must not be forgotten we have to bear in mind the fact that my hon. friend from Labelle acted throughout the proceedings to which I have referred in laying this resolution before the House, in a special capacity. He was there as the official secretary of the commission, he occupied an official position in which it was open for him to acquire absolute knowledge of a multiplicity of facts with which we are unacquainted, and it is right and proper, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, to give considerable weight to the utterances made in this House the other day by that hon. member as to these facts. Now what do we find ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate, which he must know is against the rules of the House.

Mr. MONK. I think, Mr. Speaker, that rule has been considerably modified in England as long as the reference is not an undue one. It is impossible to discuss a question—that is what I believe they have decided in England—without referring to a certain extent to a past debate. We do it every day, and if that reference is simply in order to sustain an argument and is not prolonged, I understand that under the rules of discussion that obtain in England the reference is allowed. If you rule differently, I submit to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. The position always taken in this House has been that it is not permissible to refer to a previous debate. In some instances we have gone so far as to decide that no reference should be made to answers to questions, and that has also been decided in England. And so far as this parliament is concerned I think it has been the invariable rule that no reference should be made to a previous debate.

Mr. MONK. If you apply the rule rigidly, Mr. Speaker, I think you go further than they do in England at the present time. But I am perfectly prepared to submit to your ruling. Still, it seems to me quite within the rules of this House for me to say that we have had, not only in this House, but time and again outside of this House, public utterances from that hon. gentleman who occupied, as I said, an official and important position during the sittings of this commission; we have had time and again, in the city of Montreal and elsewhere, admissions from him of the utmost value. He has told us there what he has told us here many a time, that during the proceedings which led up to the abolition of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty the interests of Canada were insufficiently and improperly guarded by this government, that they failed by acts of omission and by acts of commission in accomplishing what to my mind was a sacred duty, in representing to the British government what was so ably represented by the late Minister of Justice, Hon. David Mills, that Great Britain had unquestionable and unquestioned rights in Central America, and that it was of the utmost importance that those rights should not be sacrificed except we received in exchange something for ourselves; that those rights should not be foresworn until we had obtained from the American government something of what we considered our most just and equitable claims in respect to the Alaskan boundary.

Has this government performed its duty, as the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has time and again urged, in representing those claims and our rights to the mother country during the lengthy negotiations which led up to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and are we not entitled to know by the production of the correspondence in reference to the treaty whether the government has accomplished this duty ? If we have a refusal to produce before this House the correspondence which will show that it has really and earnestly taken up the defence of our interests, that it has not been idle and has done nothing, as has been intimated time and again by the hon. member for Labelle, we will be entitled to assume that it has not made the representations which it was its duty to make at the time as to our rights and as to the necessity, in the exercise of the treaty making power, not to sacrifice those rights but to see that they were maintained, when they were unquestionably giving up rights accruing to the empire in Central America. We have had that intimation time and again from the hon. member for Labelle. We have had it stated all over the province of Quebec. It is not necessary for me to refer to what may be considered as his more solemn utterances in this chamber, but it is sufficient for me to say that they more than confirm the arguments and statements of fact he has made everywhere. It is necessary for the honour of this government that it should show to this House that at the time and during these delicate and difficult moments when the British government was negotiating for the abrogation of that treaty, it, here, was not failing in its duty to make proper representations to the British government in regard to our claims in Alaska, or in respect to the boundary of Alaska. It is also important to know if at that time the government was urging upon the home government in respectful but in urgent and proper tones our claims in respect to a

variety of other matters of interest to this country and which was its duty to urge upon the home government. Sir, it is an admitted principle in England, and surely we are not going to go back on that principle here, that where a treaty has been concluded, where negotiations are terminated, it belongs to parliament to judge of the acts of the government as to the conduct of those negotiations. It would be impossible for anybody to refute, or even to put in question before the British parliament, that principle. What have we here? We have the known fact, the fact known to the public, the official fact, that the abrogation has taken place and upon what ground can the government refuse to lay before the parliament of this country what undoubtedly has been laid, or can be laid, at any moment, upon the demand of a member, before the House of Commons in England? We are entitled to know what part our government took in these negotiations. It had a part to take, it had a duty to perform, and we are entitled to know how it carried out that duty. In respect to the Alaskan boundary at the time the same arguments were held. We have had the statement of the former Minister of Marine and Fisheries, while in England, to the effect that the commission had sat in Washington without obtaining anything, that he considered the negotiations to be over and terminated for the time-being. We have had the statement of the secretary of that international commission, made time and again, not only in this House but before the public at large at a great variety of meetings, that the commission had been an utter failure, in respect to the Alaskan boundary, that when they had come to the discussion of that subject all further discussion was impeded and had become impossible. We have had his statement and the statement of the participators in that conference also, that it was impossible to obtain the consent of the United States to the proposal which had been made by our own commissioners to submit the question of the Alaskan boundary to a commission of similar composition to the commission which had been proposed by the American authorities themselves to settle the boundary of Venezuela. Therefore, I say we are entitled to consider and the public will consider, as this House ought to consider, that the sittings of that commission are for the present suspended. I submit, under these circumstances, that commission being a distinct body especially created for the settlement of the specific question submitted to it, and that commission having, according to the admission of those who took part in it, on our own behalf, adjourned finally in the face of insurmountable difficulties, that it is the right of this parliament, not, Sir, to pry into the doings of this commission, but it is the right of parliament to know what has passed between our own government and the Imperial authorities since the adjournment of the commission upon the subject of the Alaskan boundary. It is a subject which interests us in the highest degree. We may be wrong, but we live under the belief that a part of that territory belongs to us. It is our property, it is being exploited by a foreign power, and we have the right to know what steps our own government is taking in regard to the authority, which is the only one that can deal with a foreign power and, what have been the doings of this government since that time by correspondence, despatches or otherwise in respect to this most important question. I repeat, Sir, I believe the rule which applies in England, which is a very wise one and which has been applied there with the discretion and moderation which always obtain in the great parliament of that country, should, in this country, receive considerable modification even as to negotiations pending when the desire of this parliament is not to pry into negotiations being carried on by diplomacy between a foreign power and the government of this empire, but when we are asking for documents having reference to our own relations with the British government as to what may be considered, I submit, Sir, an Imperial domestic concern. I submit this motion, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER. Respecting the question that has been raised, I may call the attention of the House to two decisions I find in Blackmore. In 1862 and 1863 I see this question was decided in England. It was held in 1862 :

It is out of order to read extracts from speeches made in the same session.

And in 1863 :

It is irregular to quote extracts from speeches in a past debate.

I would quote also a decision in reference to the question given in 1880 to the following effect :

An hon. member cannot refer to a late debate; and the same rule applies to the answer to a question as to a debate.

Hon. members will, therefore, see that the rule has gone very far in England.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must express my surprise that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) should again bring this question before the House, after the debate which took place only a few days ago. I am still more surprised that he should persist in his intention of forcing the motion on the House in view of the quotations which he himself has read from such a standard constitutional authority as Todd. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) must see that the quotations from Todd defeat the very object which he seeks to obtain by his motion. The whole tenor of the hon. gentleman's speech has been to the effect, that while the rule, that papers are not to be communicated to parliament while negotiations are pending, applies in England, that very same rule should not be adhered to in this country. I am at

a loss to understand how it is that a rule of parliamentary government in England should not be a rule of parliamentary government in Canada. The only argument which the hon. gentleman made was, that while in England it would not be proper to ask for the production of such papers because it might necessitate the bringing down of secret correspondence with foreign powers, yet this could not occur in Canada with reference to this matter, as it only involved the publication of correspondence between the government of Canada and the government of Great Britain; no foreign power being in the case. A moment of reflection will convince my hon. friend, or ought to convince him, that his contention is purely gratuitous, and that it would be impossible to bring down the correspondence he seeks without at the same time divulging negotiations which are pending between Great Britain and a foreign power. The very contingency which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) said does not exist, does exist, and it exists in a very aggravated form. I hope that a word or two from me will convince the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) that he is in the wrong. The hon. gentleman says that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is at an end; that therefore there is nothing to conceal; that the treaty negotiated between Lord Lytton and Mr. Clayton has been modified by a recent treaty, and that therefore the papers in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty can be brought down. That reasoning of my hon. friend is fallacious. Canada had no direct interest in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty; Canada had no direct interest in the Nicaragua canal. Canada had no more interest in the negotiation of a treaty which affected the Nicaragua canal than she would have in a treaty in reference to the Suez canal, or in any other question between Great Britain and a foreign power in which she was not interested.

Mr. MONK. Had we no interest ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Canada had no direct interest. But why did Canada take any interest in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty ? It was not that we had a direct interest in the matter, but it so happened that we had a difficulty to settle with the United States in the northern part of the continent with regard to the Alaskan boundary, and Great Britain had a difficulty to settle in the Isthmus of Nicaragua in the southern part of the continent, and the suggestion being offered that concessions should be made by one power and the other, it was thought opportune that the two questions should be negotiated together, and that the request for the modification of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty should be made the means to an end, in order to obtain our object, which was a settlement of the Alaskan boundary. I would recall to my hon. friend the well known fact, that the only references that were made by the Canadian government at any time with regard to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, were simply with the object of having the Alaskan boundary considered together with the Nicaraguan question. We made representations to that effect and though one branch of this subject has been disposed of, the other has not yet been disposed of, though it is still in a fair way towards settlement, and the negotiations are yet pending. My hon. friend will see that it would be impossible to bring down anything concerning the correspondence with regard to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty except such as concerns the Alaskan boundary question, and we could not bring down these papers unless we were to give at once to the public the negotiations which are still going on with regard to the Alaskan boundary. I now come to another branch of the argument made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk). The hon. gentleman has stated that whether negotiations as to the Alaskan boundary are pending or not, we should bring down the representations which had been made by one government to the other. The hon. gentleman will understand that it would be impossible to bring down that correspondence unless we were to bring down at the same time the protocols exchanged, and the propositions and counter propositions which have been made up to this very moment upon the subject. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the Joint High Commission which sat at Quebec and Washington has adjourned sine die, and he says that we should not withhold the correspondence until this commission resumed again. I will at once relieve the apprehension of my hon. friend by telling him, as he knows—because the papers have been placed on the table of the House two years ago—that the Alaskan boundary question has been removed from the commission, and referred by the commission itself to the British government and the United States government, the two interested parties. Since that time, that is to say, since the month of February, 1899, negotiations have been going on between the two governments. Protocols have been exchanged, propositions have been made, counter propositions have been submitted, other propositions have been made again, and the matter has been under consideration and is still under consideration. So that the very argument which my hon. friend has made cannot apply to this matter, for a very obvious reason : that we could not bring down the papers without submitting the very terms of the propositions and counter propositions that have been made. I cannot divulge these secrets to-day ; but it is easy to suppose what has been going on. It is easy to suppose that certain propositions have been made by one government to the other ; that these propositions have been referred to the Canadian government ; that the government have made its comments upon these propositions ; that it has either assented to them

or dissented from them. It is easy to suppose that this is the character of the correspondence which has been going on ever since, which has not been concluded, but which is going on at this very moment; and therefore it would be not only impolitic, but a breach of the etiquette which is due by one nation to another, as well as a breach of the most sacred interests of the Canadian people in connection with the Alaska boundary question, if we were to place on the Table of the House to-day the papers for which my hon. friend asks. Does my hon. friend or any other member of the House seriously expect that we could, consistently with the duty we owe to the people of Canada at this very moment, when negotiations are pending, when the British Ambassador at Washington and the American Ambassador at London are exchanging notes, when the two governments are in conference, when we are cognisant of these conferences, when we have submitted our views upon the different propositions which have been made, when the negotiations have reached a certain stage, when it is possible that these negotiations may be completed within a month or so or perhaps longer—does he seriously contemplate that we are going to-day to place on the Table of the House and distribute to the four corners of publicity the negotiations which are still going on, but which I hope may be completed before long? Sir, the matter is a serious one, and I must express my surprise that the hon. gentleman should not have apprehended the nature of the motion he was making, and should still persevere in the demand that we should lay these matters before the public.

I agree with my hon. friend that the procedure and the methods of the British government are very different from what prevails on the continent. The system of government in Great Britain is a system of publicity—a system based on the idea that nothing should be hidden from parliament or the people. But my hon. friend knows that even in Great Britain, which is the mother of that system, there are some matters which even the representatives of the people cannot have laid before them until the time comes when the communication of them can be made with safety to the public interest. In this matter, it is obvious—I have only to state the case to show at once to every man who views the question unbiased—that it would be highly prejudicial to the public interest to bring down this correspondence. As soon as it is completed the government will be only too happy to bring it down. I have only to express my deep sorrow that the matter is not yet concluded, and my deep hope that it will be concluded at an early day. At all events, no efforts of the government will be spared to bring it to a conclusion as speedily as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

But the parliament of Canada will not be surprised if I say that this is a matter with which we have experienced a great deal of difficulty. The United States government is of all governments the one the most difficult with which to carry on international negotiations, owing to their peculiar constitution, which makes the Senate the treaty-ratifying power. Therefore the Senate has all along to be kept more or less advised—if not the whole Senate, leading members of it. For this reason we have not been able, even after years of persevering and continuous effort, to bring the matter to such a point as to enable me—what otherwise I should be only too happy to do—to gratify the legitimate curiosity of hon. gentlemen opposite to have the full particulars laid before them.

My hon. friend has referred to certain statements which have been made by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) outside the House. I might suggest to my hon. friend that it would have been perhaps more appropriate, when he lectured my hon. friend a few days ago on a question much akin to this one, to have brought up the references which he has made to-day. But at all events I never understood my hon. friend from Labelle to make any statement except by way of argument, that we had not pressed sufficiently the claims of Canada upon the British government in connection with the modification of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. He was only acting upon his own inferences. He had no data to go by. As to the fact that he was connected with the Joint Commission, I do not know that that is relevant at all. As to the other fact, that he alluded to certain statements which have not been made, but which Sir Louis Davies is reported to have made, I have in my hand a letter from Sir Louis Davies denying that he made any such statements. I do not intend to read the letter to-day, because the hon. member for Labelle is not in his seat, but I intend to do so at the earliest moment.

Mr. MONK. If the right hon. gentleman refers to the letter of denial, we are entitled to have that letter laid on the Table now.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am afraid that the letter of Sir Louis Davies, a member of the Supreme Court, cannot be treated as a public document to be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. MONK. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that no minister of the Crown can refer to a document in a statement made by him without depositing that document on the Table of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. The letter is not addressed to me as a minister of the Crown. It is addressed to me as a member of the House, asking me to give to the House his denial of a statement which has

been made in the House by a member. I propose to do so, but not to-day, simply on account of the absence of the hon. member for Labelle, whose statement it is intended to contradict.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the right hon. Prime Minister allow me to make a suggestion in all friendliness—and I think I speak with the sympathy of both sides of the House. The most important incident in the matter to which the right hon. gentlemen refers was the innuendo in the speech of the hon. member for Labelle in regard to the position of Lord Herschell; and if the right hon. gentleman could find it proper to give that an emphatic denial, as he could if the facts warranted, and to say that Lord Herschell was not inimical to the claims of Canada, the mind of Canada would be much more easy than in regard to any explanation touching the visit of Sir Louis Davies to Mr. Chamberlain. I think that was really the most serious statement or insinuation that was made.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is apart altogether from the point that has been raised by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). It is a matter which I also intended to speak about; but in the absence of my hon. friend from Labelle, I prefer not to speak of it to-day, and I am sure that the House will appreciate the position I take.

Mr. MONK. If we have the assurance of the Prime Minister that he will lay that letter on the Table, and merely express a desire to see the hon. member for Labelle, I will not insist. But what I draw particularly to the attention of the right hon. gentleman is that the hon. member for Labelle has stated repeatedly that a certain utterance had been made in England by Sir Louis Davies, and that Sir Louis Davies never denied having made that utterance.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier rising to the point of order ?

Mr. MONK. Yes, and I was interrupted by the right hon. gentleman. The point I raise is this, that no minister of the Crown can refer to any document unless he is prepared to lay it on the Table of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to have said a moment ago that he waived his point of order.

Mr. MONK. I would like to have a decision.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point raised was that the Prime Minister had no right to refer to a document unless he were prepared to lay it on the Table. The hon. gentleman afterwards withdrew his point of order, and gave his reason for withdrawing it that he understood and appreciated the motives which actuated the Prime Minister in delaying the production of that document.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the rule laid down a moment ago is to be carried out in its strictness, it would be very difficult for my right hon. friend to lay at a future date the document on the Table or make any reference to it, because he would then be referring to a past debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to have referred also to a debate outside the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is admittedly not a matter which took place outside the House but in the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is quite in error. It is always allowable to give a personal explanation. Sir Louis Davies simply desires to be allowed to give a personal explanation regarding certain words which have been attributed to him. As regards my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, I am surprised that he should be still unconvinced. I would be only too glad to read the letter at this moment, but I do not think it would be in accord with the fitness of things to read it in the absence of the hon. member for Labelle, whose statement it was caused this letter to be written. I propose, on the first occasion when the hon. member for Labelle is in his seat, to bring this letter to his attention and that of the House on a question of privilege.

Mr. MONK. I ask the ruling of Mr. Speaker upon the point I raised, and if the right hon. gentleman wishes to keep the letter until he sees the hon. member for Labelle, I have no objection. But I am entitled to a ruling.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The point taken by the hon. gentleman does not apply. The Prime Minister has not read any extract from that letter and has not referred to it for the purpose of debate. All he has done is to inform the House that he has the letter and intends to read it at a future day. That cannot be called a reference which brings it within the rule that any document quoted here must be laid on the Table.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule no doubt is when a minister of the Crown refers to a public document, he should be prepared to lay it on the Table. But all the First Minister has done on this occasion was to state that he has a letter in his possession and will produce it later on. And the reason he does not lay it on the Table now is because the hon. member, who was the cause of that letter being written, is not here. I do not think that, under the circumstances, the right hon. the First Minister should be forced to produce now the document, more especially as the hon. gentleman who raised the point of order said he fully appreciated the reason why the First Minister did not lay the letter on the Table to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not propose to say any more on the question. I think I have shown to the House the reasons why this motion cannot be granted and have only to ask that the House do not agree to it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the right hon. the leader of the government will bear with me a moment, I think I can show him some difference between the general principle, to which he refers as governing in matters of state, and the peculiar condition of affairs which confront us with regard to these particular negotiations. I would recall to the right hon. gentleman the debate in the session of 1899, and the course then suggested to him by the then leader of the opposition. That suggestion was to this effect, that the unreasonable position taken by the United States authorities made it a matter for serious consideration as to whether the government of Canada should not assume the power of treating American citizens in the admitted portion of British territory in Alaska in a similar manner to that in which British citizens were treated in the admitted portions of the United States territory in that country. If my memory serves me right, the right hon. gentleman considered the proposition worthy of consideration as a possible alternative, without giving expression to any strong opinion one way or the other. Since then the Clayton-Bulwer treaty has been abrogated, and we are entitled to know what steps this government took, if any, to see that our interests were consulted before Great Britain consented to that concession. In pressing our right to the fullest information, we are not interrupting any diplomatic negotiations, because—there is no secret about it—for we have it from the lips of the right hon. gentleman—all negotiations concerning the Alaskan boundary were suddenly broken off a long time ago. As Canadians we ought to be extremely jealous and careful as to the manner in which our interests are treated in any negotiations between the United States and Great Britain; and what we want to know now, and are entitled to know, is: What is the position which this government has taken? What are the difficulties that have confronted this government, and in what manner has this government availed itself of the various opportunities that offered? These are questions which we ought to fully discuss.

Take the negotiations concerning the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Was this government prompt to take advantage of the conditions existing previous to the abrogation of that treaty between Great Britain and the United States? At that time the United States desired much at the hands of Great Britain, though extremely niggardly of justice and fair play in their relations with His Majesty's Canadian subjects. Was the opportunity which then offered taken advantage of by this government? Our people are entitled to hold this government responsible. They are entitled to know whether this government kept the home authorities sufficiently advised and sufficiently alive to the importance of seeing that the interests of Canada were not lost sight of.

Now, in regard to what has happened since this extraordinary break off, this stoppage in the diplomatic negotiations touching the Alaskan boundary, surely we are not to wait for ever. It is not a reasonable position for the government to take, that these matters are not finally, finally ended, and that, until they reach an end, be that end good or bad for this country, this country is not to be advised as to the actual position of things touching a matter so vitally important to it. We have had, for instance, statements—I think even reiterated recently—by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) touching that indifference from the mother country to matters purely of Canadian concern, when these matters threatened the relations between the mother country and the United States. I think that since the hon. gentleman became a member of this government he has had the courage to repeat what he said when on this side of the House in regard to how little we owe to Great Britain touching various treaties and matters of Imperial concern where the interests of Canada were involved. Now, we have from another authority these ex cathedra statements of extraordinary and, so far unexplained difficulties that met our representatives at Washington at the hands of a gentleman who was, above all looked upon as the Imperial representative who was to assist and co-operative with the representatives of the Crown from Canada. And, so, not to take up time by relating the whole history of these extraordinary negotiations, we are confronted by a unique condition of affairs, and a condition that—I think, we speak by the book of the late Minister of Justice, now one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada when we say it is unprecedented, in which it would appear, that the rights and interests of Canada stand a good chance of being absolutely sacrificed. Well, are we to wait until our rights and interests are, beyond question and beyond recall, thrown away, or are we to have a government that will take the people of this country into its confidence? We do not say that the protocols are wanted; we do not say that these private matters require to be placed before parliament—that is not the point. But what the people of Canada, or a great many of the thinking people of Canada who have any regard for these matters of national interest, do want, and, I think, are entitled to, is that such correspondence—whether with the mother country or with other parties—from our own representatives should be laid before parliament as will apprise us of the condition of things that actually

exists. It seems to be—I use the word without offence—a disgraceful condition of things that we are only to guess at it from the unguarded statements of a, perhaps, excited and erratic individual who was attached to the Canadian or British commission. It is an awful thing, and against all the proprieties, that any statement of his that may be unfounded in fact should be allowed to go even twenty-four hours without a clear explanation or an absolute contradiction from the First Minister. Any importance given to the statements bruited abroad among the people of Canada and attributed to that gentleman is not due to his individual status or to the fact that he represents a constituency in this House; but what has given them a good deal of importance, and I think excited considerable alarm, is the fact that he made an insinuation with reference to Lord Herschell and made a direct statement in regard to a colleague of the Prime Minister that, if without warrant and truth, would naturally have brought an instant and indignant contradiction from the Prime Minister himself. It seems to me impossible that Lord Herschell should have been hostile to our claim. It seems impossible that Mr. Chamberlain should have trammelled or put any restriction upon the Imperial representative or others on that commission. And a statement of that kind could not have been made in this House without the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knowing all about it. He was one of that commission, a leading member of it, and he is our Prime Minister; and the very fact that days have elapsed without any authoritative contradiction is, naturally, enough to warrant a motion of this kind. One would have supposed that the right hon. gentleman would have been only too glad to have had this motion or any other suggestion of the kind made in the House of Commons, so that he could have given us the absolute, orthodox statement on all these points. One might reasonably have hoped that he would be able to give the House—without regard to Sir Louis Davies, or without reference to the feelings of a gentleman who, it is quite clear, did not consult his feelings in the matter, and apparently, did not take into consideration the gravity of the case—a statement that we could accept with regard to the views held and the co-operation afforded by Lord Herschell, and also the views of the colonial secretary. For, up to the time of the statements I have referred to, we supposed that we should have derived great advantage from the co-operation of Lord Herschell. And, having regard to the Imperial view of Mr. Chamberlain one would have supposed that no man in the United Kingdom could have better supported our claims than that right hon. gentleman. I hope that is true, but we all anxiously await an authoritative statement in the matter. But, in regard to the point involved in this motion. I would ask the right hon. the premier to reconsider the view he has expressed, and not to fall back on that rigid or technical position which, I think, is justified, only in regard to matters that are actually under treatment and consideration and not those regarding which negotiations are broken off. I do not suppose that the right hon. gentleman pretends that these matters are still under treaty. On the contrary, according to the right hon. gentleman's own explanation the position seems to be this—that Canada has dropped out and that the Alaskan question has been, as he says removed from the management of the government directly concerned——

The PRIME MINISTER. No, but of the Joint Commission.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—from the management of the Joint Commission, as the right hon. gentleman now puts it, to the hands of the mother country and the United States. I will go this far, and agree with the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) that history does not assure us that, if a matter simply remains in the hands of the mother country and the United States, Canada can expect to get her full measure of justice as the result of the negotiations. We want to know, as Canadians, that our own government is most active and persistent in demanding that there shall be no concession—that is no unfair or unreasonable concession—at the hands of the mother country for any consideration like the supposed good will of the United States or any other of these specious excuses that have been used aforetime. How are we to know what is being done ? How are we to judge hon. gentlemen opposite if they retreat behind this barricade and tell us that these matters are absolutely confidential ?

Ordinarily that is true; but when we are face to face with this critical state of affairs, that since 1899, at least, there has been no declaration other than that a most unreasonable attitude has been assumed by the United States, that the government of this country was at that time ready to consider whether retaliatory legislation would be expedient or not, I say the time has come, and more than come, when we should be reasonably informed as to the attitude of this government. The object of this motion, I am sure, is nothing more or less than that we should know what our government has been doing since 1899, whether they have been discharging their responsibilities as the people of this country would expect and require, or whether, according to the position the hon. gentleman takes when he asks the House to vote down this motion, there should be simply a blind confidence in the government, and that the members of this House should not have a reasonable curiosity satisfied, but that in due time, when

everything is settled, ended and past, we shall be told what has happened.

Now, there are other matters, too, which suggest all sorts of uneasiness, and, whether they are founded or unfounded, the result will be that in these matters of disquietude will increase rather than decrease, contrary to the prosperity and advantage of this country. I hold in my hands, for instance, a telegraphic information showing that there is an uneasy feeling spreading abroad in this country in regard to other complications which, judged by this correspondence, the government could settle in a moment. My correspondence states :

> Important international communications are passing in reference to this Alaskan boundary question, and the White Pass Railway, that people are agitating in Seattle and district that government action——

That is, I suppose, government action here——

> —compelling fair rates, strikes at independence of operation in regard to American strip.

That is to say, something affecting this modus vivendi in connection with the attitude the government has taken in order to protect the rights of the people of Canada so far as they can from the exorbitant charges that were made by the White Pass Railway. That is only a suggestion as to what will happen, and what will follow on, following not merely from these references, whether accurate or inaccurate, made by a gentleman on the back benches. It seems to me extraordinary not only that the government will not agree to bring down any statement that is in the correspondence, or make any definite statement as to the status of these diplomatic relations, but are not in a position to state on the spot, let alone in a previous debate, but to-day when the matter is before them on a notice, exactly the true state of affairs touching the attitude of the Colonial Secretary and of the British plenipotentiary who was appointed to assist them in the late negotiations at Washington.

One word more with regard to these matters, and that touches a view that I myself ventured to express in 1899. I recall to the right hon. gentleman's memory the remarks I made in a debate when the Minister of the Interior took very strong grounds in this House touching the possessory rights of the United States in Dyea and Skagway. It seems to me a clear inference to assume that the papers, if brought down, would show that one of the insuperable difficulties so far experienced in regard to the settlement of this Alaskan question is due to the admissions made by members of the Canadian government and by the right hon. gentleman in regard to this question, rather than to the attitude of Lord Herschell apart from anything else, and that it was these admissions that bothered and embarrassed the presentation of the Canadian view. The right hon. gentleman will recall the occasion when, for instance, he appealed to history as showing that from 'time immemorial,' as he put it, Dyea and Skagway had been in the possession, first of the Russians and then of the United States, a fact that was combatted as an historical fact, but which certainly was an argument wholly in favour of the United States contention. Now, then, it is possible that if the right hon. gentleman adheres to his decision of giving us no information as to how this hitch has occurred, why it is prolonged, it is possible that the people of this country may come to the conclusion, not unreasonably, under the circumstances, that it was not altogether because of this proclaimed hostility of one of the commissioners to our view, or of the hostility of the Colonial Secretary, according to Sir Louis Davies; but it was because of these inconvenient statements made on solemn occasions by members of the Canadian government. Therefore, in their own interest and in the interest of the people whose servants they are, in the interest of a country whose rights have not always been regarded as absolutely sacred by the mother country, when in contestation between the mother country and the United States, I think the government ought to have the courage of the convictions they professed when in opposition, and take the House into their confidence. Why, when we attempted to negotiate with Newfoundland in the old days, who can forget the attitude of Sir Louis Davies, now gone to a higher place, and of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) regarding Tory tyranny on the part of the Liberal-Conservative government, because they, in negotiating with Newfoundland, did not take this House into their confidence from day to day when the House was sitting at the moment these negotiations were going on ? Has the right hon. gentleman forgotten all his professions when in opposition ? While we do not want all the protocol, or the absolutely confidential documents, I do submit again that we are entitled, and that we ought to demand, and the country will demand, a clear and explicit statement, at least a compilation from these state documents, that we may know the exact position of the Canadian government, and the position of this question, whether as regards the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland or the United States of America.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright.) My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has been a minister himself, and he is also a member of the legal profession, and in both capacities he knows quite well, I think, that there is nothing more prejudicial, as a general rule, to a fair understanding of any important question than the production of some garbled documents relating thereto. He knows also that there are grave and serious questions constantly before a govern-

ment, and no graver or serious questions can come before this government or any government of Canada than those affecting the relations of Canada and of the whole empire with the adjoining republic, which questions require to be handled with great care and consideration; and that it would be a great injury to the people of Canada, and in no respect a benefit, if, for the sake of gratifying even a legitimate curiosity, we should in any way imperil the permanent interests of the country. Now, the hon. gentleman knows, I think, and if he does not, I think a good many of our friends on this side of the House know, that I myself am in no respect disposed to sacrifice in any degree or shape the interests of the people of Canada to any other consideration whatever. But, Sir, the interests of Canada and the interests of the empire, as I think hon. gentlemen have frequently pointed out to us, are not divisible but are one; and if we believe that it would not be advisable—and of course we are bound to take the responsibility of our utterances at this particular moment—to bring down the details of an intricate negotiation, more especially when, as the hon. gentleman is aware, within a very few weeks, I hope, my right hon. friend beside me will have an opportunity of discussing all these questions vive voce with Mr. Chamberlain and with the advisers of the Crown on the other side of the Atlantic, the hon. gentleman can well understand that we might not desire to bring down an imperfect and garbled correspondence, as I have said, until such time as we can present the whole case unimpaired.

But I rose more especially for another object. I had the pleasure, during the somewhat protracted period over which the negotiations of the Joint High Commission extended, of being on reasonably intimate terms with the late Lord Herschell; and I desire to say here for the benefit of all whom it may concern, that no man could have advocated the interests of Canada more sincerely, more energetically, and more ably than Lord Herschell did on all occasions, and notably with respect to this identical Alaska boundary. For that purpose I rose, and for that purpose I have spoken on the the present occasion. I desire that it should be understood by our people from one end of Canada to the other, that they have no ground, not the slightest or the faintest, to complain of the action of the late Lord Herschell in that respect. I will say this, and I think my colleagues will corroborate me, that I do not believe it would have been possible to present our case under any conceivable circumstances with more lucidity, with more ability, or more cogency, than Lord Herschell presented it on that occasion.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise merely for the purpose of corroborating in the fullest and most unequivocal manner the statement that has been made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I also had the privilege of watching the course of Lord Herschell on the Joint High Commission, and any aspersion on his character as regard his conduct in regard to Canadian interests is most unjust and unfounded. He presented the case of Canada in such a manner as to promote our best interests, he was true to Canadian interests in every respect and the aspersion upon his memory is a cruel and unjust one.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I think that the argument, so far as it has been made for or against the production of the documents, has been very fully made and I would not have thought it was necessary to make any addition to what has been said, if it were not for a remark of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as I understood him, which strikes me as being one of very considerable importance. If I am not mistaken I understood the Prime Minister, in the course of his speech in dealing with the matter that was under the consideration of the plenipotentiaries, who dealt with the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to say that the Nicaragua canal was of no more interest to the people of Canada than would be the Suez canal or any other canal in any part of the world, and that the only importance attaching to it in this connection was the value it possessed as a factor of concession which might be given in lieu of another concession. This is really a most amazing statement to my mind to be made seriously by the Prime Minister of Canada, because it seems to me that the people of Canada have as great, as natural and as complete an interest in the Nicaragua canal and in anything relating to the subject as have the people of the United States. I am not mistaken, I think, in stating that the gentleman who was lately Minister of Justice in the government of the right hon. gentleman enforced that opinion at very great length and with very great ability, and treated the negotiations dealing with the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty as a matter in respect of which Canada had an interest so deep that no other part of the world could compare with it in respect to its importance. The Nicaragua canal is not within the territory of the United States so that it is not a territorial matter for them. Its interest to them lies in the fact that on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans they have a large extent of coast which would be practically united by the canal penetrating the isthmus. In respect to the matter Canada stands in precisely the same position. We, in Canada, have as large a part of the North America continent as the United States and our interests in the Nicaragua canal, so far as territorial area is concerned, is at least as great as theirs, and looking at the possible extension of

our commerce and ship building and the growth of our population on the two coasts of the Atlantic and the Pacific our interest is as deep in the Nicaragua canal as can possibly be that of the United States. Therefore, I feel I am safe in assuming that if the gentlemen who dealt with the interests of Canada in this matter approached the consideration of this subject with no further knowledge of the importance of the matter than that which has been presented to the House by the right hon. Prime Minister, we need not be surprised if the interests of Canada in this matter were not safeguarded to the extent to which they should have been safeguarded.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I am prepared to vote for the motion made here to-day not only on its merits but in order to enter my protest against the way Canadian interests have been treated in these negotiations. I have in my hand a despatch written by the Marquis of Lansdowne, Foreign Secretary, to Lord Pauncefote, dated February 22 of last year, in which despatch he says :

> At that time the Joint High Commission, over which the late Lord Herschell presided, was still sitting. That commission was appointed in July, 1898, to discuss various questions at issue between Great Britain and the United States, namely, the fur seal fishery, the fisheries off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, the Alaskan boundary, alien labour laws, reciprocity, transit of merchandise, mining rights, naval vessels on the great lakes, definition and marking of frontiers, and conveyance of persons in custody. But serious difficulties had arisen in the attempt to arrive at an understanding, and it had become doubtful whether any settlement would be effected.

The third paragraph after this one goes on to say :

> Shortly afterwards Lord Herschell intimated that the difficulties in reard to the question of the Alaskan boundary seemed insuperable, and that he feared it might be necessary to break off the negotiations of which he had hitherto had the charge. Upon this Lord Salisbury informed Mr. White that he did not see how Her Majesty's government could sanction any convention for amending the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, as the opinion of this country would hardly support them in making a concession which would be wholly to the benefit of the United States, at a time when they appeared to be so little inclined to come to a satisfactory settlement in regard to the Alaskan frontier.

The whole of the despatch of Lord Lansdowne is an indication of the British position and of our position. He wound up the despatch with this significant sentence :

> It would follow, were His Majesty's government to agree to such an arrangement, that while the United States would have a treaty right to interfere with the canal in time of war, or apprehended war, and while other powers could, with a clear conscience, disregard any of the restrictions imposed by the convention, Great Britain alone, in spite of her enormous possessions on the American continent, in spite of the extent of her Australasian colonies and her interests in the east, would be absolutely precluded from resorting to any such action, or from taking measures to secure her interests in and near the canal.
>
> I request that Your Excellency will explain to the Secretary of State the reason, as set forth in this despatch, why His Majesty's government feel unable to accept the convention in the shape presented to them by the American ambassador, and why they prefer, as matters stand at present, to retain unmodified the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

Lord Lansdowne took that position just one year ago. He took that position because he said it was not in the interests of the empire that the concession which the Americans demanded should be made. He took a very strong position, and he took that position, I believe, on account of his knowledge of Canadian affairs. He had been a Governor General here, he was thoroughly cognizant of our interests and he was prepared to vindicate them and say : This treaty must remain as it is to-day. But, later on, in some way or other, what the Americans wanted was conceded. The canal question was settled, but the very thing in which Canadians were interested, the Alaskan boundary question, and these other questions were stood aside. Why is it that the Americans can get a settlement of their issue and why should that settlement be made at a time, when, according to this very despatch, the Americans :

> Appeared to be so little inclined to come to a satisfactory settlement in regard to the Alaskan frontier.

It is time that this parliament protested against the way in which Canadian interests have been treated in these negotiations, and this is perhaps as good an opportunity as we shall have to enter our protest in this respect. Our interests have not been protected in the way they should have been. For some reason or other they have not been defended as they should have been. When Lord Lansdowne took this strong position and when he declared that Lord Salisbury held that the country would not support the making of a concession wholly to the benefit of the United States at a time when they appeared to be so little inclined to come to a satisfactory settlement in regard to the Alaska frontier—if, I say, at that time, the Canadian government had insisted on Lord Lansdowne standing by her guns, viz., 'to prefer to retain unmodified the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty,' we should have had the settlement of the Alaskan boundary at the time the final treaty was made. We were told some years ago that sunnyways taken down to Washington would secure us our rights. We now know that the sunnyways can do nothing of the kind, but that Americans can have a settlement of their issues while Canadian issues must always stand over. I am voting for the resolution as a

protest of my own against this kind of treatment of Canadian affairs, and I hope and trust that hereafter the government of Canada will represent to the Imperial authorities that when two issues are coupled together, one involving Canada, and one involving the United States, they shall not be uncoupled unless Canadian interests receive the same treatment as is accorded to American interests.

Motion negatived on division.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT—PUBLICATION IN PARTS.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved :

That whereas the yearly Report of the Auditor General is made out so that the expenditure under the control of each department appears as a separate and distinct part, be it resolved, that each such part be in future promptly made public in the ordinary way after it has been prepared.

He said : Mr. Speaker, for many years after confederation the departmental reports were not presented to the public until after the assembling of parliament. Some years ago I made a motion requiring these reports to be circulated as soon as they were prepared, in advance of the assembling of parliament; and also requiring monthly statements as to the public debt, revenue, railway receipts, &c. That motion carried, and since then the reports of the various departments have as a rule been placed in the hands of members before the opening of the session. In all cases where this has been done, it has been found productive of good results, because members can come to their duties informed to some extent with regard to public affairs, and possessing the information which enables them to discharge their duties and to take an interest in the transaction of public business. We have on several occasions been delayed in some branches of the work of this House through a delay in presenting the report of the Auditor General, which is very voluminous and which contains information essential to the discussion of various public questions. I now propose that the information compiled by the Auditor General which relates to the various departments of government should be published and placed in the hands of members as soon as it is prepared, without waiting for the completion of the full report. By this means we will get the reports with regard to Customs, Public Works, and other departments of government, without waiting for the entire report, which comes down sometimes late in the session. The advantages that will be secured by the adoption of this motion are, I think, so obvious that I shall not detain the House further than to propose the motion that I have placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The chief complaint of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is that the delay which sometimes occurs in the bringing down of the Auditor General's Report has been inconvenient to members, and has postponed somewhat the transaction of the business of the House. In that I entirely agree. It is very desirable that the Auditor General's Report should be brought down promptly. This year, however, we have had no reason to complain, because the report was brought down immediately after the opening of parliament. If we could always rely on that, I think the House would have no reason to complain. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I do not think that it is desirable that the Auditor General's Report should be prepared in the piece-meal way he proposes. There are probably as good reasons why other reports dealing with the public service should be divided, but there is a manifest convenience in having the volumes brought down as at present, provided they are brought down promptly and that the business of the House is not delayed. If it were necessary, we might be prepared with an amendment to the legislation, the fixing of the time when the Auditor General shall complete his report and deliver it to the King's Printer, and then we would have a reasonable guarantee that it would be brought down promptly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the English practice ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is somewhat similar to our own, except that I do not think that they distribute documents in advance of the opening of parliament, as we have done in some cases. I think we might provide that the Auditor General should, at a reasonable time before parliament meets, complete his work and deliver his manuscript to the King's Printer, leaving himself, of course, free, if anything should arise later, to make a supplementary report. At present the Auditor General, for very worthy purposes, I am sure, likes to keep matters open, and he is always introducing something into his report in the endeavour to bring it down to the moment when parliament assembles. The consequence is that occasionally very serious delays occur. My own judgment is, that at a date to be fixed by parliament, the Auditor General should complete his report and hand it to the King's Printer, and that no alterations should be made in that volume of the report, but that the printer should publish it and deliver it to members promptly. If anything arises with reference to which the Auditor General wishes to make a further communication to parliament, that might be made the subject of a supplementary return. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) that every good purpose would be served if we are able to guarantee the bringing down of the Auditor General's Report promptly as it was brought down this year, and as I hope may be the case in the future.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Toronto Centre). It is very desirable that the suggestion made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should be complied with. This country has such a high idea of the Auditor General as one of the most important employees of this parliament, that it would be a retrograde step if his action should be hampered in any way in the direction which the Finance Minister has suggested. This matter should be left entirely in the hands of the Auditor General. If he can see his way, under instructions from this House, to bring down his report after the manner suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) it would be a very great convenience to us all. That the Auditor General should be hampered by any positive instructions from the House such as the minister has suggested, would be very undesirable. I think that he should be, as he is now, independent of any instructions from the government in this matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not propose that he should get any instructions from the government, because he is not an officer of the government. I proposed that whatever instructions we would give him should be incorporated in an Act of parliament, because he is an officer of parliament.

Mr. BROCK. I contend that he should not be hampered either by this House or by the government in any way that might prevent him from making any criticisms he may wish to make on the financial affairs of the country.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). When the financial year is closed, the Auditor General has completed one branch of the subject and his report on that branch is just as complete then as it is when the whole report is presented to parliament. The money has been paid out when the transaction is completed, and the country is interested in knowing how the money was paid. If the motion of the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) were carried, there is no doubt that it would be a great benefit to the country. The transactions referred to in the report would then be fresh in the minds of the representatives of the people when parliament met. We could then take note of the report and digest it far better than under the present system of bringing down the entire report when parliament is in session. We have not time to digest it, the press has not time to go over it, and the result is that although it is a most valuable and important report, there is very little scrutiny of it by parliament, the press or the general public. For these reasons, I do not see any objection to the report being brought down in the way proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk, and therefore I will support his motion.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). The arguments which have been advanced in support of this motion presuppose that the financial reports are prepared a considerable time before parliament meets. Whether that is the fact or not I do not know; but it seems to me that the Auditor General's Report, in its present form, assuming that it is brought down early, as it has been this year, meets the case better than would a number of volumes. Independent of that, however, the fact is that efforts have been made for some time to facilitate the work in the Printing Bureau. Those who have no technical knowledge of printing will not understand the difficulties which the management of the Bureau have had to contend with in getting out the reports promptly. They have now reached a point at which they are meeting the requirements of the House with great efficiency; and if the Auditor General's Report were divided into sections, it would simply complicate the work of the Bureau, and make it more difficult for them to issue the report promptly than it is at present. I have some practical knowledge of the matter, and, having looked into the work of the Bureau lately, I believe it is better in every way to issue the report in its present form than to divide it into sections.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the same thing done with the report of the Committee on Agriculture? The evidence of the different witnesses is printed in sections, and at the end they are all bound up together as one report.

Mr. HOLMES. Even so, that means a great deal of work for the Printing Bureau which the hon. member for East Grey knows nothing at all about. To prepare these reports and issue them in supplementary form would be to increase the work of the Bureau instead of facilitating it, without benefit to the members of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it not be possible to distribute to members of parliament the various portions of the Auditor General's Report as they are made up and printed? I do not know whether the printing of the report is all done within a short period of time, or whether it is carried on from the 30th of June of one year to the opening of the session of the following year; but if the printing covers a considerable period of time, it seems to me that there could be no objection to doing what I suggest. The advantage of that would be that members could make themselves more familiar with the report than it is possible to do at present.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the Auditor General's practice is to keep his report open in order that he may bring the work down to the latest possible date before the meeting of parliament. That is one of the things of which we have oc-

casionally complained, although of course recognizing the right of the Auditor General to inform parliament fully of everything in relation to his accounts. I quite agree that if the Auditor completed his main report he would have the right to present to the House a supplementary report at any time. Any difficulty that has occurred has not been owing to what is complained of to-day, but simply to an unusually early meeting of parliament or some other cause. But it seems to me that when the Auditor is able to get his work done and the report issued early, as it has been this year, every interest is served.

Mr. CHARLTON. The different portions of the Auditor General's Report are prepared one following the other, and many of these are ready and could be submitted to parliament long before the volume is completed. I can state that the Auditor General himself, who is perhaps as good a judge in this matter as any one else, believes that this would be a very advantageous arrangement, as it would enable him to place before members of parliament information which, if it is withheld until the whole report is completed, must be brought down at a late date, in a vast volume, when members cannot give the amount of attention to the various matters contained in the report that is desirable. For this reason, it would be an advantage to me, and in my belief to other members of parliament who desire information on public questions, to have the different portions of the Auditor General's Report issued when completed—not for public distribution, but to members of the House. It could add but slightly if at all to the cost of issuing the volume, because these parts would be assembled together and issued as a volume afterwards. I must say that I think the objections of the hon. Minister of Finance are not well founded. I have the authority of the Auditor General for saying that in his opinion this would be a very desirable and proper method to adopt.

House divided on the motion.

YEAS.

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Avery,
Barker,
Birkett,
Blain,
Borden (Halifax),
Brock,
Broder,
Bruce,
Carscallen,
Charlton,
Clancy,
Clare,
Clarke,
Culbert,
Earle,
Fowler,
Ganong,
Gilmour,
Hackett,
Halliday,
Henderson,
Ingram,
Johnston (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,
Kemp,
Kendrey,
Lancaster,
LaRivière,
Lavell,
Lennox,
Maclean,
McGowan,
Monk,
Morin,
Osler,
Pope,
Pringle,
Puttee,
Richardson,
Robinson (Elgin),
Roche (Marquette),
Rosamond,
Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Taylor,
Tolton,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Vrooman,
Ward,
Wilson.—52.

NAYS.

Messieurs

Angers,
Archambault,
Bazinet,
Beith,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bernier,
Blair,
Brunet,
Bureau,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carbonneau,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd.)
Champagne,
Christie,
Copp,
Cowan,
Davis,
Demers (Lévis),
Demers (St. John),
Dugas,
Edwards,
Erb,
Ethier,
Farquharson,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gould,
Guthrie,
Harwood,
Heyd,
Holmes,
Horsey,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hyman,
Johnston (Cape Breton),
Kendall,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Legris,
Lewis,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Mackie,
MacKinnon,
MacLaren (Hunt'n.),
McCarthy,
McColl,
McCreary,
McGugan,
McLennan,
Madore,
Malouin,
Marcil (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martineau,
Matheson,
Maxwell,
Meigs,
Mignault,
Monet,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Oliver,
Paterson,
Proulx,
Reid (Restigouche),
Riley,
Ross (Ontario),
Rousseau,
Russell,
Schell,
Smith (Vancouver),
Stephens,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Talbot,
Tarte,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Turcot,
Turgeon,
Wade,
Wright.—96.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Fraser,	Bell,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Bickerdike,	Bennett.
Bruneau,	Leonard,
McCool,	McLeod,
Emmerson,	Wilmot,
Sifton,	Haggart,
Borden (King's),	Casgrain,
Bourbonnais,	Calvin,
Brown,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Costigan,	Ball,

Delisle,	Cargill,
Douglas,	Hughes (Victoria),
Gallery,	Northrup,
Gibson,	McIntosh,
Girard,	Seagram,
Harty,	Roddick,
Lang,	Sherritt,
Lemieux,	Hale,
McEwen,	Cochrane,
McIsaac,	Porter,
Murray,	Tisdale,
Parmelee,	Boyd,
Power,	MacLaren (Perth),
Prefontaine,	Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Halifax),	Gourley,
Scott,	Kidd,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup.

Motion negatived.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Indian River Railway Company.—Mr. Béland.

Bill (No. 15) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—Mr. Ingram.

Bill (No. 17) to incorporate the Lake Bennett Railway Company.—Mr. Maxwell.

Bill (No. 18) to incorporate the Velvet (Rossland) Mine Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to take up government Bills on a private day with a very thin House, and, as he knows, the House is thin for very serious reasons.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not want to press hon. gentlemen opposite, if my hon. friend wants to adjourn.

PENSIONS TO NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that to-morrow the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that pensions or gratuities may be granted to officers of the North-west mounted police and to the widows and children of such officers, as follows :—

To an officer compulsorily retired, for any cause other than misconduct or inefficiency, after 20 years' service, or retiring voluntarily after 35 years' service, a pension not exceeding one-fiftieth of the pay and allowances of his rank or appointment at the time of his retirement for each year of service ; service beyond 35 years not being reckoned.

Mr. CHARLTON.

To an officer who retires voluntarily after 25 years, but less than 35 years' service, a pension 20 per cent less than is above provided for.

Towards making good the said pensions, 5 per cent to be deducted from the pay of officers.

To an officer retiring on account of infirmity, or retiring to promote efficiency or economy in the service, a gratuity not exceeding one month's pay for each year's service ; if retiring on account of injury received in the discharge of his duties, a gratuity not exceeding three months' pay for every two years' service.

To the widow and children of an officer who had served twenty years, and was at the time of his death on full pay, or in receipt of pension, the following pension or allowance :—in the case of the commissioner, $500 to the widow, and $80 to each child ; the assistant commissioner, a pension of $450 to the widow and a yearly allowance of $80 to each child ; a superintendent or surgeon, $350 to widow, and $70 to each child ; an inspector, assistant surgeon or veterinary surgeon, $250 to widow, and $65 to each child ; it being permissible to double the amount to children if they are motherless and in need ; no allowance to be granted to a son aged eighteen or a daughter aged twenty-one ; and the total amount granted to the family of an officer in one year not to exceed the amount of the pension attached to his rank.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 8.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 6, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth) moved :

That the time for receiving petitions for private bills be extended to Friday, 28th March, inst., and that the time for presenting private bills to Friday, 4th April next, according to the recommendation contained in the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

He said : This corresponds with the time set by the Senate for their adjournment so that it really does not affect the time required for the transaction of the business in respect to these Bills.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before the motion is adopted, I would like to remind the Prime Minister that he has intimated that this was intended to be a short session. That can only be accomplished by adhering as closely as possible to the rules respecting the reception of private Bills. We have to-day adopted a course which we have pur-

sued in the past, it is true, but which if it is continued this session we cannot hope to make the session reasonably short. I would suggest to the right hon. gentleman that it would be well not to have too many repetitions of this, or otherwise the session cannot be kept within reasonable bounds.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think, Mr. Speaker, we should have no repetition of it at all, after this date.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Sovereign Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 30) to incorporate the Sydney Land and Loan Company, Limited.—Mr. Kendall.

QUESTIONS.

STEEL RAILS—CONTRACT WITH MR. CLERGUE.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. How many tons of steel rails have been delivered under the contract entered into with F. H. Clergue, of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, and at what price or prices ?
2. Where were they delivered, on what dates, and in what quantities ?
3. Where were the rails, so delivered, manufactured ?
4. Has delivery been made of all rails contracted for ? If not, how many tons are still to be delivered, at what points are deliveries to be made, and at what price or prices ?
5. Are all future deliveries to be of Canadian manufacture ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That question was answered yesterday.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The same question ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Identically. No rails were delivered by Mr. Clergue.

EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. BELL asked :

Is the government of Nova Scotia urging the government of Canada for a refund to the counties of Pictou, Antigonish and Guysborough of the amounts paid by these counties for right of way of the Eastern Extension Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The matter has been repeatedly brought to the notice of this government by members of the provincial government, but no action has been taken upon it.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—TAX ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS.

Mr. KEMP asked :

1. What steps, if any, have the government taken to cancel or render ineffective certain legislation of the government of Prince Edward Island, 'in restraint of the freedom of trade,' popularly known as a 'tax on commercial travellers' from other provinces in the Dominion ?
2. After this question had 'engaged the close attention of the Honourable Minister of Justice,' in accordance with the statement made by the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries (see 'Hansard' report, page 5331—1901), what was his judgment respecting same ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The legislation in question was reported on by the Minister of Justice; carefully considered by the government and allowed to go into operation.

IMPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BRODER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

What was the total value of our imports for home consumption from the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, under the following heads : Mine, fisheries, forests, animals and their produce, agricultural products, manufactures and miscellaneous ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The answer to this question involves the preparation of a very lengthy special statement, and it is suggested that an Order of the House be asked for a return in this case.

IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN ONTARIO PORTS.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. How many bushels of grain, or other seeds, were shipped through the ports of Depot Harbour, Midland, Collingwood, Meaford, Owen Sound and Sarnia respectively, during the year 1901 ?
2. How many barrels of flour ?
3. How many bags oatmeal ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The grain and other seeds, and flour and oatmeal, shipped through the undermentioned ports during the calendar year 1901, are reported as follows, viz :

——	Grain and other seeds—Bush.	Flour—Brls.	Oatmeal—Bags.
Depot Harbour	17,524,407	143,262	.....
Midland	7,840,546	.....	.....
Collingwood	222,000	.....	.....
Meaford	1,447,222	.....	.....
Owen Sound	1,576,527	1,963	.....
Sarnia	5,624,520	297,669	.....
Goderich	2,665,420	.....	.....

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. KEMP asked :

What rates per ton does the Intercolonial Railway receive for carrying pig iron from Sydney, Cape Breton, to Montreal and points west of Montreal ? What rates for carrying coal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The Intercolonial Railway rate for carrying pig iron from Sydney to Montreal is $2.95 per ton.

2. The rate for carrying coal to the same point is $2.55 per ton. Both of these rates are conditional upon returning box cars being used, which would otherwise have to be hauled east empty.

SALE OF FORFEITED GOODS AT SYDNEY, N.S.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Were tenders invited by public advertisement in the spring of 1901 by the collector of customs at North Sydney, N.S., for certain goods forfeited under the customs law ?

2. If so, how many tenders were received, the names of tenderers and amounts of their respective offers for said goods ?

3. Was any tender accepted; and if not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

1. Tenders were invited by public advertisement on the 16th March, 1901, by the collector of customs at North Sydney, N.S., for goods forfeited under the customs laws.

2. Tenders were received from the following persons for the goods advertised, viz : David C. Musgrove, $607; John P. Brennan, $509.32; Charles W. Lavers, for tobacco and cigars, $113.25.

3. None of the tenders were accepted because articles covered by different seizures were not distinguished separately in the advertisement and goods which were not intended to be sold at the time were by error included in the notice for tenders.

Tenders were again invited by public advertisement and the tender of D. C. Musgrave for $591.50 for the forfeited goods (lots 1 to 5, inclusive) was accepted.

EXPENDITURE ON CANALS.

Mr. DAVIS—by Mr. Calvert—asked :

1. How much has been spent by the Dominion government on each of our canals since confederation ?

2. What has been the cost of maintenance in each case ?

3. How much revenue has been derived from same ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The answer to this involves reading a complicated statement which I would ask the permission of the House to give to 'Hansard.' The answer is as follows :

1. Amount spent by Dominion government on each canal since confederation :

Canal.	Chargeable to Capital.	Chargeable to Income.	Chargeable to Maintenance (Staff Repairs).	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
St. Peters	492,023 82	138,119 97	88,746 94	718,890 73
Baie Verte	.....	44,387 53	.....	44,387 53
Lachine	8,421,876 09	278,170 40	2,309,623 97	11,009,670 46
Beauharnois	25,266 15	199,391 99	725,762 64	950,420 78
Cornwall	4,861,777 29	118,831 70	898,228 47	5,878,837 46
Williamsburg	7,295,342 11	44,916 70	525,987 06	7,866,247 87
Welland	16,376,100 18	591,561 66	5,009,925 96	21,977,587 80
Ste. Anne	1,035,759 12	57,265 33	160,940 87	1,253,965 32
Carillon and Grenville	4,119,039 32	166,316 39	822,568 50	5,107,924 21
Culbute	382,906 46	55,328 87	18,543 63	456,778 96
Rideau	19,559 30	312,099 33	1,650,165 22	1,981,823 85
St. Ours	.....	100,235 56	127,632 76	227,868 32
Chambly	2,345 00	465,774 49	1,002,628 67	1,470,748 16
Murray	1,247,470 26	400 00	101,471 59	1,349,341 85
Trent	2,851,956 06	178,372 99	186,508 26	3,216,837 31
Tay	489,599 23	748 65	.....	490,347 88
Sault Ste. Marie	4,093,025 60	997 74	139,319 01	4,233,342 35
Soulanges	6,254,692 43	115 00	42,755 39	6,297,562 82
	57,968,738 42	2,753,036 30	13,810,808 94	74,532,583 66

2. See column of maintenance above. 3. Total revenue, $12,717,343.01.

MANITOBA REFERENDUM ACT.

Mr. PUTTEE asked :

1. Has the government received a petition from the Manitoba Prohibition Alliance urging, on constitutional grounds, the disallowance of the Referendum Act of 1902 ?

2. If so, has any decision been arrived at, and what is it ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll) :

1. Yes, upon grounds claimed by petitioners to be constitutional.

2. No.

THE ALASKA BOUNDARY.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say that in looking over the Debates of yesterday, I find that references were made to certain remarks I made some time ago in regard to a declaration made by Sir Louis Davies with reference to the Alaska boundary. I have not with me to-day the papers with which to justify my statement, but I will bring them to-morrow ; and, before the Orders of the Day are called, I will read a letter which I received from Sir Louis Davies to that effect.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :—

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1902, and in accordance with the provisions of ' The British North America Act, 1867,' the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, March 6, 1902.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved :

That the message of His Excellency, together with the estimates accompanying it, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

COLONIAL TROOPS IN DEFENCE OF THE EMPIRE.

Mr. DOMINIQUE MONET (Laprairie and Napierville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to a telegram from London, that was published this very morning by the Ottawa ' Citizen,' and which reads as follows :

London, March 5.—The war office scheme mentioned by the war secretary, Mr. Brodrick, in the House of Commons yesterday evening, by which he hoped the colonial forces would become available in the event of war involving the general interests of the empire, is said to-day to contemplate India providing three army corps, South Africa two army corps, Australia two army corps, New Zealand one army corps and Canada four militia army corps.

These in addition to six British army corps would constitute a force for Imperial defence little inferior in numbers to the legions of the continental military powers.

The Montreal ' Gazette,' in its issue of this morning, reproduces this telegram and gives the very words used by Mr. Brodrick on the floor of the English House of Commons. He said :

I trust it may be possible that an arrangement may be made by which the whole forces of the empire would be available in case of war in which the whole of the empire would be involved. An opportunity for conferring with our colonial friends on this subject will occur at the time of the Coronation.

When this telegram is published in the evening papers, I do not think I am wide from the mark when I say that it will arouse the public opinion and create a sensation throughout the country. May I ask the right hon. Prime Minister to tell us whether, in his opinion the information conveyed by this telegram is well founded or not ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the government has had no information whatever up to the present time of the declarations alleged to have been made by the hon. Mr. Brodrick. No communication of any kind with regard to any scheme of military defense to be applied to the empire has been received by us, and I think that when the exact words of Mr. Brodrick are brought to our attention, it will be found that he has been misrepresented. As to the intention said to have been indicated by Mr. Brodrick of taking up this matter of Imperial defence for discussion at the conference which is to take place next summer, the correspondence which will be brought down in a few days, in answer to a motion which was passed by the House some time ago, will show the attitude of this government on that question.

TELEPHONE COMPANIES.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York) moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) respecting Telephone Companies.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would ask my hon. friend to allow this to stand, in view of the measure which the government has brought in on the same subject.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, but I would point out, for the information of the hon. leader of the House and the House itself, that my Bill may contain provisions not contained in the government measure, and there should

be no objection to my Bill being read the second time and going to the committee, and the two Bills being considered there together. That being the case, I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House to-day in moving the second reading of this Bill. The object of this Bill is to comply with a widespread public expression in favour of some kind of regulation of the telephone companies of this country. It has been found that these companies have not been treating the public fairly, and this parliament has been besieged with petitions from all over the country in favour of some measure of this kind. At the present time they are under no regulation, and they do with the public pretty much as they choose. Just take two or three instances in point. These companies, like other great companies, are incorporated to do a certain business, and are given a great franchise; but there is no compelling clause in their charters to force them to give the public a reasonable service, a cheap service, or a service wherever the public may demand it. It is high time that some means should be adopted for compelling these companies to treat the public fairly.

The Bill which I have introduced provides for the regulation and control of the rates of all telephone companies. It further provides that these companies shall give equal treatment to every section of the community, and that every company shall give the use of its wires to any other company that may desire to use them at tolls to be regulated by the government. In England they have very strict and up-to-date legislation in regard to telephone companies. The charters of all such companies in England cease in 1911. Before they can do business they must be licensed by the Postmaster General, and must have their rates approved by the government; and in every way provision is made by which local or municipal authorities who wish to establish a telephone service of their own, will be enabled to do so. I am looking forward to having provisions of a similar character put into this Bill, so that not only will the rates of every company be regulated, but it will be compelled to give exchange rates to any other telephone company, and will be prevented from discriminating against municipalities which wish to establish their own telephone systems. Mark what has happened in the case of several municipalities in this country which desired to establish local telephone services. Immediately that they announced their intention of doing so, the Bell Telephone Company cut their rates down to $3 or $5 a year in order to close up the local competing company. This Bill provides that if they do that in one locality, they must do it all over the country. In that way they would be prevented from choking off local competition. In Ontario provision has already been made in the Municipal Act whereby municipalities can go into the telephone business, and can borrow money for that purpose; but if any municipality desired to have an exchange over the system of the Bell Telephone Company, it would probably be blocked. My Bill provides that every telephone company shall give equal service to everybody who applies for it. I have been told that this would be interfering with their rights. If we compel them to give the use of their system to local companies, they will be paid for it and are not going to lose anything. The great argument used is that we will be interfering with the Bell Telephone Company by compelling it to give fair treatment to local companies, but it will be very well paid, even though the rates they receive be regulated by the government.

The Bill introduced by the hon. the Minister of Justice proposes to put the control of the telephone companies under the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I think it would be better to vest the jurisdiction, as is done in England, in the Postmaster General. In England the Postmaster General has the fullest control over all these telephone companies. He can license them, revise their rates, and compel them all to use the trunk lines which are owned by the government in connection with the post office.

I do not intend to go over the other details of my Bill, as they will be fully threshed out in the committee.

I am told that my Bill will interfere with certain municipal rights. If that be the case, I am prepared to consent to an amendment which will get rid of that objection. However, I do not believe that a Dominion charter can override the municipal right, but it may be better to put in a provision protecting the municipalities, and I am prepared to listen to any recommendation made on their behalf.

I would move the second reading of my Bill, on the understanding that it will go to the Committee of Railways and be considered at the same time as the Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). If my hon. friend really has in view the control by the government of Canada of the telephone companies, his Bill entirely fails to accomplish that object. However, it is idle to spend our time discussing its details. My hon. friend has fully explained his measure, and when it comes before the Railway Committee, its various provisions will be thoroughly discussed. My hon. friend suggests that the control of rates should be within the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General. That suggestion is worthy of being considered. But when he refers to what is done in England, I would remind him that in this country the telegraph companies are not within the control of the Postmaster General as they are in the

mother country. In the hon. gentleman's own Bill, he omitted to make any provision for any control by the Postmaster General, so that his suggestion to this effect is evidently one that has occurred to him lately, and no doubt he will explain his change of opinion before the committee.

Mr. MACLEAN. If my Bill does not secure government control of the rates, I hope the Bill of my hon. friend does, and in that case I will make way for him.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the Minister of Justice if both Bills are to be considered at the same time by the Railway Committee ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That of course is a matter for the Railway Committee to decide, but in my opinion it would be better that they should be.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose that reasonable time will be given the municipalities, after the hon. gentleman's Bill has been printed and distributed, to give most careful consideration to both Bills and to be heard before the Railway Committee.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am having a hundred additional copies printed of my Bill, and have arranged that hon. gentlemen may be enabled to send them to the municipalities interested.

Mr. CLARKE. That arrangement is quite satisfactory.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would ask that arrangements be made to print extra copies of my Bill also, as a number of municipalities have asked me for copies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAYS.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin) moved second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act with respect to drainage. He said: This Bill is of a similar nature to that introduced a few days ago by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan), and I would like to have it sent to the committee at the same time, so that both Bills may be considered together. The farmers in my constituency are very much interested in this measure. There are four different railway corporations doing business there and one which comes within a mile of the place. No doubt railways are of great benefit to the farmers, but they also frequently do considerable injury to the lands through which they pass. Fences, timber and crops on these lands frequently suffer considerable damage from the operations of a railway. Many years ago, when railways were first built, the question of drainage was not given sufficient consideration, and many railway companies have refused to give proper drainage. There is no law compelling them to do so, and I hope that this parliament will see that the farmers get justice in this matter. Last year a similar Bill to this was referred to a sub-committee, composed of eleven members, and that committee reported favourably upon some of the clauses. This year I hope that the whole matter will be taken up again and the farmers satisfied.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

ANGLO-GERMAN COMMERCIAL AGREEMENT.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I think that, with the permission of the House, I ought to change the wording of the resolution which stands in my name. I gave notice of a motion for :

> Copy of all correspondence, despatches and memoranda which may have passed between the British government and the Canadian government relating to the new Anglo-German Treaty of Commerce.

The arrangement arrived at between Great Britain and Germany in the early part of 1898 was not a new treaty. The treaty of 1865 had been denounced, and went out of course; and in 1898, an agreement was arrived at but not an agreement having the solemnity of a treaty. I would, therefore, with the permission of the House change the wording of this motion to this :

> All correspondence which may have passed between the British government and the Canadian government relating to the new Anglo-German Commercial Agreement of 1898.

This would cover the object I have in view and would avoid describing as a treaty what is, as I understand it, a mere commercial arrangement for a certain time. After what has been decided by this House, I feel that in proposing this arrangement, I and those who join with me in calling for these papers are leading a forlorn hope. It seems evident, under the interpretation of our constitutional usages which has been given, that, in the opinion of the majority of hon. members of this House, the representatives of the people, even though met not merely for the purpose of voting supplies but for the purpose of passing judgment on the administration in general, cannot demand to be put in possession of information which will enable them to form a proper judgment of the doings of the government. I shall not again go over the authorities which I had the honour to quote to you and to this House on a proposition with which, I take it, the members of the House are now absolutely familiar. I believe I am right in stating that the Commons of Canada, as well as the Commons of England, after the final adoption of any act of the government, diplomatic, or otherwise, are entitled to have laid before them the correspondence had by the government, and, as representing the people to

judge in the light of that correspondence the acts of the government. This motion addresses itself to just such a series of acts. After the denunciation of the Anglo-German treaty of 1865, negotiations were at once entered into by the British government and the German government for a renewal of commercial relations between those countries.

The public and parliament of England were made aware at an early date after the denunciation of that treaty—one has only to examine the English 'Hansard' to be convinced of the fact—that negotiations were going on. What we desire to know to-day, and what I submit this House has a right to know, is what representations were made to the British government by our own authorities in regard to our interests when the new commercial agreement was arranged and was to come into force. It is evident from the agreement which was arrived at in 1898 that we had a paramount interest, since, as a result of that agreement, Great Britain and, if I mistake not, all the British dependencies were given the advantage of the most-favoured nation clause, and Canada alone was excluded from the benefit of that agreement, thereby causing an appreciable impediment to our grain trade with the German Empire. Since then there has been a falling off instead of an increase in our trade with Germany. It must be evident to every member of this House, as it requires no argument to show, that having been transferred from the tariff as it stood in 1897 to a higher tariff, having been deprived of the most-favoured nation clause under the new agreement of 1898, we in Canada stand to-day in a more unfavourable position than we did previous to the consummation of that agreement.

Now, what have been in the meantime the endeavours made by this government which was so anxious, if we are to take the declarations made a long time ago by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to open up new avenues of trade with every country in the world, if possible? What have been the endeavours made by this government to see, as it was their duty to see, that the interests of this country should be protected? When the time arrived to make the final agreement between England and Germany in 1898, no doubt this government took great pains to make representations to the British government to prevent the unfortunate ending of the negotiations, to prevent this country from being excluded, as it is specially excluded, singled out for exclusion, from the benefits to be derived from the new agreement? Memoranda must have passed between both governments; and it is not only our duty to ourselves to have this memoranda and that correspondence before us, but I submit it is the duty of the government, in face of that agreement as we read it, to disculpate itself, and to show that, having boasted that it has obtained the denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties, and made, as they say, of this country a nation, it is their duty to show that they have taken up the role which appertains to a young nation, that they have done their very best to see that our interests were protected at the time the agreement was made to which this motion refers, the agreement of 1898. What conclusion, Mr. Speaker, must we arrive at if the government should refuse to give us that correspondence? There will be but one conclusion throughout the country, and I submit it will be a fair conclusion, namely, that there is no correspondence; that the government have failed in their duty to make those representations to the home government which, if properly made, would have had undoubtedly the effect of assuring to us a continuance of the German market for our agricultural produce, and particularly for our grain. I say that if the government refuses, as it has already done on similiar occasions, to lay before the representatives of the people the correspondence in question, it will produce in the public mind a well-founded conviction, either that those representations were wrongly made, were not made with that insistence with which they should have been made under the circumstances, or else that no representations were made at all; that those gentlemen were so busy arranging their own difficulties amongst themselves that they forgot their duty upon that important point; that they were so busy, like the Macduffs and the Macbeths, in 'laying on' to one another, that they did not cry 'hold! enough!' or take up sufficient time to make in a dignified and firm way to the Imperial government, those representations which I have no doubt would have been listened to if they had been made properly and at the proper time.

Sir, it is a circumstance which I think should be mentioned, that all the correspondence having reference to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty has been laid before the British parliament, conformably to the usages which obtain in England. Mr. Speaker, the convention by which the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was abrogated was signed at Washington on February 5, 1900; and conformably, as I have said, to the usage which has obtained in England since they have true parliamentary government, since they have responsible government, since ministers are obliged to submit every one of their acts to the judgment of the people's representatives, scarcely a month had passed before the whole correspondence was laid before the British parliament, although we have hitherto vainly sought to obtain it here. Why have we not that correspondence here? It can be obtained for a penny.

But, it seems somewhat strange that in the home of liberty and constitutional practice, the members of the House of Commons, on the 25th of March, and the members of the House of Lords, on the 25th of March, 1901, should have had all that correspondence before them, and that we, in this country, who only participated and could only have participated incidentally in the conclusion of the convention, we British subjects, claiming to have the same rights as they have in England, are deprived of that correspondence which has been laid before the House of Commons and the House of Lords in England, and that we should be obliged to address ourselves to the mother country, to correspond with members of parliament in England, or with friends on the other side to obtain that which had been produced to them, which was laid before the representatives of the people about a month, as I have stated, after the convention of the 5th of February, 1901, abrogating the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which had been finally concluded at Washington. I know that it is not the right of any member of this House to criticise the decisions of this House, and I have too much respect for the rules of the House and for the House itself to allow myself to transgress that rule, but I think I am not going too far when I say that the anomalous spectacle of the representatives of the people of England having before them the correspondence in question and our own representatives of the people in this country being deprived of it, may lead some people in this country and in the other country from which we derive our free political institutions, to wonder if we are, to use the language of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), going forward, or if, in reality, we are not, under this government going backward, and will be obliged to fight for our liberties over again. I appeal, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues from the province of Quebec, with whom I am perhaps more familiar, more intimate, than with my colleagues from the other provinces, to say whether they are not in favour of the fullest and most entire knowledge being conveyed to the members of this House of each and every act of the government, to say whether we are to return to the old idea of an absolute division between the executive and the legislative power, or whether we are to conform to the principle which without any doubt obtains in England to-day that the executive power, the ministry of the day, constitutes nothing in reality but a committee of the House of Commons, a committee of parliament, and that the parliament of which the administration is only a committee has a right to the amplest and the fullest knowledge of every act of the government. We hear a great deal sometimes from these hon. gentlemen in respect to the rights of parliament, but I appeal to my hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Angers), for instance, to say whether he does not support my contention on this point. I feel that in moving for this correspondence I will have the support of my hon. friend from Laprairie (Mr. Monet), and indeed, Sir, the question seems to me to be such a simple one, it seems to me we are so clearly entitled to the communication of every one of the representations made and memoranda written to the British government by this government during the year and a half that elapsed between the denunciation of the treaty and the final making of this new agreement of 1898, that I venture to say that any hon. member of this House who votes against our obtaining communication of this memoranda will be, in reality, denying to this House one of its oldest and most precious privileges.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has displayed a great deal of mock heroics without any adequate cause at all. He knows very well that there is no reason for him on this occasion to say that he is going to fight for the liberties of the people and the rights of parliament. He will not be called upon to go to such extremities as that. He knows very well that there is not even cause for any interference with parliament on this occasion, but the weakness of the position which he has assumed is such that he has made a strong effort to rebuke the House for the decision it took yesterday. If he has not forgotten the authorities which he quoted yesterday he knows that the one exception which is made to the standing rule that parliament is to be placed in possession of every act of the government relates to matters which are still under consideration. My hon. friend says that the parliament of Great Britain has been more favoured than the parliament of Canada because the parliament of Great Britain has had communication of all the correspondence in regard to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. The matter is at an end so far as the government of Great Britain is concerned. There was no reason, therefore, why the rule should not apply. But, the matter is still pending so far as Canada and the people of Canada are concerned. If the hon. gentleman looks into this correspondence—I have had no occasion to look into it—but, I am sure that none of the representations which have been made by Canada in regard to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and the settlement of the Alaskan boundary will be found in that correspondence, because the matter is still under consideration. And so it is in regard to this very question we have here. We have made representations, we are still negotiating, and I may say to the hon. gentleman that we are not only negotiating with the government of Great Britain, but that, so far as we can, also, although we cannot do it formally, we have

made representations to the government of Germany, not officially, of course, because we are not in a position to do so, not having the right to make our own treaties, but so far as we can make representations informally in order to plead our own case with Germany, we have done so. The matter is still pending. The communications which have been addressed by us and which are under the consideration of the government of Germany, have not yet been answered; yet, the hon. gentleman would have us bring down that correspondence and therefore spoil all these negotiations or any effect they could have hereafter. I am surprised at the insistence of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) in asking to place the House in possession of correspondence which is still pending, and to publish which would therefore be in direct violation of this very rule for which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is ready to fight and to shed his blood. I have only to make the statement to the House, that the correspondence is still pending and therefore there is no reason why this motion should be granted, and it cannot be granted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) saw fit to taunt the hon. member (Mr. Monk) with his desire to fight, he might have recalled the days when the right hon. gentleman himself proclaimed that he was ready to shoulder his musket on the banks of the Saskatchewan. I suppose my right hon. friend, on that occasion thought that he was about to shoulder his musket in defence of the constitutional liberties of this country, and therefore I see no reason why he should reproach my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) with being willing to follow the example which he himself has given. If my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has been indulging in mock heroics, what was the right hon. gentleman indulging in when he made that profession to the country on a former occasion. The right hon. gentleman should have a better memory. He has reproached me sometimes with a poor memory, but apparently his own memory has failed to-day and he has not recalled the past quite as vividly as he might have done, or otherwise he would not have used that language in reference to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk).

With regard to the motion itself I think it is highly desirable that this House should have information as to the stand this government has taken on this question. There are several reasons for that. In the first place, we have an illustration of what may have taken place in the past, by comparing the despatch of Lord Lansdowne concerning the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, with the stand which has been taken by members of this government respecting that very matter. Lord Lansdowne, in his despatch, took the ground most clearly and distinctly that the British empire in the right of Canada, was most distinctly especially interested in the question as to whether or not that treaty should be abrogated. I venture to think that we will look in vain for any intimation from the right hon. gentleman himself, or from any member of his government, to show us that this government has ever seen fit to take, with the Imperial government, such a stand as that. Otherwise, how is it that after a stand of that kind was taken by Lord Lansdowne we should find so complete a change of face to have been made by the Imperial government as that which resulted in the abrogation of this treaty without any word of settlement whatever respecting the Alaskan boundary question.

I come more immediately to the question now before the House. In view of the language of the Finance Minister last year when he practically justified the action of Germany, is it not right that we should know whether or not this government in its communications with the Imperial government on that important subject to this country, took the ground that the Minister of Finance took in this House, when he practically justified the action of Germany, because forsooth he said : We have discriminated against Germany and therefore Germany had a right to discriminate against us. I do not pretend to be quoting the words of the Finance Minister exactly, but I venture to think that any hon. gentleman who looks up 'Hansard' will find that is practically the stand which the Finance Minister took last year in this House. Under these circumstances I think it is high time that this House should be informed of the position of the government in regard to this matter. It was brought to the attention of the government during the debate on the Address last year ; it was brought again to the attention of the government in the debate upon the motion to go into Supply when the Minister of Finance delivered his budget speech. Notwithstanding that, the government came down this year with a Speech from the Throne dealing with many matters of the most trivial character and not saying one word to this House or to this country with regard to so important a question as that. That, Sir, would seem to indicate that the government is not seized in this matter with the view which prevails throughout the country as to its importance. If we can judge by the utterances of the ministers, they do not seem to realize that this matter is of the importance which is attached to it throughout the country. In the light of the action of the government with regard to this, in view of the fact that they have taken no action ; that their public utterances seem to indicate that they think that no action is necessary ; it seems to me that the House is justified in asking to have exact information as to the course which has been taken by this government with the Imperial gov-

ernment respecting this most important matter, and that the papers which have been moved for by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), should be brought down for the information of the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker. It is quite certain now that the government have not protected the interests of Canada in connection with this German matter. If we want any evidence as to their incompetence to protect the rights of Canada, we need not go further than their conduct with regard to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. I wish to direct the House for a moment to one or two of the main points bearing upon that matter. On February 22, 1901, just about a year ago, Lord Lansdowne did write a despatch, and this despatch is, I say, the charter of the liberties of Canada as regards the negotiations conducted by the mother country with outside nations on behalf of this country. There is in that despatch, to be found the charter of Canadian liberty. There never was such a declaration of the right of Canada to be considered in all these negotiations, as there is in that despatch of Lord Lansdowne. For the information of the House I intend to read that despatch to-day. It was in reference to the proposal to establish a new treaty between the United States and Great Britain dealing with the Nicaragua canal, and in his communication to Lord Pauncefote the Marquis of Lansdowne used the following words—and I wish the House to pay particular attention to them :

'So far as Her Majesty's government were concerned, there was no desire to procure a modification of that convention. Some of its provisions had, however, for a long time past been regarded with disfavour by the government of the United States, and in the President's message to congress of December, 1898, it was suggested, with reference to a concession granted by the government of Nicaragua, that some definite action by congress was urgently required if the labours of the past were to be utilized, and the linking of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by a practical waterway to be realized. It was further urged that the construction of such a maritime highway was more than ever indispensable to that intimate and ready intercommunication between the eastern and western seaboards of the United States demanded by the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands and the prospective expansion of American influence and commerce in the Pacific, and that the national policy called more imperatively than ever for the control of the projected highway by the government of the United States.

This passage in the message having excited comment, Your Excellency made inquiries of the Secretary of State in order to elicit some information as to the attitude of the President.

In reply, the views of the United States' government were very frankly and openly explained. You were also most emphatically assured that the President had no intention whatever of ignoring the Clayton-Bulwer convention, and that he would loyally observe treaty stipulations. But in view of the strong national feeling in favour of the construction of the Nicaragua canal, and of the improbability of the work being accomplished by private enterprise, the United States' government were prepared to undertake it themselves upon obtaining the necessary powers from congress. For that purpose, however, they must endeavour, by friendly negotiation, to obtain the consent of Great Britain to such a modification of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty as would, without affecting the general principle therein declared, enable the great object in view to be accomplished for the benefit of the commerce of the world. Although the time had hardly arrived for the institution of formal negotiations to that end, congress not having yet legislated, the United States government, nevertheless, were most anxious that Your Excellency should enter at once into pourparlers with a view to preparing, for consideration, a scheme of arrangement.

Her Majesty's government agreed to this proposal, and the discussion which took place in consequence resulted in the draft convention which Mr. Hay handed to Your Excellency on the 11th January, 1899.

At that time the Joint High Commission, over which the late Lord Herschell presided, was still sitting. That commission was appointed in July, 1898, to discuss various questions at issue between Great Britain and the United States, namely, the fur-seal fishery, the fisheries off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, the Alaskan boundary, alien labour laws, reciprocity, transit of merchandise, mining rights, naval vessels on the great lakes, definition and marking of frontiers, and conveyance of persons in custody. But serious difficulties had arisen in the attempt to arrive at an understanding, and it had become doubtful whether any settlement would be affected.

In reply, therefore, to a request for a speedy answer with regard to the convention, the Marquess of Salisbury informed Mr. White, the American chargé d'affaires, that he could not help contrasting the precarious prospects and slowness of the negotiations which were being conducted by Lord Herschell with the rapidity of decision proposed in the matter of the convention. Her Majesty's government might be reproached with having come to a precipitate agreement on a proposal which was exclusively favourable to the United States, while they had come to no agreement at all on the controversy where there was something to be conceded on both sides.

Shortly afterwards Lord Herschell intimated that the difficulties in regard to the question of the Alaskan boundary seemed insuperable, and that he feared it might be necessary to break off the negotiations of which he had hitherto had the charge. Upon this Lord Salisbury informed Mr. White that he did not see how Her Majesty's government could sanction any convention for amending the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, as the opinion of this country would hardly support them in making a concession which would be wholly to the benefit of the United States, at a time when they appeared to be so little inclined to come to a satisfactory settlement in regard to the Alaskan frontier.

These two last paragraphs are, as I said before, the charter of the liberties of Canada in the matter of negotiations with outside nations. There is a statement contained in that extract which I have read, quoting

the opinion of Lord Salisbury, the former foreign secretary of England, and that opinion is reinforced by the present foreign secretary, Lord Lansdowne, who was a Governor General of Canada ; who was the greatest British statesman ever identified with the government of this country, and who to-day is the equal of any statesman in Europe. He endorsed the doctrine laid down by Lord Salisbury : That no convention should be made unless the rights of Canada in connection with the Alaskan boundary should be discussed and should be settled at the same time.

I say that is the charter of our liberties as regards these negotiations, though it is not contained in an Act of parliament. It happens to be contained in that Imperial despatch ; but many of the great liberties of the British and Canadian people are contained in just such documents as this. When that statement was made, and it was put on record that there should be no settlement of this question until the Alaskan boundary question was settled, a way was opened for securing the rights of Canada. But the rights of Canada were completely ignored ; and why ? Because we had an incompetent government in power in Canada who, when they knew that the British government had taken that stand, failed to insist on the British government maintaining it. They abandoned the whole case of Canada and allowed the Americans to have their own way and get everything they demanded. Nor is it strange, when you investigate the history of hon. gentlemen opposite, to find them neglecting the interests of this country. They are the party of commercial union. They sent the senator from Ontario to go to the Boston meeting to promote commercial union. They preached the doctrine that this is the continent to which we belong. They are the party who throughout their whole history have been ready to abandon the rights of Canada and to allow the United States to ride rough shod over us. That is the charge we make to-day—that they have completely ignored the interests of Canada in connection with this German treaty ; that they failed to put in a proper protest : that they did nothing. They are also the party, who in connection with our trade relations with the mother country, have been ready to give a preference without getting any preference in return. That is not protecting the rights of Canada ; that is not true Canadian statesmanship. They are also the party who were willing to allow their leading man to become a picturesque figure in the jubilee procession, but were not willing to accept the offer of a trade preference to Canada when it was held out to them. In their whole record we find that they have been ever ready to abandon the interests of Canada, and by a side wind to advance the interests of the United States. Now, we are sick and tired of that in this country. We want statesmen like Sir John Macdonald who, in connection with the Washington treaty, made it clear that he would not consent to anything which was against the interests of Canada. He never sacrificed the interests of his country, and he never had such an opportunity as hon. gentlemen opposite had to hold the British government to such a magnificent declaration as that contained in the despatch of Lord Lansdowne. There never was such a declaration made before ; and, by reason of the fact that Lord Lansdowne was then in control of the Foreign Office, and, by reason of his experience in Canada, he had a thorough knowledge of affairs in America, and especially of the interests of Canada, and was prepared to stand by them ; and he had the support of Lord Salisbury in doing so ; but, so far as we know, there is no declaration on the part of any Canadian statesman showing that hon. gentlemen opposite insisted on Lord Lansdowne, Lord Salisbury and the British government standing by that declaration of theirs, or offered any protest when it was abandoned. They allowed it to be swept to the four winds, and the Americans got everything they demanded. They got the right to build that canal and to override every contention which Canada has put forward, while we got nothing, and our case was allowed to stand over. The same thing is happening in connection with this German treaty, and the same thing will continue to happen so long as we have unpatriotic men at the head of the affairs of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, I say that the affairs of this country are in the hands of unpatriotic men. They are the men who were commercial unionists a few years ago, who had no faith in Canada, who told us that Canada would only succeed by the favour or grace of the United States. They are the men who told us that preferential trade with the mother country did not amount to anything. They are the men who are ready to sacrifice our interests in order to give a preference to the mother country in our markets. That is not the view Canadians hold. They want public men who will insist on their rights, and will defend their rights. If they do not, they will put men in office who will. The reason I say that hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be dispossessed of power, and dispossessed to-day is that, so far as we know, they have failed to protect the rights of Canada when that great opportunity presented itself last August. So far as we know they did nothing. When asked to bring down the papers, they had an opportunity to tell us whether they had done anything or not in connection with the German treaty ; but they have evidently done nothing. That German treaty is a detriment to Canada. It is the outcome of the miserable

preference which hon. gentlemen opposite gave two years ago. I repudiate that preference. It is contrary to the interests of Canada. It is contrary to national policy; it is against the interests of Canadian workmen and Canadian factories. It is giving something to the manufacturers and workingmen of England, and to German and other foreign manufacturers, at the expense of the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian workingman. That is not the way to show your loyalty to the mother country. The way to show your loyalty, as I said before, is by sending troops when she needs them—doing something for the nation, not for individual Englishmen who happen to be manufacturers or workingmen. I say I repudiate that preference; it is unpatriotic and un-Canadian, and this misunderstanding with Germany is the outcome of it. And all this is because hon. gentlemen opposite are wrong in their whole policy. They have always been shilly-shallying with the trade question, and have always been getting into trouble. If they had been honest protectionists, as they profess to be now——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). No, no.

Mr. MACLEAN. Do I hear the hon. member for South Oxford say that he is not an honest protectionist?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Certainly not.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is he a dishonest one? He sits there as a defender of the national policy.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, by no means.

Mr. MACLEAN. Why has he not repudiated it? Why has he not left the government which is maintaining it?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman does not know the difference between a tariff for revenue and a protective tariff.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. Minister of Public Works says it is a protective tariff, but not sufficiently so, and he wants to make it more protective. I gather now that there is a storm coming and that John of Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is to have his jacket warmed in a very few days by Richard of Oxford. When that comes, it will simply be an additional evidence that this government has no fixed or determined policy and is sacrificing the interests of Canada on every possible occasion. It has sacrificed them in the past, and is prepared again to do so, when the greatest opportunity ever yet presented to a Canadian statesman will present itself in June next. This government has been invited to send over a delegate to meet the other colonial representatives and the British authorities with the view of arranging some kind of inter-Imperial trade relation. Can we trust hon. gentlemen opposite to take part in these negotiations in view of the record they have made in connection with the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty? They will go over there prepared to be gold bricked, prepared to give a preference and get nothing in return, as they have done already, and will be received in the capital of the world as 'rubes' prepared to give away everything. There is any amount of evidence that hon. gentlemen opposite are not competent to protect our interests in connection with foreign affairs. As a matter of fact they have no defence to offer and cannot show that they have done anything to protect the interests of Canada in connection with the German treaty.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I presume that, so far as the discussion in relation to the documents pertaining to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is concerned, that incident is now closed. But, if the right hon. the Prime Minister had known yesterday that these documents, or a portion of them, were made public in the Imperial House of Commons nearly two years ago, I think that his attitude would have been entirely different.

As regards the motion now before the House for the correspondence between this government and the government of Great Britain regarding the question of German discrimination, this discrimination has been going on some four or five years, and I do not see that the government is any nearer a settlement of the matter than when it first took it up. It seems to me that sufficient time has elapsed to entitle us to have the documents produced and laid on the Table. The right hon. the Prime Minister has been made aware on many occasions through public bodies in this country, of the situation. In Toronto, in December of 1900, a deputation waited upon him to urge that something should be done. He then described the situation as a German boycott of Canadian products. On July 25, 1901, the Toronto Board of Trade again presented a petition to the government on this question. The Montreal Board of Trade also approached the government as well as the Montreal Corn Exchange, and urged it to do something. In its petition to His Excellency in Council, the Montreal Corn Exchange said:

> Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that Your Excellency in Council will be pleased to take into consideration the matter of said tariff discrimination by Germany against Canada, with a view of adopting the course usually pursued by other nations under like circumstances, i.e., the imposing of such increased duties on German goods imported into Canada as may demonstrate to the German government the inexpediency of continuing to with-

hold from this country the most-favoured nation treatment it formerly enjoyed.

It has been said by the right hon. the Prime Minister that we have no treaty making power. That being the case, what is our position ? Great Britain, being a free trade country, is unable to make reciprocity treaties with other nations, and can be of no help to us in this matter, so that it becomes a serious question what are we going to do, if other nations besides Germany pursue the same course. The position of our producers is this : When our products were allowed to go into Germany on the same conditions as those of the United States, one of our largest grain exporters in this country exported into Germany, by way of Montreal, in the year 1897-8, 1,767,397 bushels of grain, and by way of Portland, 1,549,842. Since then this same firm has only exported 73,727 bushels from Montreal and 70,000 bushels by way of Portland to Germany. True, after this discrimination took place, a very large amount of Canadian products found their way to Germany through the United States and were classified by the Germans as American products. But the Germans, having discovered this practice, now insist on certificates of the origin of the production so as to show that these are Canadian.

They discriminate against us now to the extent of 50 per cent more duty on wheat, oats and rye, and 40 per cent more duty on peas, than they levy upon the products of the United States. It may be said that our trade was very small with Germany and has not decreased very much. Well, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in the commodities which we can produce, the United States has increased their exports since 1897 to Germany about 100 per cent. Our position is peculiar in this respect, while we take from Germany about three of four times as much in value as we send there, on the other hand the United States sent to Germany nearly double what they buy. And although we allow German products to come in here at a tariff half that of the United States, yet Germany sees fit to subject us to this humiliating and unfair discrimination. I claim that there should be no pretense of state secret in regard to this correspondence. Four or five years were ample time for the government to do something, and so far it has done nothing. Nor is it at all likely to in the future. The attitude of the German government has been so far that of a bully. Such is practically the description given of it by the London correspondent of the New York 'Tribune.' When these resolutions were passed by the Montreal Board of Trade and the Toronto Board of Trade, that correspondent thus discussed the attitude of the Germans; they threaten that, if the government yields to the demands of the Montreal bodies, they will bring their influence to bear so as to have the general German tariff on Canadian goods increased by 50 per cent.

Now, what position do we occupy ? Suppose that the United States were treated in this way by Germany, how long would Germany be allowed to discriminate against the products of the United States ? I venture to say that they would not discriminate for more than twenty-four hours. Look at the position of Russia at the time when the United States put a duty on Russian petroleum. I do not think there was any danger of petroleum being sent from Russia to the United States—that would be like carrying coals to Newcastle. But, the moment the United States did that, the Russian government at once retaliated in such a way that the Americans saw fit to remove the duty that they had put on. Therefore, I contend that there is only one way for this country to deal with Germany. Our government should take into consideration how they can so arrange the tariff of this country as to protect ourselves in cases of this kind, if we are unable, through the mother country, to get justice. Germany, of all the nations of the world, is the last from which we should accept unjust treatment. What has been the position of Germany with regard to the British Empire for the last two or three years ? What has been her position with regard to British troops in South Africa ? Her position has been one of misrepresentation and abuse. I consider that the attitude of Germany towards Great Britain, and towards the British Empire, of which we form part, has been a most unjust and most unreasonable one. They have looked forward to the downfall of the British Empire, and have considered what portions of the empire might fall to them should that downfall take place. They are the greediest nation on the face of the earth, and their attitude with respect to this discrimination against Canada is their attitude in all trade matters. It is a day of extreme commercialism and extreme materialism in Germany. Their attitude to Great Britain concerning the war in South Africa has been dictated by no higher consideration than their commercial advancement. I hope the government will see fit to lay these documents on the Table of the House.

House divided on motion (Mr. Monk) :

YEAS.

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Kidd,
Avery,	Lancaster,
Bell,	LaRivière,
Bennett,	Lavell,
Birkett,	Lefurgey,
Blain,	Lennox,
Borden (Halifax),	Maclean,
Boyd,	McGowan,
Brock,	McIntosh,
Broder,	Monk,
Carscallen,	Morin,
Clancy,	Northrup,
Clare,	Osler,

Clarke,
Culbert,
Earle,
Fowler,
Ganong,
Gourley,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Halliday,
Henderson,
Ingram,
Johnston (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,
Kemp,
Kendrey,
Pope,
Pringle,
Richardson,
Robinson (Elgin),
Roche (Marquette),
Sherritt,
Simmons,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Taylor,
Tolton,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Ward,
Wilmot,
Wilson.—56.

NAYS.

Messieurs

Angers,
Archambault,
Bazinet,
Beith,
Béland,
Bernier,
Blair,
Borden (King's, N.S.)
Bourassa,
Brown,
Brunet,
Bureau,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carbonneau,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)
Champagne,
Christie,
Copp,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Davis,
Demers (Lévis),
Demers (St. John),
Douglas,
Dugas,
Edwards,
Emmerson,
Erb,
Ethier,
Farquharson,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Fortier,
Fraser,
Gallery,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gibson,
Gould,
Guthrie,
Harwood,
Heyd,
Holmes,
Horsey,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.)
Johnston (Lambton),
Kendall,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption)
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Legris,
Lewis,
Logan,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Mackie,
MacKinnon,
MacLaren (Huntingdon)
McColl,
McCool,
McCreary,
McEwen,
McGugan,
McIsaac,
McLennan,
Malouin,
Marcil (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martineau,
Matheson,
Maxwell,
Mignault,
Monet,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Murray,
Oliver,
Paterson,
Proulx,
Puttee,
Reid (Restigouche),
Riley,
Ross (Ontario),
Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Rousseau,
Russell,
Schell,
Smith (Vancouver),
Stephens,
Sutherland (Essex),
Sutherland (Oxford),
Talbot,
Tarte,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Turcot,
Turgeon,
Wright.—107.

PAIRS.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Belcourt,	Cargill,
Bruneau,	Vrooman,

Harty,
Johnston (Cape Breton)
Lang,
Lemieux,
McCarthy,
Madore,
Meigs,
Parmelee,
Power,
Prefontaine,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Rimouski),
Scott,
Sifton,
Wade,
Hyman,
Dyment,
Charlton,
Bickerdike.
Bruce,
Robinson (Northumberland),
Rosamond,
Leonard,
MacLaren (Perth),
Barker,
McLeod,
Seagram,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Hale,
Calvin,
Cochrane,
Casgrain,
Hughes (Victoria),
Gilmour,
McCormick,
Tisdale,
Reddick.

Motion negatived.

PENSIONS TO NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

House went into committee on the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that pensions or gratuities may be granted to officers of the North-west mounted police and to the widows and children of such officers, as follows :—

To an officer compulsorily retired, for any cause other than misconduct or inefficiency, after 20 years service, or retiring voluntarily after 55 years service, a pension not exceeding one-fiftieth of the pay and allowance of his rank or appointment at the time of his retirement for each year of service ; service beyond 35 years not being reckoned.

To an officer who retires voluntarily after 25 years, but less than 35 years service, a pension 20 per cent less than is above provided for.

Towards making good the said pensions, 5 per cent to be deducted from the pay of officers.

To an officer retiring on account of infirmity, or retiring to promote efficiency or economy in the service, a gratuity not exceeding one month's pay for each years service ; if retiring on account of injury received in the discharge of his duties, a gratuity not exceeding three month's pay for every two years service.

To the widow and children of an officer who had served twenty years, and was at the time of his death on full pay, or in receipt of pension, the following pension or allowance :—In the case of the commissioner, $500 to the widow, and $80 to each child ; the assistant commissioner, a pension of $450 to widow and a yearly allowance of $80 to each child ; a superintendant or surgeon, $350 to widow, and $70 to each child ; an inspector, assistant surgeon or veterinary surgeon, $250 to widow, and $65 to each child ; it being permissible to double the amount to children if they are motherless and in need ; no allowance to be granted to a son aged eighteen or a daughter aged twenty-one ; and the total amount granted to the family of an officer in one year not to exceed the amount of the pension attached to his rank.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Chairman, I venture to express the hope that the resolutions which are now before you will receive the very favourable consideration of the com-

mittee. They are exactly similar to the resolutions that were introduced last year to provide pensions for the militia. By the North-west Mounted Police Act, which has been in force now for many years, constables are allowed a pension, but the officers have been denied that privilege. Last year a Bill was introduced to give pensions to officers of the militia, which Bill, I may say, was received with great favour by the House, and elicited nothing but favourable criticism and the sanction of both sides of the House. Now, without making any invidious comparison, and whilst I do not at all wish to abate from the just praise which is due to the militia, I think that the mounted police are entitled to at least as much consideration. The services of the mounted police do not require to be praised. Those services have been so valuable, especially in recent years, that I am sure the country will feel that we are only giving the North-west mounted police their due when we provide that the officers as well as the men shall receive a pension in their old age. At present the work of the mounted police, far from being restricted, has increased, and is increasing. In the Northwest Territories we now have patrols all the way from the United States frontier of Montana and Minnesota up as far as Mackenzie river. The most northern post we have is on the Great Slave lake. In the west we have one or two posts, certainly one on the Peace river. In the Yukon it is a fact recognized by everybody that the services of the mounted police have been simply invaluable. They have maintained order, and made the Yukon as safe as any other part of Canada. This is saying a great deal in favour of the force, especially when we reflect that the Yukon is of such recent growth, and is settled, as such countries must be settled, by a rather unsteady element.

Provision is made first of all that the officers of the mounted police, like the officers of the militia who are to receive a pension, shall contribute a certain amount thereto, consisting of an abatement of 5 per cent of their salary. Then it is proposed that if an officer of the mounted police is retired after 20 years of service he shall receive a pension equal to twenty-fiftieths of his annual pay for the time he has been in the service. A similar pension is given to other officers who are retired after a service of 25 years. Those who retire voluntarily after 35 years of service are entitled to a pension equal to thirty-five-fiftieths of their income during that time. The number of officers who will be entitled to participate in this fund is 55 : the commander, the assistant commander, 11 superintendents, 35 inspectors, 6 surgeons and 1 veterinary surgeon. Then there is a provision that the wives and children of the officers shall be entitled to a pension in the same way as the officers of the militia.

An hon. MEMBER. Do the provisions apply to those who have retired ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Only to those who are in the service. I think those who have retired would not be entitled, because they have not served the full time of 20 years.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister made any calculation of how much money will be required to be added to the 5 per cent to make up this pension ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I have not made any calculation, and I do not see how it is possible to make such calculation. We think the country will not be called upon to contribute to any of these pensions for a long time to come, and I will give the reason for thinking so. There are, as I have said, 55 officers who will be entitled to this pension. Of that number 16 have now served under 5 years ; 7 under 10 years ; 11 under 15 years ; 17 under 20 years ; 2 under 25 years, and 2 under 30 years. So there are only 4 who could participate in the fund at an early date. I think only one or two members of the force are likely to take advantage of this fund for a considerable time to come. But the greater number of the force have not yet been 20 years in the service, so it is not probable that for a long time to come the country will be called upon to pay anything towards these pensions.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I right in understanding that this 5 per cent only applies to officers and not to men ?

The PRIME MINISTER. To officers alone. The men, I may say, contribute nothing. Though the force has now been in existence about 27 years, and there have been 4,000 men passing through the force, we only pay at present in pensions to the men less than $2,000 a year. The reason is that a good many of those 4,000 have withdrawn from the force and settled in the North-west, and have thereby renounced their pension.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I understand the officers of the mounted police have been paying into the superannuation fund a great many years, I believe 2 per cent.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. DAVIS. I was so informed by the controller of the police. However, there is one clause in the resolution which I cannot agree with, that which says that an officer retiring on account of injury received in the discharge of his duties, gets a gratuity not exceeding three months pay for every two years of service. Therefore, if an officer has joined the North-west mounted police and, after two years service, has received some injury in the discharge of his duties necessitating his retirement, he would be

entitled to the magnificent sum of $240 on retiring. Now, as the officer might receive injuries that would unfit him from maintaining his family, I think the government should arrange in some way that he should receive something more substantial than that amount of money.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). My attention was drawn to the same clause, which the hon. gentleman has just mentioned. It does seem to me that if it is intended to make some provision for an officer in case of injury in the discharge of his duty, the resolution is hardly in the form in which we should expect it. Possibly it is intended to be an addition to the pension.

The PRIME MINISTER. These resolutions have been copied word for word from the Act which was passed last year in regard to the militia. I will take note of the objection and at a future stage I will be able to give information upon it.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I understand this pension applies to the officers only and not to the men ?

The PRIME MINISTER. To the officers only.

Mr. SPROULE. Undoubtedly we have adopted a somewhat similar principle in the militia branch, but, I have always held that wherever we employ men and give them good compensation in the shape of wage or salary, they have no more reason to expect superannuation or pension if they have served 20, or 25, or 35 years, than hundreds of thousands of people who are discharging service in the country quite as hard, whose occupation is quite as dangerous, whose remuneration is much smaller, and for whom we make no provision whatever.

Resolution reported.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing :—

1. The amount of refined sugar imported into Canada (a) from the first of January to 31st of December, 1900 ; (b) from the first of January, to the 31st of December, 1901.

2. The amount of raw sugar imported within same dates, each year separate, and the name of the country from which it has been imported.—Mr. Madore.

Copies of all papers, Orders in Council, telegrams, letters or other documents relating to the dismissal and superannuation of Mr. William Jackson, late lighthouse-keeper at Gananoque, and the appointment of Mr. Robert Chadwick, as keeper of said light, as successor to Mr. Jackson, also the cancellation of such appointment, and the appointment of a Mr. Landon to the position.—Mr. Taylor.

Return showing :—

1. The total amount paid by the government to the Montreal ' Herald ' since the 30th June, last.

2. The total amount paid by the government to the Toronto ' Globe ' since the 30th June, last.

3. The total amount paid by the government to the Halifax ' Chronicle ' since the 30th June, last.

4. The total amount paid by the government to ' Le Soleil ' of Quebec, and ' La Patrie ' of Montreal, since the 30th June, last.—Mr. Monk.

Return showing :—

Lists of all passes issued, and to whom, on the Canadian government railways and steamers during the past year, other than those issued to members of parliament and the various provincial legislatures.—Mr. Clarke.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 5.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 7, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough) moved:

That the first and second reports of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts be now concurred in.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I do not rise to object to this particular motion being adopted only a few minutes after it has been presented to the House. I believe that we should have an opportunity of knowing what these reports contain, and I wish to give notice that I shall object to this procedure in every other case.

Mr. FRASER. My reason for moving the adoption of the report now is, that there are but two small matters referred to in it. The first is the employment of a shorthand reporter, and the second, that certain evidence which was taken before the committee last year be brought down ; and, as the committee may have to meet any day, I did not want it to meet without having this before it. That is the reason I made the motion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I withdraw the objection in this particular case.

Mr. SPEAKER. Because the point of order was well taken.

The PRIME MINISTER. Before the point of order is taken, I would ask my hon. friend to let the matter stand until Monday or Tuesday, so that we may examine the case. I doubt whether a notice is required to be put on the Order paper in order to make a motion for the adoption of the report.

Mr. FRASER. I certainly agree to that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have no objection to the motion; but nearly every day,

reports of committees are adopted a few minutes after they are read in the House. I think this is irregular, and I simply give notice that after this I hope the rule will be enforced.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Buffalo Railway Company and the International Railway Company.—Mr. Osler.

SUPPLY—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to bring before the House a matter that has been talked of a good deal in this House and outside of it, with reference to a statement which I made some days ago as to declarations made by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davies, in relation to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and the settlement of the Alaskan boundary question. A couple of days after I had made that statement I received from Sir Louis Davies the following letter :

The Supreme Court of Canada.

February, 21, 1902.

Dear Mr. Bourassa,—My attention has been called to the report of your speech in the House of Commons on your motion for papers in re the Clayton-Bulwer treaty in which you credit me with having made the statement that I 'had spent three months in London trying to get the officers of Mr. Chamberlain to take the part of Canada at the sittings of the Anglo-American Commission.'

May I ask you for your authority for attributing to me such an extraordinary statement ?

Faithfully yours,

L. H. DAVIES.

As I received this letter just before I was leaving for Montreal, I simply dropped a note to Sir Louis Davies, a copy of which I have not kept, telling him that I would try to satisfy his mind on the matter. So, on the 25th I wrote to him the following letter :

House of Commons,

Ottawa, February 25, 1902.

Sir Louis Davies,
Supreme Court,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—In compliance with the promise I made you last week, I send you my authorities for the statement which I made in the House in the following terms :

And here is the exact statement I made as reported in the official report of the Debates :

'One of the Canadian ministers, who was on that occasion one of the British plenipotentiaries, the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davies, went to London and passed three months there. For what purpose ? He was candid enough to tell us, when he came back from England that—after the Anglo-American Commission had sat for six months, after they were supposed to have at their back the influence of the British government—he, Sir Louis Davies, was obliged to pass three months in London to convince Mr. Chamberlain's officials that they should not side with the American government, but with us.'

I go on :

My authorities for making such a statement—

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I do not know under what rule or right the hon. member for Labelle brings into the House a controversy between himself and Sir Louis Davies on a particular subject. The most he could possibly do would be to make a personal explanation of something which he said on a particular day, and as to which he was misrepresented or misquoted; but to read letters which have passed between him and Sir Louis Davies is clearly out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood, from what has been said so far, that the hon. member for Labelle wanted to make a personal explanation, and I supposed that the letters he has just quoted were simply his excuse for making the personal explanation which he desired to make. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that all he can do now is to make a personal explanation, and I would ask him to confine his remarks as much as possible to that.

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly, it is not my intention to do anything else than make good the statement which I made and which has been challenged in this House and outside of it, and on which Sir Louis Davies asked me to make a personal explanation in this House. Therefore, I do it, in justice to the hon. gentleman, in justice to myself, and in justice to the House; and I think the House will be pleased to have a full explanation of the matter. I think it is my right to explain for what reason I made the statement, and to prove that the statement was accurate.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wants to make a debate, he should be very cautious about it. He should not go so far as to refer to a past debate. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate, and simply reaffirms the statement he made.

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to refer to a past debate. I merely wish to give the explanation which has been asked for by Sir Louis Davies, who was a plenipotentiary on that occasion. My only purpose is to make that point clear, without any reference to what may have happened in this House. The letters I am reading now are necessary to make the whole record complete. I went on :

My authorities for making such a statement are the interviews which you gave on your arrival from England and published in the

'Montreal Gazette' on October 30th, 1899, page 7; in the 'Toronto Globe' of the same date, page 10; in the 'Montreal Herald,' of either of the same day or the next, page 9.

I may have made a mistake as to the length of time you passed in the Old Country. But the substance of my statement is fully justified, I think, by those interviews which, to my knowledge, have never been rectified.

Yours respectfully,
HENRI BOURASSA.

To this I received the following reply:

Supreme Court,
Ottawa, 26th February, 1902.

My Dear Mr. Bourassa,—This morning I received your letter in answer to mine of the 21st instant, in which I asked you for your authority for making the extraordinary statement you were reported in the newspapers to have attributed to me in your speech in the House of Commons on your motion for papers in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. This report stated that you 'then went on to credit Sir Louis Davies with making the statement that he had spent three months in London trying to get the officers of Mr. Chamberlain to take the part of Canada at the sitting of the Anglo-American commission.'

I am glad to find that you now repudiate the correctness of this report, and send me as a correct statement of what you did say that I 'was obliged to pass three months in London to convince Mr. Chamberlain's officials that they should not side with the American government, but with us.'

While accepting this statement of what you really did say, I have failed to notice that you have made any public correction of the report of your remarks.

As your authority for making this statement you refer me to certain alleged interviews which, you say, I gave upon my arrival from England, namely, the 'Gazette,' and the 'Herald,' Montreal, and the Toronto 'Globe,' of October, 1899. I have looked up these reports which you gave as your authority, and I am obliged to say that after a careful perusal of them, I am unable to see that they afford just ground for the statement you were reported to have made, or the one you send me as the statement you actually did make.

I gave no 'interview' to any of those newspapers, and the report to which you call my attention do not purport to be in the form of a regular interview; but with respect to the charge you make, you have been entirely and grievously misled. I went to England in 1899, accompanied by Mr. Pope and Mr. King, to lay before the Imperial government a complete statement of the contention of Canada with respect to the Alaska boundary line. Our treatment by the officials of the colonial office on that occasion was most sympathetic, and those gentlemen did everything they could to furnish us with any official documents and information we required. In point of fact, Sir John Anderson, who had charge of this question in the colonial office, did everything that lay in his power to further the object of our mission.

Nothing could have been further from my thoughts than to have attributed to Mr. Chamberlain, or any of his officials, either indifference or hostility to Canada's interests, and if I had done so I certainly would have done violence to the truth.

And here I call the attention of the House to the following paragraph:

The American correspondents of the English papers in Washington and New York had been transmitting during that summer letters and cablegrams to England giving a very perverted and incorrect view of Canada's claims and position, with respect alike to the main contention and the provisional boundary line then being established, and these telegrams would, no doubt, have had the effect of prejudicing Canada's case, if left unanswered. I did what I could to dissipate this prejudice.

I certainly never made any such statement as you are reported to have attributed to me; nor did I ever make any such statement as you in your letter give as the correct report of what you said. I never knew or heard of any officials of Mr. Chamberlain taking any part adverse to Canada during the sittings of the Anglo-American commission or afterwards; on the contrary, as I have stated before, so far as my knowledge went they were ready at all times to do everything they could to further Canada's interests.

As you were one of the secretaries of the Joint High Commission, and sat as a colleague with me for two sessions after this alleged interview took place, and never to my knowledge, made reference to it before, I trust you will take an early opportunity in the House of Commons of correcting your statement, which is certainly a misleading one and unjust to me.

Yours faithfully,
L. H. DAVIES.

The three interviews, or whatever you may choose to call them, were as follows: The first appears in the Toronto 'Globe' of October 30, 1899, page 10. It is a special despatch from Montreal dated October, 29. The despatch first notes the arrival of Sir Louis Davies from London, and after a long story about his difficulties at the customs in New York, it reads as follows:

In London he laid the whole Canadian case regarding Alaska before the British government and cleared away the fog which was raised by American correspondents of London papers, who succeeded to some extent in prejudicing Canada's position. He prepared a lengthy volume on the case, and the whole British government are now thoroughly posted on the matter. As it stands now, a temporary arrangement has been made, pending the settlement of the whole case. To that end, Sir Louis, on behalf of Canada made three propositions, an unconditional arbitration, or a reference similar to the Venezuela case, or, finally, if the United States claimed Skagway and Dyea in any event, Canada should have Pyramid Harbour in any event.

Then the Montreal 'Gazette' of October 30, page 7, had the following:

Sir Louis Davies arrived yesterday from London, Eng., where he had been for some months consulting with the Imperial government regarding the Alaska boundary difficulty. He found that the Americans, and particularly certain American correspondents of London papers had succeeded in prejudicing Canada's case in the eyes of the English authorities, but he had drawn up quite a lengthy volume setting out the position of Canada and through this and personal interviews with the government re-

moved these false impressions. The British government is now thoroughly seized with Canada's contention.

And the Montreal 'Herald' of October 31, 1899, page 9, published the following:

'Sir Louis Davies, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, returned Sunday from London, where he had been for some time past engaged in putting the case for Canada, with regard to the Alaska boundary, before the Imperial authorities. He says he found that the Americans, and particularly certain American correspondents of London papers had succeeded in prejudicing the case for Canada in the eyes of the English authorities, but he had drawn up quite a lengthy volume setting out the position of Canada, and through this and personal interviews with the government, removed these false impressions. The British government is now thoroughly seized with Canada's contentions.

Now, Sir Louis Davies gives those interviews or reports, or whatever you may choose to call them, a denial. The whole thing, he says, was perfectly false. Well, if the whole thing was false, if Sir Louis Davies never gave to the newspapers the information on which they based these reports, if they were not inspired by him, I think it is rather strange that he should have delayed saying so until now. I think it rather singular that a representative of the Canadian government and at the same time a plenipotentiary of the British government, should have waited two years and a half before correcting the report published by three of the most reliable newspapers in Canada—one a Conservative and the other two Liberals—that the hon. gentleman was obliged to go to London to dissipate the prejudices raised by American newspapers in the minds of the British people. The only statement which Sir Louis Davies complains of is that which I made. He does not complain of what may have been reported by this or that newspaper, for whose reports I am not responsible.

Well, all I have to say to-day is this, that for six months the Canadian commissioners, acting as British plenipotentiaries, endeavoured patiently and assiduously, but in vain, to have this question settled between the British and American governments on the same basis of action as the Venezeula dispute. I have been accused in the public press of having been indiscreet because I told the truth. Why, a similar statement was made to this House at least three times by the right hon. the Prime Minister. If therefore I have been indiscreet, the right hon. gentleman has been equally guilty. More than that, the hon. gentleman not only made a statement similar to mine, but on the 5th of June, 1899, he laid before the House protocol 63 of the Anglo-American Commission, in which it is shown that a proposal had been made by the British plenipotentiaries to have the Alaskan boundary dispute settled by an arbitrative tribunal, as was done in the Venezuela dispute, that the American commissioners refused this offer and made a counter proposition, and that when the British plenipotentiaries reported that they could not accept this counter proposal, the whole thing was left in the hands of the American and British governments.

I think the Prime Minister is loyal enough to say that, in this matter, I am not going one iota beyond the statements that have been made by himself, made by common agreement between Mr. Fairbanks, the president of the American commission, and the right hon. gentleman, acting as chairman of the commission, Lord Herschell being sick. Therefore, I am accused of indiscretion, a few gentlemen in this House and a few newspapers want to lay upon my shoulders—that have been accustomed to scuh treatment for two years and a half—the full burden of what is the fault, or rather the alleged fault of others. But I contend that there is no fault. I have always stated, on the only two occasions when I have referred to the Anglo-American Commission, that the Canadian commissioners did the best they could in the interests of Canada; they made the best fight it was possible to make to protect Canadian interests. But what I say, and what I am supported by the testimony of the Prime Minister in saying, is that when they thought it impossible to get any settlement of the question from the commission, they handed it over to the British government. And then what did we see? Three months after it was handed over to the British government, one of the British plenipotentiaries told us that he had been obliged to take means to dissipate prejudices aroused in the minds of the British authorities, to whom our case was committed, by articles appearing in the American press. Sir Louis Davies does not deny that some things were said to the press, but he objects to these being called interviews. I do not care what name is used; what I am interested in is the fact and the result. And in the letter which I have read, Sir Louis Davies makes the admission. He says that the American correspondents in Washington and New York of the English papers transmitted, during that summer, letters and cablegrams giving a very perverted and incorrect view of Canada's claims and position. And he says, 'I did what I could to dissipate this prejudice.' He does not even go so far as to say that he actually dissipated the prejudices, and we have now the proof that this prejudice has not been dissipated. I have said nothing that is not now repeated in the letter written to me by Sir Louis Davies. After the adjournment of the Anglo-American Commission, the whole settlement of this question, so far as Canada's interests were concerned, was put in the hands of gentlemen who preferred being prejudiced by articles written by American correspondents of newspapers rather than

take the case laid before them by Lord Herschell and our own Canadian representatives.

It has been said, I do not exactly know where, by some excited or erratic individual, that I calumniated Lord Herschell. Sir, I never uttered a word regarding Lord Herschell but once. In 1899, in the debate on the address, at the opening of the first session following the adjournment of the commision, I spoke about Lord Herschell. This is what I said :

I consider the sad death of Lord Herschell as heavy a loss to Canada, as it is to Great Britain. His very appointment was a great favour and a high compliment to Canada, as well as an acknowledgment of our independence. One of the most eminent jurists of this century, a straight opponent of the present English administration, and therefore out of political office, the presence of Lord Herschell on the commission meant that the whole political direction of the negotiations was left to the Canadian commissioners, who were given the help of a great legal mind and the moral and constitutional support of Great Britain. And the American commissioners understood it ; they saw clearly that in Canadian matters they must deal with the Canadian people, behind which stands the British flag, not as a forced protection to a flock of slaves, but as a free help to free men.

Mr. Speaker, I have changed my mind on some of the things I said then. I was full of hope. I was impressed by the deliberations of that commission, and I had full confidence that, with the good case so ably made by Lord Herschell, and after the energetic efforts made by our own representatives, we could count on the British authorities to show as much zeal in the interests of Britain's loyal colony of Canada as they had shown in the case of Venezuela. I was justified in making that statement then. I have now a good deal to withdraw so far as the British government is concerned. But so far as rendering a testimonial to the ability and zeal and devotedness which were displayed by Lord Herschell, in the case of Canada, I have nothing to withdraw. My opinion of Lord Herschell is the same to-day as it was then. And, if any man says I calumniated Lord Herschell, then it only shows that in the British-Canadian dictionary, there still needs to be retained, as a living and useful expression, the word ' Tupperism.'

It has been stated also—I do not know where, for I have been absent for eight days, but I have been told that it has been stated—that I had been very indiscreet in disclosing the secrets of the Anglo-American Commission ; that, time and again in the province of Quebec, I made declarations about it which showed me to be an excited and erratic individual. I hope I shall always be an excited and erratic individual in that case, for the moment I become composed and judicial, as some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this matter believe themselves to be, I suppose I shall be free to discourse in Tupperisms or Monkeyisms. But, having such a bad reputation as I have, I am bound to remain within the limits of truth and discretion. As a matter of fact, I have never opened my mouth on the subject of the Anglo-American Commission. I acted as secretary to that Commission, and I perfectly understood what my duties were, just as I understand what my duties are to-day. For two years I was perfectly silent, though I was beginning to perceive what was going on. I was waiting for the moment when public facts known to the whole people of Britain, as well as the whole people of Canada, would allow me as a Canadian representative, to state, on the floor of this House—where I have the right to speak in the Canadian interests as well as anybody else—what was the true position of Canada. But, since the case of Canada was handed over to the British authorities, not one inch of progress has been made. What is my authority for this ? Is it taken from the deliberations of the commission ? Not at all; it is taken from the repeated statements of the Prime Minister. And my anticipations as to the betrayal—that may be considered too strong a word, then, if you prefer let us say the abandonment—of our rights by the government of Great Britain, are merely those that were expressed in this parliament by the late leader of the opposition, Sir Charles Tupper. I suppose I am not bound to be more loyal to Great Britain than that hon. gentleman was. On the 22nd of July, 1899, the late leader of the opposition, Sir Charles Tupper, read in this House the announcement that was made of the adjournment of the commission by Mr. Fairbanks and Sir Wilfrid Laurier acting respectively as the American and British presidents of the commission, and added :

Those who have read the American papers, and those who have read the London 'Times,' know that a great deal of misapprehension has existed with regard to this question, and that the steady and persistent efforts of the press of the United States of America to mislead the public mind on the question have been eminently successful in that country, and I regret to say too successful in Great Britain. . . . But I now come to a very important question, and that is the reluctance on the part of Her Majesty's government to do that with the United States that they would do with any other country in the world. I speak from intimate knowledge, and from my personal acquaintance and official association with both the great governing parties in England—because there were many changes of government while I held the position of High Commissioner, and I was necessarily thrown, in relation to these matters, into intimate association with both—when I say that from 1868, when I had occasion to deal with an important question relating to Canadian interests with Her Majesty's government, down to the present hour, I have been struck very forcibly with the unwillingness on the part of Her Majesty's government to allow any circumstance whatever to even threaten a collision with the United States.

And so on. Well, Mr. Speaker, before this day I never uttered a word of blame against the British government in relation to this question, I never uttered a word of criticism upon the conduct of these negotiations. Contrary to what has been stated in this House and outside, I never opened my mouth, either in this House or elsewhere, giving a single word of what passed during the commission upon this question. The only time I referred to it was in 1899, just at the opening of the session, when we were told the deliberations of the commission would begin pretty soon, and I said I felt that in the hands of our commissioners our case was safe, and I hoped also it would be safe in the hands of the British government. Down to this session I have never said a word during all the time that comments were freely made by members on both sides of the House, and in the Canadian press, accusing at one time the British government, at another time the Canadian government, and at another time the United States government. During all that time I remained silent. But when I read this article published under the signature of the late Minister of Justice in the December number of the 'Empire Review,' I felt compelled to speak :

Canada is a great North American State. Her commerce is far greater in proportion to her population than that of the neighbouring republic. The construction of a Central American canal would be as much called for in her interest, as in that of the United States, and we shall never be content to submit to any other rule in respect to such a canal than that of perfect equality. This is what our neighbours asked for at the outset, and this is all they have a right to claim now.

The provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty in this regard, are vital to Canada, and the government of the United Kingdom must not, for any political consideration, sacrifice the interests of Canada, and the future of the British Empire upon this continent.

And later on :

To give the United States possession of the canal, is practically to transfer the territory of Central America to that republic, contrary to the terms of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. We shall see by a further examination of the diplomatic correspondence upon this subject, how the principles by which they then claimed to have been governed in the adoption of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and their adherence to a particular construction of that instrument have been departed from in the bolder pretensions which they have recently put forward. These, I think, upon careful examination, will be found to be of such a character that to recognize them would be a greater menace to our security and future progress than any other matter of controversy that now presents itself for solution.

Not fifteen days had elapsed after these lines were written over the signature of an adviser of the Crown in Canada, before we were told that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty had been sacrificed, that the interests of Canada —to use the words of the late Minister of Justice—had been sacrificed by the British government. Well, Sir, the least I expected was that the British government had done something in the way of securing compensation for Canada in return for the abandonment of its rights under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Therefore, when I heard the declaration of the Prime Minister that the Alaskan boundary question had not advanced one single iota, when I heard that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty had been abrogated without any protest having been made in relation to that question, when I remembered that the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries was obliged to admit, what we have now in evidence over his own signature—that it was sufficient for some American correspondents to write to the London papers in order to destroy, in the minds of the British officials, the results of six months' labour under the presidency of such an able and devoted man as Lord Herschell—I said to myself that it was time that we should know a little about it. I am sometimes told that I am an Anglophobe, that I am an anti-Imperialist. I hope the time will come when it will be seen that my love for Great Britain, though perhaps not so bombastic, not so noisy, not so voluble as that of some whose expressions we have heard, still it is true. But I believe we can best prove our attachment and admiration to Great Britain by showing that we have as much national spirit as they have, and that when our interests are sacrificed we see clearly through the game. I think it is very important that this question should be cleared up. Within a few months the Prime Minister will be going to the foot of the Throne, and will lay at the feet of His Majesty a declaration of the unswerving fidelity and loyalty of his Canadian subjects, and in that respect the people of this country are a unit. I hope that in addition to that declaration he will also be able to point out to the British officials that the Canadian representatives understand their duty towards the Canadian people, and if this parliament is ready at any time to vote millions of dollars to assist some English cause elsewhere, at least a majority in this House are disposed to assure the British government that the Canadian people are determined to see their rights respected. I did not expect to go fully into these details ; but in summing up, I think I am justified in saying that the letter I have received from the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries and which I have just read to the House, is a full justification, not of the words I am reported to have used, but of the declaration I actually made, namely, that Sir Louis Davies was obliged to go to London in order to dissipate the prejudices that had been raised in the minds of the British officials by articles in American newspapers. I think it is important that it should be thoroughly known in this country that the American newspapers

had more influence with the British government than Lord Herschell had, or the four representatives of the Canadian government.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). When my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) rose a few moments ago, I was under the impression that his object in speaking to the motion now before the Chair, was simply to rectify a statement which had been made by him, and to which exception had been taken by Sir Louis Davies. So far as that matter is concerned I do not propose now to do anything more than confine myself to that issue. A few days ago I received this letter from Sir Louis Davies :

February 28, 1902.

My dear Sir Wilfrid,—I have been obliged to correct a most unjust and misleading statement made by Mr. Bourassa in the House of Commons with respect to my mission to England re the Alaska boundary line in 1899. I inclose you herewith a copy of the last letter I have written him in which I request him to make the necessary correction in the House, so as to put me straight with the country and with the officials in the Colonial Office, if any kind friends were to send them marked newspapers with Mr. Bourassa's statements. May I ask you, if Mr. Bourassa fails to make the proper explanation and correction, to do so for me at some convenient time, and if necessary, to read those passages of my letters giving his statement full contradiction. I have marked in pencil the passages.

Yours faithfully,

L. H. DAVIES.

At the same time Sir Louis Davies showed me a copy of the letter he had addressed to Mr. Bourassa, in which he takes issue, not, I remind the House, with the words which have been attributed to him by the hon. member for Labelle, but with the construction which has been put upon them by the hon. member for Labelle. In that letter Sir Louis Davies writes as follows :

My dear Mr. Bourassa,—This morning I received your letter in answer to mine of the 21st instant, in which I asked you for your authority for making the extraordinary statement you were reported in the newspapers to have attributed to me in your speech in the House of Commons on your motion for papers in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. This report stated that you 'then went on to credit Sir Louis Davies with making the statement that he had spent three months in London trying to get the officers of Mr. Chamberlain to take the part of Canada at the sitting of the Anglo-American Commission.

Then Sir Louis Davies goes on to say :

I am glad to find that you now repudiate the correctness of this report and send me as a correct statement of what you did say that 'I was obliged to pass three months in London to convince Mr. Chamberlain's officials that they should not side with the American government but with us.'

That is the statement which the hon. member for Labelle is stated to have made concerning Sir Louis Davies' action. This action was that he had been obliged to pass three months in London to convince Mr. Chamberlain's officials that they should not side with the American government but with us. In regard to this inference Sir Louis Davies says that the hon. member for Labelle is attributing an action to him that he never contemplated and never did. I think it would have been more in accordance with the fitness of things if the hon. member for Labelle had accepted the statement of Sir Louis Davies without any qualification. The hon. member for Labelle, however, thought he was justified in not accepting the correction which was made by Sir Louis Davies. He thought he was justified in persisting in attributing to Sir Louis Davies an action which Sir Louis Davies repudiates altogether. My hon. friend for Labelle stated that he was justified by three interviews which he said were published in the Toronto 'Globe,' the Montreal 'Gazette' and the Montreal 'Herald,' in persisting in attributing to Sir Louis Davies an action which Sir Louis Davies altogether repudiates. Well, I must say to my hon. friend that for my part I think he is not at all justified in taking from these newspaper reports the inference which he has. First of all my hon. friend must admit himself that the report, or the despatch, from which he has quoted, did not purport to be an interview with Sir Louis Davies. I do not know how the newspaper man could have made that report, but at all events, the journalist who sent it to the 'Globe,' to the 'Gazette' and to the 'Herald' does not pretend that he is reporting the words of Sir Louis Davies, but an inference himself, and from that inference another inference is drawn by the hon. member for Labelle. I think that in public life this is hardly fair. My hon. friend says to-day that Sir Louis Davies might have corrected this ; but did not. Well, my hon. friend has been long enough in public life to know that if a public man were to undertake to correct all the misstatements made regarding him in the newspapers, life would hardly be worth the living. This is an age of enterprise, newspapermen are looking for news and we all know that a newspaperman will sometimes build up an argument or a fact out of very little and sometimes out of nothing at all, and I do not think my hon. friend is justified in assuming the correctness of the report because Sir Louis Davies failed to make a correction at the time.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have said that I was basing my holding of that view upon another paragraph of the very letter which the right hon. gentleman has in his hand.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will come to that presently. I must say, at all events, that my hon. friend has no foundation to attribute to Sir Louis Davies a statement

which Sir Louis Davies actually contradicts and repudiates. The statement is very flimsy, or no statement whatever. I think my hon. friend would have done better not to have built up any argument upon these newspaper reports. As to the paragraph to which my hon. friend comments upon, it is this :

The American correspondents of the English papers in Washington and New York had been transmitting during that summer letters and cablegrams to England giving a very perverted and incorrect view of Canada's claims and position, with respect alike to the main contention and the provisional boundary line then being established, and these telegrams would, no doubt, have had the effect of prejudicing Canada's case, if left unanswered. I did what I could to dissipate this prejudice.

That Sir Louis Davies should have done what he could to dissipate whatever prejudice might have been caused by the American newspapers was not only within his rights, but a duty which he owed to Canada while he was in England, but, because Sir Louis Davies undertook to contradict and dissipate the impression which might have been created by the American newspapers certainly cannot warrant my hon. friend in stating, as he does in his letter, that Sir Louis Davies was obliged to pass three months in London to convince Mr. Chamberlain's officials that they should not side with the American government, but with us. Certainly, there is no correction, and it is most unfair to Sir Louis Davies to persist in attributing to him statements which he never made. I have no intention of saying anything further upon this matter, but I submit to my hon. friend that in public life, when we are daily called upon to comment upon the actions and sayings of each other, when a public man of the honour and respectability of Sir Louis Davies makes a statement, it ought to be accepted without any further comment upon it, without being qualified at all, and without question.

One word more about another matter. The other day I was quite surprised, if I may be permitted to say so, because it is a matter of some importance, when I heard the reference made by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) as to certain allusions which he said had been made by the hon. member for Labelle unfavourable to the memory of the late Lord Herschell. I am bound to say, in the presence of the hon. member for Labelle, and I am sorry I cannot say it also in the presence of the hon. member for Pictou, that to my knowledge the hon. member for Labelle is absolutely guiltless in this matter. I have never heard any statement made by him disparaging to the memory of Lord Herschell. I may say that of the hon. member for Labelle, although it is not necessary for me to offer any defence of him, but since the memory of the late Lord Herschell has been mentioned, I am only too glad to testify for myself, as has also been done by my colleagues, to the great loss which Canada has suffered in the death of Lord Herschell, and to the great service which he rendered to Canada while he was chairman of the British side of the commission. The public do not know, and unfortunately the Canadian public will never know, the extent of the service which he then rendered to Canada, and the ability he displayed in defence of our rights. No Canadian could have shown more zeal than he did for the cause of Canada, and no man, to whatever nationality he might belong, could have done it more effectively than he did at Washington and Quebec.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, in reference to this extraordinary debate, something that I never had the honour of hearing before in this House of parliament, when an hon. member gets up, the rules of the House allowing him to make a personal explanation, and enters into a controversy as to whether a statement made by a gentleman outside of this House, occupying a dignified position, is correct or not, I desire to say a word or two. The right hon. leader of the government, whose duty it is to look after the rules of the House and draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to any breach of these rules, as it is your duty, Sir, to maintain the rules, never stopped that hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) until an hour had elapsed in discussing a question as foreign to the proceedings of this House as anything could be.

The PRIME MINISTER. Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) allow me to interrupt him ? I did not interrupt the hon. member for Labelle, because, on a motion to go into Supply, the hon. gentleman was within his rights in discussing anything he wanted to discuss. He might discuss the empire of China, or the empire of Japan, or anything that he might desire to bring to the attention of the House.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought the hon. member for Labelle got up to make a personal explanation.

The PRIME MINISTER. He got up on the motion to go into Supply.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, if there is a motion to go into Supply I shall discuss the question fully, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Labelle made a statement to this House the other day. He was secretary of a commission appointed by the Imperial authorities for the purpose of considering one of the most important subjects that could have been referred to it, the settlement of disputes between us and the United States, and for the purpose of arranging, if possible, trade relations between these two countries. He was cognisant of the proceedings of that commis-

sion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) shakes his head, but I will quote the words he uttered in this House. He said :

But what happened after that ? One of the Canadian ministers, who was on that occasion one of the British plenipotentiaries, the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davies, went to London and passed three months there. For what purpose ? He was candid enough to tell us when he came back from England that after the Anglo-American Commission had sat for six months, after they were supposed to have had at their back the influence of the British government, he, Sir Louis Davies, was obliged to pass three months in London to convince Mr. Chamberlain's officials that they should not side with the American government, but with us. Sir, I think that was a most unfortunate statement, but I think it was just as well that it should have been made. It is true that it made known to the public of the United States that in dealing with the government of Canada they were not dealing with the British authorities. But it is just as well that the public of the United States and the public of Canada should know that while profuse compliments were being paid to us in the newspapers of Great Britain and by the speeches of public men in the British parliament, still, when it came to the point of helping the Canadian cause, the British officials sided with a foreign government.

Now, the right hon. Prime Minister was present when the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) made that statement—

Mr. SPEAKER. It is true that we are on a motion to go into Committee of Supply, but the rule applies on that motion as well as on others, that a past debate must not be referred to. I must admit that so far this debate has been conducted somewhat irregularly, and consequently I do not like to interfere with the discussion on which the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has entered. I trust, however, that this will not be considered as a precedent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The statement was made on the floor of this House that six months after this commission met, certain proceedings occurred before that commission, and Sir Louis Davies was sent home for the purpose of pressing Canada's view on the Imperial government, but that Canada was not supported by the Imperial authorities. The hon. member (Mr. Bourassa) says that such a statement was made previously by Sir Louis Davies, and by the right hon. Prime Minister, and we have the fact that the Prime Minister when speaking to-day never denied the charge of the hon. member (Mr. Bourassa), that the action of the commission was not supported by the Imperial government. The hon. member for Labelle told us that in making that statement he was only repeating what Sir Louis Davies and what the Prime Minister had previously said.

Mr. BOURASSA. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I rise to a point of order. I have never stated either in this debate or in any other debate, that the action of the Anglo-American Commission during its sittings was not supported by the British government. Never did I make that statement to-day nor on any other day. What I have stated is, that after the case was laid in the hands of the British government, the British government took such action that one of our commission was obliged to go there to dissipate their prejudices. That was the only statement I have made.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I quite understand the fine point which the hon. gentleman has made. He did not state in this House that anything occurred before the commission, or that the commissioners appointed by the Imperial authorities or any of them, had not supported the contentions of Canada ; but that some things which had been recommended by that commission were pressed upon the British Imperial government by Sir Louis Davies, and had not received the sanction or support of that government.

Mr. BOURASSA. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is not that what you said, Sir ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, that is right.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) says that he has not published that for the first time, but he was secretary of that commission, he knew the facts, he knew all the circumstances and whether or not it was the opinion of Sir Louis Davies and the Prime Minister, he had at all events given that statement his imprimatur when he quoted it.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I must remind him that I was not acting as secretary when that occurred. My action as secretary ceased the day of the adjournment at Washington some time in February, 1899, while the matters which I have been referring to did not happen until six months after.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am glad to hear the explanation of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) because I thought he was secretary of that commission at this very moment.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am officially, but I mean actually. Since that I have never acted.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am the secretary theoretically, if you prefer the word.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We will not consider it a precedent. I believed myself that the whole discussion was out of order, and I drew attention to it, but the Prime Minister stated that on going into Supply we had a right to discuss all these matters.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not a previous debate.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) was discussing a past debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. We can discuss, even a question which has been previously discussed, on a motion to go into Supply, but we must not refer to a previous debate. I am sorry to have to say that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) went a little too far in that regard. Not only did he give a personal explanation, but he entered into a discussion of the matter. I therefore do not like to stop the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) in his argument, but I would ask that this should not be taken as a precedent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, am I to understand that you have acted in a dual capacity, first as Imperial secretary and then as Canadian secretary? At present the hon. gentleman is secretary of that commission he tells us, and we would like to know whether he is the Canadian secretary or the Imperial secretary. However, that does not bear on my argument. What I have stated is, that the hon. member (Mr. Bourassa) as secretary of that commission had full knowledge of the proceedings, and the very fact of his repeating what Sir Louis Davies said, gives that statement the imprimatur of the secretary. We should know about this. There is something which was pressed on the Imperial authorities and of which we have no knowledge whatever. Now, what is that? Let us hear of it. We are entirely in the dark as to what contention was made by Sir Louis Davies and the commissioners. The other day the hon. member (Mr. Bourassa) made a statement in this House which was thought so important that a denial was obtained from Sir Louis Davies, one of the Supreme Court judges, and we witnessed the extraordinary spectacle of the Prime Minister, who is a member of the commission, sitting still in his seat and not offering a word of contradiction.

The PRIME MINISTER. Contradict what?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member for Labelle made the statement that the Imperial government had refused to sanction some of the wishes and some of the aspirations that a majority of the commission had urged upon the commission for the purpose of settling our claim.

The PRIME MINISTER. He never said that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And, he said that instead of supporting the Canadian view of the case the British authorities took a contrary attitude. That was the statement of the hon. member for Labelle, and that statement was not denied by the Prime Minister. The right hon. gentleman said that Canadian interests were not always safe in Imperial hands, that we had been treated badly in the past, and he hoped we would not be so treated in the future, and he left the inference that as in the past we had been badly treated in our dealings with the United States, there was very little prospect of our receiving better treatment in the future. He led us to believe that it was a question of such importance and that it had reached such a crisis that we had better wait for two or three years for the purpose of having our rights adjudicated upon unless we were disposed to go to war on the subject. He had the despatch of Lord Lansdowne stating: 'We will not consent to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty unless you settle the claims of Canada in regard to the Alaskan boundary.' With that declaration before him, made publicly to the whole world in the despatch of Lord Lansdowne, the right hon. gentleman was silent. But the hon. member for Labelle has let the cat out of the bag. I doubt very much if there was even a protest made. I do not know that our interests were at all represented or that any communication on the subject was sent to the British government; because, if it had been, in view of the remarks of Lord Salisbury and Lord Lansdowne, no government which would consent to the abrogation of that treaty without making some provision for the settlement for the claims of Canada could continue to exist in England. There may be something in the background—I hope there is. It may be that the Imperial government, notwithstanding their consent to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, have had some understanding on the subject. We have no statement from hon. gentlemen opposite whether they made a representation on the subject or not. All we know is from the published statement of their late Minister of Justice in certain magazine articles, on which the London 'Times' commented, commending the contention of the Minister of Justice. But I trust in the justice of the Imperial government. I have great belief in the power of the ægis which that mighty government flings over us, and it may be that they did not consent to the abrogation of such an important treaty as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, in which we have such great interests involved, without having some understanding, perhaps not by treaty but only by word of mouth, for the settlement of these difficulties. At any rate, the public of Canada have a right to know our position in reference to these matters, and I hope we may be informed of it in a short time.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, I consider the discussion now before the House a proper time for making a few remarks with regard to the conduct of the Imperial government towards Canada. The idea is liable to go forth that an impression prevails in this House on the

part of a considerable portion of its members, and also in this country, that Great Britain has been guilty of neglect of the interests of this Dominion, and has come short of her duty in regard to promoting and maintaining those interests. I consider, Mr. Speaker—and I think I am warranted in making my belief public at this time—that such a charge at this time against the British authorities is entirely unjust. There have been a great many criticisms indulged in, at present and in the past, with regard to England's failure to maintain our interests, and it has been asserted that in many cases she has been outwitted by American diplomats. It is well to bear in mind that Great Britain has world-wide interests. It is a mighty empire with interests in every clime and every hemisphere; and Great Britain is unable to take exclusive cognisance of the interests of one colony alone, but in the management of her policy must be governed by broad considerations. It may be necessary at times for her to take a course which would not be taken if the interests of one special corner of her dominions were alone to be considered. I believe that on the whole England's management of the affairs of Canada has been all that could be expected—has been all that she could maintain for us. I remember when a boy there was an old controversy about our northern boundary. The American contention was for a boundary line on the 54·40th line of latitude. I remember that one of the battle cries of the great presidential contest of 1840, when I was a mere boy, was, '54·40 or fight!' This was inscribed on political banners all over the United States. Well, I consider it a very great triumph of British diplomacy that the boundary was secured at the 49th parallel instead of at 54·40. If the American contention had prevailed at that time, the great Canadian North-west, which is the future hope of this Dominion, would have been worthless to us, because we would have lost nearly 400 miles in width from north to south of the southern portion of that territory. At a previous time we had the boundary line of Maine settled. It has always been asserted that we were beaten on that occasion. Well, the American contention was that they were entitled to the southern shore of the St. Lawrence as their boundary, and the selection of the line which was selected was a compromise. Whether we got all we were entitled to or not, I am quite sure that Lord Ashburton succeeded in getting all that it was possible to get, and that the interests of Canada in that settlement were as fully cared for as possible.

In reference to this Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which has been the subject of discussion here, and about which my hon. friend the late Minister of Justice has furnished communications to British periodicals, that treaty has been abrogated. I believe that the consent of the British authorities to the abrogation of that treaty was good policy. I do not believe it was necessary to keep open a source of irritation which was in danger of bringing the two nations to the verge of war, and I am quite certain that the new treaty is one which in a broad sense is advantageous to British interests. I remember speaking to Lord Pauncefote at Washington the day after the treaty was signed, and that eminent diplomat stated to me that there was no incident in the course of his whole diplomatic life which had afforded him so much gratification as the fact that he had been instrumental in setting at rest difficulties between the two governments which had threatened to lead to the most serious consequences. It has been maintained that we should have special rights in this canal. We have rights which the British government have deemed sufficient for Great Britain. The American people are of course more intimately connected with and more intimately interested in that canal than any other people. It is practically an extension of their coast line from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We have not the same intimate interest in the canal which they have, but we have all the advantages which any neutral power has. I believe we are making an unnecessary amount of fuss about the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. I believe that the British government has in this matter been governed by broad and high considerations and did what was best under the circumstances. I have no sympathy with these criticisms of the British government. We have no ground for complaint against that government. We have had the protection of its army and navy, and the use of its consular and diplomatic corps without cost, ever since we have had existence as a Dominion. On every occasion the British authorities have shown the most friendly feeling and the most earnest desire to protect our interests, and while Great Britain may not have on all occasions done all that we desired, yet she has done all that it was possible to do in our interest.

So far as this Alaskan boundary question is concerned, it is unnecessary to say that our contentions are well founded and those of the Americans not tenable in our opinion. But that is a matter which is pending now. We cannot open this question. The government are not in a position to take the House and the country into its confidence. If it were to do so, that would have a most pernicious and prejudicial effect on the progress of the negotiations. I think that the position of the government is unassailable. It has pursued the proper policy, and the criticisms levied against it are not well founded.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not understand the contention to be that we are dissatisfied because England abrogated the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, but because it was abrogated without any settlement of the Alaskan boundary dispute. That was the contention put

forward by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), and not that he was dissatisfied with the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. He said, what every one will admit, that we have as great interests both on the Atlantic and the Pacific as the United States, because our territory extends to both these oceans, and is quite as large as the United States. Therefore, anything that affects the interests of the one in this matter must also affect the other.

But what I rose to refer to more particularly is the keeping back of papers which ought to have been before us long ago.

The Joint High Commission was appointed in 1898. It carried on its operations from time to time, during six months, and practically, so far as we know—and we glean that information from the remarks of the hon. the First Minister last fall at Montreal—it will never meet again. We are further told by the secretary of that commission that he has long ceased to be its secretary. If the statement of the premier be accurate, then all these papers and correspondence should have been before this House long ago. Without these documents we are unable to judge of what has been done or criticise it intelligently, and yet, on one pretext or another, they are refused. In view of the announcement which was made by the First Minister, it seems to me that these papers should have been before us long ago. Until they are before us neither this House nor the people will be satisfied that Canada's interests have been defended as they should have been.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Dominion public building, Manitoba—Renewal improvements, repairs, &c., $5,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How much has been spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). Two thousand four hundred and fifty-eight dollars.

Mr. PUTTEE. This is an exceedingly modest item for Manitoba, where there is great necessity for public buildings. The business of the city has increased so much that the public service is hampered through lack of accommodation. Our accommodation has not been increased for a good many years, and I am sure that the Minister of Customs and the Postmaster General will be able to show the Minister of Public Works that the business in their departments has been more than doubled in the last few years. The population of Winnipeg has practically doubled between the two censuses, and the last month's returns from the Customs Department are 30 per cent higher from those of February of last year. This matter has been brought to the attention of the hon. minister several times.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My attention has been called by the board of trade and other people to the position of affairs in Winnipeg. I quite appreciate what my hon. friend has said, but Winnipeg, like Montreal, Toronto and other places, has not so far been able to get all that it requires. We will have to grapple with the situation, which I admit requires a remedy.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does Winnipeg come into the category of those places not entitled to the favour of the government ? That is to say, in regard to the representative of Winnipeg in this House, is he entitled to demand, if not favours, justice, in the way of the expenditure of public money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have the greatest regard for the representative of Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee). He is one of the representatives of the labour element, and any representations he makes to me are received with the consideration that I always entertain towards the labour element. Now, my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is altogether wrong in stating his views as mine. I am prepared to stand by what I have said, but I do not like to have him attribute to me things that I have never said and opinions that I do not entertain.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. minister is aware that many of those who sit in this House represent more working people, perhaps, than does the hon. member for Winnipeg. Is it a question of whether one represents working people or whether one supports or opposes the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With me, there is no other question than justice and fairness.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then, the hon. gentleman has turned over a new leaf.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The new leaf is not a bad one, neither was the old one.

Mr. PUTTEE. I have placed the position of Winnipeg before the minister purely on the actual demands of the public service. As far as we in the west are concerned, we see that the time that has been talked of for years, the new time with us, is practically dawning. This year has shown that we are entering upon the era of prosperity and incoming population that has been talked of. I am sure the hon. minister will understand that the public service in Winnipeg demands further accommodation in the matter of buildings. As to what the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says concerning the support and non-support of the government, I believe he understands that, so far as I am concerned, these matters make no difference. I am prepared to deal with this government or any other government solely on their action and their merits.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand that this item is to be expended on public buildings not merely in Winnipeg but in Brandon and other places. Is the hon. minister able to tell us what portion will be spent on the basis of day's labour and what on the basis of public tender and contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be all by day's labour, as the amounts are very small.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the largest amount the minister has in view ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. An expenditure on the custom-house, of $933.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will that be by day's labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Judging by the figures given in the Auditor General's Report, which show only a number of small expenditures, the buildings must be in fairly good repair. The same thing would be indicated by the fact that we see here in the estimates 'appropriations not required for 1902-1903, $17,900.'

Mr. McCREARY. I was rather surprised when I saw this sum of $5,000 in the estimates as the total that was going to be spent in the province of Manitoba next year for Dominion public buildings. When we compared that $5,000 with the amount to be expended in other provinces, even, judging on the basis of population, it will be seen that we are very small potatoes indeed.

An hon. MEMBER. The buildings are in good condition.

Mr. McCREARY. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, the buildings are not in good condition. I know the Dominion immigration hall at Winnipeg pretty well, and I know that it is certainly not in good condition. The Dominion immigration hall should be reserved entirely for foreign immigrants, and for British immigrants there should be a new building distinct and apart from it. The best class of immigrants do not care to go into the Dominion immigration hall. I am not afraid to say that, because I know it. Every year, about March or April, there are some contagious diseases, and the building is in such a condition that it is almost impossible to keep it as it should be kept. What I did two years ago, was to rent a building on the edge of the river, which happened to be vacant, and put the British immigrants there, reserving them a place for themselves. The consequence was that we got the best class. Not only the steerage passengers, but the intermediate passengers went to that building, and they were quite content. Why ? Because it was a good place for them to stay. We had it fitted up with beds so that the people could have a rest. As I understand it, the Dominion immigration halls at Quebec, Halifax and other places are fitted up splendidly, with beds provided and every accommodation. Much more is this required in the Dominion immigration hall at Winnipeg. When the immigrant crosses from the seaboard he likes to rest over at Winnipeg for a day or even two or three days. They are weary with their journey, the children are exhausted, and they like to get a good rest. The immigration hall should be fitted up much better than it is. With regard to the post office building at Winnipeg, I know something about that because I live in the city, and a great number of my constituents come to the city for their mail as my constituency touches the city on three sides embracing such parishes as Kildonan and St. James and part of Rockwood. The Winnipeg post office is almost a disgrace. The revenue of that post office makes it the third in the Dominion, yet I have seen, at the general inquiry wicket an average of eight or ten people waiting their turn to ask for mail matter. The first floor of that building is entirely too small. This year land should be bought, even if the building of an extension is not carried on at once. On Main St., property is going up so rapidly that, if it continues at the present rate it will double in a little over a year. Property that was bought by Messrs. Osler, Hammond and Nanton at $600 a foot—50 feet of it, not on a corner—was sold to certain parties for $1,000 a foot almost spot cash, and a building is to be erected upon it fifteen stories high. That land is almost opposite the post office. The banks, wholesale houses and other enterprising institutions are buying real estate and erecting large buildings. I would urge upon the minister that, before the property gets too valuable, a site should be secured either alongside the post office, or in rear of it, and a new building erected, and then remove the custom-house, inland revenue office and the land office and centralize them all in one place. The Dominion government should keep pace with the progress that is being made there and be ready to meet the wishes of the people.

Mr. CLARKE. Has any representation been made to the Minister of Public Works as to the unsatisfactory state of the Dominion immigration building in Winnipeg ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember any other representations having been made to me. My hon. friend must not forget that I am only a builder. That immigration building is under the care of the Minister of the Interior. When he wants repairs and applies to me, I make them, but I do not remember having received any application for another building.

Mr. CLARKE. Is a building rented for the accommodation of those immigrants of British origin, or are they herded along with the foreign elements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I see the hon. gentleman is urging the erection of another building.

Mr. CLARKE. If we want additional accommodation. Has a building been rented for the purpose of providing accommodation for the British immigrants there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If one has been rented, it was not done by my department. I have none under my charge. I don't know whether my engineer has rented a building.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is any necessity for an additional building or enlargement of a present one, would not application therefor be made by the Minister of the Interior to the Department of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. And no application has been made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not that I remember, and not that my officers remember.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose if new buildings were erected it would devolve on the Department of Public Works to look after them, light them, pay water rates, and so on ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, all that; except that in some cases the Militia Department take care of their own buildings.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is clerk in Winnipeg ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Cyr is in charge for the province.

Public Works—North-west Territories—Carnduff court-house, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site has been purchased from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for $440, and a contract has been awarded to a firm in Brandon, Manitoba, for the sum of $5,238.46.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I thought the minister had concluded to do these small works by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I made up my mind it was better in this case to give the contract after tender. I never said I would carry out every work by day labour.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman did not bind himself to do so, but if I remember rightly he expressed sympathy with the views of some hon. gentlemen in this House who were of the opinion that where the amount was small the government could save money by doing the work directly under the supervision of the department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this case I thought it was better to call for public tenders. It is a far away place, and I did not know any one there.

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

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With furniture, &c., we expect it will cost $9,000. The item we are now discussing will complete the work. The lowest tender was accepted, and the contract is to be completed on the 15th of July, of the present year.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to know if the minister has adopted any plan or rule as to what work shall be done by day labour, and what work by contract, or whether all new works of construction are to be done by contract ? Are there any particular classes of buildings that the department construct by contracts, and are there any other classes where the department adopts the rule of constructing them by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As a rule we erect all new public buildings by tender and contract. There are very few exceptions. I do not remember any case where a new public building has been erected otherwise than by contract.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the Department of Marine and Fisheries I think they still continue the practice of building lighthouses by day labour. I think the rule was that where the work cost less than $10,000, that was the better plan of doing the work, and they had an official, Mr. Noble, who had charge of these works in the different provinces. That rule, I understand, has been abandoned in the Department of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would my hon. friend advocate such a rule ? I would like to have his views.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I practiced that rule, though not absolutely. I referred to the experience of the department, which I think has been continued, and I mentioned the name of the gentleman whose time was wholly occupied in supervising the construction of these lights. My inquiry was as to whether such a rule still obtains. I understand it does not in the Department of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say the other day that in his experience most public works could be carried out quite as well by day labour as under contract, and he gave as an illustration the

building of his dredges at Sorel, and the building and repair of harbours. Now he seems to have come to another conclusion, and he thinks the proper course is to let the work by contract. If it is a proper course to pursue to let the erection of a building by tender, although it may only cost $5,000 or $6,000, surely, by the same parity of reasoning, the same ought to apply to the building of a wharf or a vessel. I can understand why it might not apply in the case of the government operating a shipyard of its own, but in a hundred and one instances the minister has adopted this system of doing work by day's labour, and he defended it the other night on the ground that the contract system, was, in his experience considerable of a failure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has not been a failure in every case. Public buildings have been erected by contract. Most of the important works have been constructed by contract also. I am constructing some smaller works by day's labour. I may say in all frankness that doing work by contract gives a minister a good deal less trouble, as all those who have been in office will admit, but there are works that cannot possibly be given by contract and it was while discussing these works a few days ago that I said what the hon. gentleman for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has alluded to. The repairing of a public building cannot possibly be done by contract because you never know in advance the quantity of work you must carry out. Works of repairs cannot be done by contract.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Small repairs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, you cannot do them in that way. As to larger works, while I spoke the other day very much from a theoretical standpoint, I would say it is necessary for a prudent man to have a good foreman when he makes up his mind to do work by day's labour. Unless he has a good foreman, I would not advise any one to undertake public work by day's labour.

Mr. CLARKE. It was stated the other day that the practice of some municipalities was to do municipal work by day's labour and that it had been found to work out fairly satisfactorily. I may say frankly that under proper conditions I am very much in favour of work being done by day's labour, but I want to point out that the methods adopted by the government are not such as to enable that system to be tried as fairly and successfully as it ought to be done. The municipalities that I have any knowledge of which have adopted the day's labour system ask for tenders for all the supplies that they require for a municipal work or service that they undertake to do by day's labour. That practice does not apply in the department of the hon. gentleman, or in the department of any of his colleagues. If they desire to strangle the system of doing work by day's labour they will persist in the course they have pursued. If the best possible results are to be obtained, why not take a leaf out of the book of the municipalities, why not ask for public competition to supply the government that purports to do work by day's labour with the best materials procurable at the lowest possible price ? The plan which the hon. Minister of Public Works has adopted in carrying out public works by day's labour is not to call for public tenders for the supplies that are required, but rather to give orders here and there to political friends. And then, in the selection of workmen to do this work, no municipality that I know of would confine the giving of employment to men of one political stripe. Why should workingmen who do not agree with the hon. Minister of Public Works, or who may not agree with any political party, be deprived of the right to receive a reasonable amount of employment on public works ? They will have to contribute their share towards the cost and maintenance of these public works and the plan adopted now is a plan designed to militate against the development of the principle of doing government work by day's labour. If the hon. Minister of Public Works is really sincere, if he is honest in the desire to give a fair trial to that system, he must amend his methods considerably. I take it that the hon. minister is honest in striving to apply that principle to all of these small works, but I would point out to him most respectfully that he is doing that principle or system of doing work a very great injury. If he is really sincere he must in future purchase supplies by public tender and he must not confine the giving of employment to men who are to be engaged to do this work by day's labour, of one political stripe. I ask the hon. minister if he has any plan as to the magnitude of the work to be done by day's labour; that is to say, if works that would cost a certain sum are to be given by contract and works of less magnitude are to be done by day's labour ? There does not seem to be any plan now. Some works costing $3,000 or $4,000 may be done by day's labour and works involving an expenditure of a smaller sum may be done by contract. If the hon. minister would decide as to the magnitude of the work that may be done by day's labour and of that which may be done by contract, ask for supplies by public tender and not give employment to men of one political stripe only in carrying out that work, I am perfectly satisfied that much more satisfactory results would be obtained. I am not in favour of indiscriminately doing public work by day's labour as it has been done, but I am strongly in favour of giving the system of doing government work by day's labour a fair chance, and that is what I claim it has not been given by the hon. Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am in a very peculiar position. The reproach has often been made to me by a good many of my political friends that I am still employing opponents of the present government. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) is unfair, though not knowing it, I am sure, when he seems to level at me the reproach of being altogether exclusive. May I be allowed to tell him just now that the addition which has been erected here by day's labour, has been under the control of one of my officers, not a permanent officer, who is a strong opponent of the present government.

An hon. MEMBER. Turn him out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Turn him out, I am told. That is just the way. On one side the minister is told by his political friends to turn out everybody who is not in sympathy with him, and on the other hand, when he comes to the House, the opposition—it is fair warfare, and I have no complaint to make—tell him : Well, you are in office, but you have no right to exercise patronage in the interest of your own party. When we were in office we did not do anything of the kind, but do not do it now, if you please ! That is my position; between the two I try to be fair. I give a preference to my political friends, and it is my right and duty to do so, but I say that when I leave office I think I will be able to bear the testimony for myself that I have not cut off all the heads that others might have cut off. When an officer does his duty well he has a right to be protected, and he has a right to vote as he pleases. But my hon. friend will admit with me, that in a riding where a public work is going on, the preference has to be given to a large extent to political friends. Nobody would do anything else. As to the supplies, we buy upon quotations, as all firms do, and most of the time we ask for tenders. I suppose it is impossible to lay down a fixed rule in advance as to the works that can be carried out by day's labour. If you find a good foreman and material at hand, you can successfully carry out the work by day's labour.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister has just demonstrated that the contention advanced by this side of the House is well founded. He would have us believe that he does this solely for the interest of the working men, the words are scarcely cold on his lips when he tells us of the insuperable difficulties he encounters. I have no doubt of the hon. gentleman's goodness of heart, but I have very great doubt as to his strength to carry out his intentions. He knows very well that when he starts on the system of day's labour the work will be pounced upon and monopolized by his political friends. He does not pursue his course in the interest of the working men of Canada, but in the interest of the partisans of the government. Under our system that seems to be the rule, and personally I do not complain at it, but I do complain of the hon. gentleman pretending that he has adopted this system in the interest of the working men, when we all know that he has adopted it in the interest of his political friends. The hon. gentleman says that he does his very best, but I can tell him that his best under such circumstances is worthless. When contracts are let every man gets a chance of employment according to his merits, but when the work is done by day's labour it simply amounts to an unfair use of public patronage. The minister tells us that he gave this work to a man in his department who was a Conservative. Would he turn out that man because he was a Conservative ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could have done it.

Mr. CLANCY. Oh, I suppose the hon. gentleman could, and I suppose he is astounded at his moderation because he did not do it, but I can tell him that if he did so, it would be adding another sin to the many he is guilty of.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not guilty this time anyway.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not complain for one of the patronage going to the Liberals of this country under our present system, but I do complain of the minister claiming that he is benefiting the workingmen of Canada when he is simply benefiting his own partisans.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On what authority did the Minister of Public Works erect a building costing over $5,000 without letting it out by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I stated that the building had been erected under the supervision of a man who is a strong political opponent of ours.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. By day's labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. It could not be done any other way.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister must know that the law of the land prevents him from doing that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The statutory law makes it incumbent on you to give a contract for any building costing over $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no law of that kind.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is an Order in Council which in a sense is higher than a statute, because it has been approved by the government itself. I have heard that principle contended for time and time again when the Liberals were in opposition, but perhaps they have disregarded their principles more in this than even in other matters. I always understood that we asked

the minister if the work would be given by contract whenever a vote was taken, but perhaps we did not do so in this case.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Here is the Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know the Order in Council very well.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This Order in Council states :

Order in Council, May 23rd, 1880. On a joint memorandum, dated March 20th, 1880, from the Honourable the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways and Canals, recommending that hereafter all public works involving an expenditure of over $5,000 shall be let by public tender and contract, unless owing to urgency or other cause it be deemed advisable to take different action, and that in all such cases authority be obtained by an Order in Council.

Probably the Minister of Public Works did not even get an Order in Council passed. All expenditures such as this are illegal except in the case of a canal breaking or some work of emergency. The Minister of Public Works disregards Acts of parliament, Orders in Council and everything else. I do not know of any possible way of keeping him within the principles which were so earnestly advocated by his friends when in opposition. An Act of parliament won't do it, an Order in Council won't do it, and I don't suppose we can secure a vote of censure from the House on the conduct of the hon. minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that my hon. friend could get the censure of the House, because there is no ground for it. The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken in his interpretation of the law. I invite him to read it; it is very clear :

The minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest or in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers in the service of the department.

The minister is perfectly free.

Mr. CLARKE. What are you quoting from ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Public Works Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister must see, if he reads it again, that it bears no such interpretation as he says. Unless it can be otherwise done better by the department——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of which the minister himself is the judge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly; if not, who is the judge ? But more than that there is an Order in Council, to which my hon. friend probably has meant to allude, which provides that all works costing over $5,000, and done by contract must be advertised. I cannot give a contract for any work costing over $5,000 without advertising for tenders; but if I make up my mind to carry out by day's labour any work, whatever the cost may be, I am perfectly free to do it. Whenever I give a contract for a work costing over $5,000 without tender, I must go to my colleagues; but if I want to carry out any work by day's labour, I am perfectly free to do it, and it was done over and over again by the late administration. For instance, I have often cited the case of the post office and custom-house of St. John, New Brunswick, the work on which cost over $200,000, and was done by day's labour.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It was a case of emergency; the roof was burnt, and it had to be repaired.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was there an Order in Council for the addition to this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there was not, and it was not necessary. I did not give any contract for the work; I carried it out by day's labour, as I had a right to do.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has just said that he has not the right to do it without an Order in Council where the cost exceeds $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry I have not made myself understood. I cannot give a contract for over $5,000 without an Order in Council, but I can carry out by day's labour any work, whatever the cost may be, without any Order in Council. That is the law.

Mr. CLARKE. I am not finding very particular fault with the Minister of Public Works for doing work by day labour; but I hold that the method he is adopting is not giving that system fair play. As one who desires to see the system of day labour more generally adopted, I protest that the method at present followed in the Public Works Department is not conducive to the continuance of that system. If the day labour system is to be successful, it must be divorced entirely from partisanship ; but that unfortunately has not been the case. If it is germane to this discussion, as we have the Minister of Labour in his seat now, I particularly ask the Minister of Public Works what he has to say of the circular or letter which was sent out by the Postmaster General when acting as Minister of Public Works two years ago to his political friends throughout the country, with regard to doing work by day labour or by contract. I find that a copy of the letter, which was sent by the Postmaster General to his political friends in March, 1900, is spread on 'Hansard' of July 13, 1900.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that I never read it.

Mr. CLARKE. I will read two or three lines of it, and I want to know what the minister will do about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will judge fairly.

Mr. CLARKE. I am sure he will judge fairly between the Minister of Labour and the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is it long?

Mr. CLARKE. The letter contains a good many clauses, but I will only read the fifth clause :

In case of any work not now under contract, but authorized by vote of parliament, please state whether you advise its being carried out by contract or by day's labour.

I want to know from the minister whether the advantage that a political party may obtain by work being done by day labour or by contract is the only one to be taken into consideration, or does he think that that method of doing work should be applied ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I want to read the whole letter. I cannot judge an important document of that kind without reading the whole of it.

Mr. CLARKE. The gentleman wanted to know if it was a long letter, and I wished to spare him the reading of the whole of it. But I will read the whole of it. It is to be found in 'Hansard' of 1900, at page 10,110 :

Ottawa, March 13, 1900.

My dear Sir,—During Mr. Tarte's absence I have been requested to take charge of his department for him, and it would be of great service in enabling me to take up his work if you would kindly write me at your earliest convenience with reference to the following subjects :

1. For what works in your constituency has there been a parliamentary vote ?
2. Have these works been begun ? If so, in what state of progress are they ?
3. If not begun, what is your advice as to whether or not they should be begun ?
4. Are you asking for provision being made in supplementary estimates for :
(a) New works ;
(b) Carrying on or completion of works already authorized or begun ?
If so, what are your views :
(a) As to sum required ;
(b) As to what work should be performed ?
5. In case of any work not now under contract, but authorized by vote of parliament, please state whether you advise its being carried out by contract or by day's labour.

Yours faithfully,
WM. MULOCK.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I think it is a document that is worthy of attention. My hon. friend was new to the Department of Public Works; he did not know the work of the department as well as I did, and he wanted information, and I congratulate him on his desire to do right.

Mr. CLARKE. And evidently he could not get any information in the department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see anything wrong in that document. My hon. friend the Postmaster General was simply asking for advice, as my hon. friend opposite would have done under similar circumstances.

Mr. CLARKE. Then the idea that has been disseminated most carefully by the hon. gentleman and his friends opposite, that they believe in this system of day labour, is not very well founded. Political exigencies evidently have guided them so far, and judging by the statement of the Minister of Public Works and the letter from the Postmaster General which I have just read, there is not much hope of any reform in that direction.

Mr. GANONG. I had occasion last session to call attention to the manner in which a large public work in the county I have the honour to represent is being conducted. That public work has resolved itself into an immense political job, neither more nor less. This is easy accounted for by the frank statement which the minister has made to-day. He has told us in plain terms that preference would be given on government works to the political friends of the party in power. The hon. gentleman can certainly find no fault with the manner in which that principle is carried out on the work at Wilson's Beach. When an applicant asks for employment on this particular work, he is asked whether he paws with the right foot, and it would be interesting to learn from the hon. minister if that is another of the many graphic phrases which have made his name a household word. Well, if the applicant paws with the right foot, he gets the job. Otherwise he does not. If the hon. minister is responsible for this system of selection, if he has sent out a circular to ascertain how many people down there paw with the right foot, I would ask him to take the House into his confidence and let us know.

There have been considerable purchases of material in connection with this work, and I doubt whether in any single instance tenders have been called for. In the Auditor General's Report, we find one purchase of timber exceeding $8,000 and another exceeding $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Were any tenders asked?

Mr. GANONG. Not so far as we know. No doubt the parties who furnished this timber pawed with the right foot. Certainly the firm of T. McAvity & Sons, which furnished supplies to the extent of $1,342, comes within this category. Has the hon. gentleman sent out his mandate that only those who paw with the right foot will be given work on this breakwater ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot gratify my hon. friend's curiosity with regard to pawing by either the right or left foot, but I think the House will find that his indignation is rather out of place when I inform it that we asked for tenders on this work and did not receive any, consequently I had to carry on that work by day labour. I suppose my hon. friend, if he had called for tenders and had not received any, would not have done the work either with his right or left foot. I, however, am doing the work with both feet and both hands.

Mr. GANONG. Were any tenders called for, in the case of the lumber and other supplies ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say. Those are details that were left to the engineer.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Public Works put his own interpretation on the Order in Council. He says it only applies to contracts over $5,000 and does not apply to work done by day labour. The hon. gentleman is the first minister to venture to put that interpretation upon it. But what does he care about Orders in Council or Acts of parliament. They are not binding on him. The words in the Order in Council are as clear as possible :

On a joint memo. dated March 20th, 1880, from the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways and Canals, recommending that hereafter all public works involving an expenditure of over $5,000 shall be let for public tender and contract, unless, owing to urgency or other cause, it be deemed advisable to take a different action, and in all such cases authority must be obtained by Order in Council.

The hon. gentleman says he never got such authority, but he puts up the plea that while he could not enter into a contract of over $5,000 without calling for tenders, he could employ day labour to any extent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman would read the whole Order in Council, he would find that it deals solely with public tenders and contracts. That is a view which has always been acted upon both by myself and by predecessors. It is no use trying to interpret an Order in Council by quoting only a part of it. The hon. gentleman knows very well that there is no difficulty in any minister carrying on a work by day labour or by contract if he makes up his mind to go to his colleagues.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He gets an Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That has never been done.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Always.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Never in the Department of Public Works. At any rate in the present instance, the work has been given by public tender and contract.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was the deposit ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Ten per cent.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who was the successful contractor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Harrington.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How were tenders called for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By advertisement in the newspapers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In what newspapers ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say now. If my hon. friend wants to know whether the advertisements were put in the Conservative newspapers, I can tell him they were not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, what I want to know is what opportunity was given the public to know that tenders were called for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We published all our advertisements in the Ottawa papers and in the North-west papers as well.

Mr. CLARKE. With regard to the Wilson's Beach breakwater, the hon. minister has said that he advertised for public tenders and could not get any. Where were these advertisements published ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In many of the newspapers of New Brunswick and also in Ottawa, I have no doubt.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In 'La Patrie' ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I believe 'La Patrie' has a very large circulation.

Mr. CLARKE. There has been $14,000 to $15,000 expended on that work already. Is it possible that for such a work the hon. minister could not get tenders ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not.

Mr. CLARKE. After advertising ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it has happened to the department several times.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I would like to say a few words on this public tender and day labour question. We on this side claim that the healthiest way of doing the public work is to advertise for tenders. The Minister of Public Works, on the other hand says that the work will be done more cheaply, by day labour. No doubt there are cases where it is absolutely necessary to do the work by day labour. It seems to me there

are many cases in which it would be more economical to do the work by public tender than by day's labour, as it is done now. In five years there has been an increase of $10,000,000 in the cost of the public service, and possibly this system of doing work may account for some of that increase. Let me give the minister a small example in my own county. In 1896, there was a ferry across the Burlington channel. It was operated by hand, one man being in charge. Another man was in charge of the lighthouse. They received, together, about $900. In 1896 or 1897, a swing bridge was built. It now takes four men to operate that swing bridge, although the bridge is moved by power furnished by the Radial Railway, and all a man has to do is to touch a lever. These men are paid by the day. If the contract for working this bridge were let out, as the Postmaster General lets out contracts for carrying mail over short routes, the work could be done for $300 or $400 a year. The bridge is not operated at night, but only from 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. The work of the bridge could be done by one man, while another could attend the lighthouse and might assist at the bridge, as the lighthouse requires not more than two hours labour a day. Yet, it now costs $1,900 to do this work, which is so much less laborious than before, when it cost only $900. Of course, there is one gain to the hon. minister, for all the men employed there vote the hon. gentleman's ticket.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Years ago there was a ferry at Burlington channel. But before I came into office a swing bridge was placed there. I would have been glad to put it there, because there should be a swing bridge over the Burlington channel. But, as a matter of fact, I had nothing to do with putting it there. I suppose that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) does not understand the work or he would not talk about it as he does. What is the use of talking about one man doing the work ? The bridge must be operated, and there are windy days and there are days when the strength of one man would not be sufficient. And, in any case, this has no bearing upon the question of day's labour.

Mr. GANONG. There is a phase of this question of day's labour which has not yet been spoken of. Take, for instance, the work at Wilson's Beach. I speak of that because it is in my own county. Though that work had not been going on for quite a year, there has been expended for tools and other articles necessary for the workmen between $800 and $900. By the time it is completed probably $1,500 or $2,000 will have been expended in furnishing the necessary tools and other articles for carrying on the work. This will be added to the nominal cost of the work by, perhaps, from five to ten per cent. And the hon. minister knows that when the work is done these axes and adzes and manilla rope and other things will not be in sight.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ganong) is a sound business man, and he will agree that the Department of Public Works cannot carry on works without tools. This work could not be let by tender, and it is not fair to charge to this work all the cost of these tools. We are in the position of a public contractor who has a plant. Though we buy tools for a certain work those tools are used elsewhere. These workmen are electors of my hon. friend (Mr. Ganong), and surely they are honest men and are not going to steal these tools.

Mr. GANONG. I can only say that the hon. gentleman will need to put up a larger building than he has ever put up yet, if he continues to do public work in this manner, because he will have more tools accumulated from works done from the Atlantic to the Pacific than could be stored in any public building so far constructed.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the hon. minister to say that the new additions to the parliament buildings cost $75,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect, who is within hearing of my hon. friend's (Mr. Blain's) voice, tells me that the cost will amount to about $50,000, and this includes the two elevators. There will be an item in the suplementary estimates for this addition, and when it comes up, I shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman all information.

Mr. BLAIN. One thing I should like to learn is what proportion of this $50,000 will be wages and what proportion will be material ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When this item is before us, I will have the information.

Mr. GANONG. There is another item to which I wish to call attention in connection with this work at Wilson's Beach. I notice there is an item for Foreman Ethelbert Savage—this is during the month of June—and also for Foreman James Johnston. The minister is probably not aware, but I can tell him why it was necessary to have two foremen in doing this work by day's labour. I am well advised that they carried the timber there, dumped it into the water, hauled it up on a lot rented by the government, fitted it, as well as one foreman was able to do it to go into position. Then it was hauled down to the pier, but it was found that it did not fit so that another foreman was needed to fit it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can only say that the reason we employed two foremen was that there were two different works, the work of repairs and the construction of a new work. My hon. friend knows very well that two foremen would

be required, and he is only trying to make a little political capital.

Dominion Public Buildings—N. W. T. Court houses, police accommodation, &c., $1,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would the minister give us some information about this item of $1,000 for court-house, lock-up and police accommodation, &c.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is for all court-houses and lock-ups in the North-west Territories.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then it ought to have been 'court-houses' instead of 'court-house'.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it means court-house accommodation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On what principle is that money expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Caretakers write to the chief architect that such and such work needs to be done, and the chief architect authorizes it.

Dominion public buildings—Renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $4,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What did the hon. gentleman spend last year, and in what parts of the Territories ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We spent $1,639.41 up to the month of December.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. For what was the money used ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A great number of items : Calgary court-house, $5 ; Calgary land and registry office, $4.40 ; Calgary post office, $53.74 ; Edmonton post office, $24.25 ; Edmonton immigrant shed, $4.50 ; Edmonton registry office, $74.80; Lethbridge immigrant buildings, $1.57 ; Lethbridge post office, $90.33 ; Land office, $2.50 ; Macleod custom-house, $40 ; Moose-jaw court-house, $20 ; Moosomin, $7.50 ; Moosomin barracks, $6 ; Prince Albert court-house $61 ; Prince Albert land office, $75 ; Regina court-house, $416.70 ; Dominion land office, $2 ; Rossland immigrant house, $149.-60 ; North-west Territories, generally, $288.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What instructions are given to the officers there ? Do they make just such repairs as they see fit ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, they always make requisitions, which are approved by the chief architect.

Edmonton Jail, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have now before Council a report asking to be authorized to purchase a site, and the site has been chosen by the Department of Justice. They see that they will be obliged in the future to have a penitentiary, and they have found a site of 150 acres. It was intended at first to have both a jail and a court-house, but after considering the circumstances the government has concluded to build only a jail. It is badly needed. It will provide accommodation for 40 male prisoners and 10 or 15 female prisoners. I do not intend to spend more than $20,000 or $25,000 on the jail. My officers tell me that we cannot build a jail for that money, exclusive of the site. Of course I do not want to bind myself against the opinion of my chief architect, but it seems to me that with $25,000 we can build a jail.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand it was originally proposed to build a court-house, and there was a report as to what that would cost. What was the amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot remember. I am informed that no estimate was made of the cost of both a jail and court-house.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But a vote was taken a few years ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When was the land bought ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The land was negotiated for during last August, I think, from Mr. T. McDougall and Mr. Kenneth McDonald.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How was the value of it settled ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The late Minister of Justice conducted all the negotiations for the purchase of the site. He sent me a report telling me that he had taken an option upon this property.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What did you pay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $8,950. The late Minister of Justice with whom I discussed the question told me that he thought he had made a great bargain.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That the vendor had made a great bargain ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, he, the Minister of Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the hon. minister to say that in purchasing the site he purchased 150 acres.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. The Department of Justice seeing that they would be obliged to erect a penitentiary and finding a suitable site took an option upon it. It will be for the time being a kind of penitentiary because there will be prisoners incarcerated there.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume the Minister of Justice intends to start a model farm out there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose they will do the same thing there as at other penitentiaries. They will make the prisoners work, and it is a good thing too.

Mr. MORIN. What is the population of Edmonton ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give the exact population—I think 5,000 or 6,000.

Mr. MORIN. I will tell you the population. It is 2,626.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is the centre of a large district.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the hon. minister has paid a very high price for that site if he has paid $9,000. From whom did he purchase it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just said that the site was bought by the late Minister of Justice from Mr. McDougall and Mr. Kenneth McDonald.

Mr. SPROULE. Of Edmonton ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose so. I do not know them. I only know the Minister of Justice in this case.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the building is to be put up by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By contract.

Mr. SPROULE. There were no tenders asked for the site, I presume ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, if we must advertise for sites, I give it up. I cannot do it.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 16) respecting the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Port Dover, Brantford, Berlin and Goderich Railway Company and to change its name to 'The Grand Valley Traction Company.'—Mr. Heyd.

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railways Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company.—Mr. Cowan.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Macleod—Court-house and jail, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have selected a site there on government property so that we did not have to buy it. We have decided to erect a building of the same nature as that at Medicine Hat which has cost $10,000. The people of the town would like something more expensive but we will not go beyond that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the contract been let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Why are you asking $12,000 for a $10,000 building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The $2,000 extra will be for heating and fittings and so on. I intend to ask for tenders this summer for a $10,000 building and I do not intend to spend more than $12,000.

Red Deer—Court-house, lock-up and land office, $2,300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have bought a site for $840. The lot is 250 x 178 feet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. From whom did you buy that land ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers have not given me the name but I will get it if the hon. gentleman wishes it.

Mr. SPROULE. Last year the vote was $6,700 and the revote now is $5,700, and you are now asking $2,300. There must be something wrong about that. Do you expect to spend that $5,700 before the first of July ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have spent $840 for a site. We have simply made a mistake in addition.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the estimate for that building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Just the amount voted—$8,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No advertisements have been published ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, but it will be advertised, and will be given by tender.

Red Deer Valley immigrant building, $1,000.

Mr. GILMOUR. Where is that building to be situated ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On lot 20, block 4, section 16-17, township 30, range 27. That is all I know about it.

Mr. GILMOUR. Is it in the neighbourhood of Red Deer village ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must plead a certain amount of ignorance. The site has been chosen after consultation with the Minister of the Interior, who has charge of immigration.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where is the Minister of the Interior ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is ill, I am sorry to say.

Mr. INGRAM. Too much election.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It makes a fellow sick at times.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely this building is in the same place as the court-house and jail ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The court-house is in the town.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you purchased the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. What has it cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have paid $75 for it. It was bought from Messrs. Nanton & Munson.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the size ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The size is not indicated.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the Department of Public Works negotiate the purchase ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I think so. Sites are bought in this way, since I am asked. The Department of Justice is our agent for all these purchases. We choose a site ; the Department of Justice is then applied to, and they negotiate, examine the title, and pass the deed.

Mr. GILMOUR. Perhaps the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) will be able to tell us where this immigrant building is ?

Mr. OLIVER. The site of the proposed building is in the village of Red Deer, in the southern part of the village, on the east side of the railway track.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In regard to this purchasing of sites, the explanation of the hon. minister did not seem to be altogether satisfactory. This afternoon the hon. gentleman was good enough to state that the late Minister of Justice had undertaken to negotiate the purchase of the site for the Edmonton court-house and jail, which cost $9,000, and the hon. minister could give us no facts on which we might reach a conclusion as to whether that was an exorbitant price or otherwise. Now the hon. gentleman says that the practice is that the Department of Justice is concerned only to search the title and pass the conveyance. That is the ordinary rule. Can the hon. gentleman say how it is that this exceptional course seems to have been adopted of entrusting the Department of Justice with the work of arranging the purchase of the property ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection to state what has taken place. Before that purchase was made I had been in consultation with the hon. member for Alberta, and we had come to the conclusion to purchase another site. The late Minister of Justice came before council with another project. He stated that it was his intention, and he thought it was good policy, to prepare for a penitentiary later on. He represented to us that he had found a site that was a very suitable one. He was an experienced gentleman, seventy years old, long in public life, and his colleagues entrusted him with the matter. In point of fact the report of council by which I was authorized to purchase this site was his own. All I had to do in connection with the purchase of the site was to ratify his action.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the statement of the minister is unsatisfactory. He says the transaction is the work of his late colleague, and he washes his hands of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is nothing to wash.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There may be a satisfactory explanation of what at first blush seems to be an exorbitant price, $9,000, for a site of this kind.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One hundred and fifty acres of land.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know, an enormous piece of land. There were reasons for that, no doubt, whether good or bad. We have no explanation as to why such a tract of land was required or what the intention of the department is in regard to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The purpose of the late Minister of Justice was to provide for the penitentiary. No doubt one will soon be required there, and in the meantime the jail will serve for that purpose. The Prince Albert jail is a kind of penitentiary—so much so that I have nothing to do with its administration. Before preparing a report under my own

signature, I had a consultation with the hon. gentleman who sits for that riding, and he told me that the transaction was in every way advisable.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is it located ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A little out of the town. The hon. member for Alberta knows the place and can describe it.

Mr. OLIVER. At the request of the hon. Minister of Public Works, I can only say that the facts are exactly as he has stated them. The Department of Justice sent its trusted official to Edmonton and he decided that the needs for the present and the future were such as to require the purchase of a much larger piece of ground than the minister contemplated. He looked over the ground, and without any assistance from me in that part of the transaction, decided, on his own judgment, that this particular river claim—lot 20, I think—would answer the purpose exactly. He desired to secure a property closer to the town, but I objected because I did not think it desirable to have a penitentiary located too close to the town. He then decided that this property, which was the third river lot to the east of the boundary of the town, was just what was required. There are two coal mines on the property in operation at present. It has a river frontage, and is bounded by the lake in the rear. It belonged to two different parties, and is one of the oldest claims in the settlement. This official purchased the river frontage from the owner who had occupied it some twenty-five or thirty years at the rate of $75 per acre.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is his name ?

Mr. OLIVER. Terence Macdonald. He purchased the rear portion, which was not in occupation, from David McDougal for $50 per acre. Or rather, he secured options on the property at that price. The transfer has not yet been made and the options have expired, and I am not at all sure that the department could get the property at the money now.

Mr. GILMOUR. Does it front on the Saskatchewan river ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, east of the town.

Mr. GILMOUR. How far from the town ?

Mr. OLIVER. About twenty or thirty chains.

Mr. GILMOUR. Did that option secure the coal mine ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, subject to the present lessees holding. There are two lessees operating the coal mines, but their leases terminate in one or two years and the coal goes with the land.

Mr. SPROULE. What is land selling at in that vicinity ?

Mr. OLIVER. In some cases it goes from $7 to $10 an acre, at a distance from the town, and up to $100 per foot frontage on the main street.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose the department contemplates utilizing this large acreage for farming purposes ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For ordinary penitentiary purposes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And also operating the coal mine ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, the prisoners must be employed in some way.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems a very large piece of ground for a penitentiary, if we take the quantity of land devoted to other penitentiaries. It would appear as if the minister contemplated something out of the ordinary there.

Saskatoon immigrant building, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That work is under contract for the amount of $3,300. It was let by public tender on the 27th of October, 1901.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why does the department not give it by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The labour market at Saskatoon is not very large.

Yorkton—Court-house and jail, $4,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. minister please explain this item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a mistake there. A mistake of the Department of Finance, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been a clerical error. I am blamed so often that I want to blame somebody else now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount should be $9,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How has that been spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have bought the land. Lots 7, 8, 11 and 12 on Front Street, and lots 42 and 44 on Argyle Avenue have been bought from the Canadian Pacific Railway for $279, and lots 5, 6, 9 and 10 on Front Street, and 42 and 43 on Argyle Avenue from Mr. J. J. Smith, for $279—a total of $588 for the site.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Tenders have not been asked for, I suppose? But this will be done by tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be by tender, but tenders have not been asked for.

Public Works—chargeable to income—British Columbia—Dominion public buildings—renewal, removements, repairs, &c., $6,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was spent of last year's vote?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We seem to have spent $114 more than the appropriations.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where were the expenditures made?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nanaimo, custom-house; New Westminster, Dominion land's office, fisheries' office; Vancouver, examining warehouse; Victoria, drill hall, Marine hospital, post office, clerk of works' office, old custom-house; Kamloops, post office; William's Head, quarantine building; and general repairs; total $6,114.03.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Concerning the Vancouver public building, which is occupied by the post office and custom-house, has the hon. minister considered any improvement in that building? I believe there is no question but that the building is not large enough. In fact, I understand customs officers have to occupy a different building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have received a petition stating the facts which my hon. friend has just stated. In this, I am bound to acknowledge that the hon. gentleman is right and that there is not enough accommodation, as in the case of other cities. But he must not lose sight of the fact that we have just completed an armoury and drill hall at Vancouver, a large and extensive building. I do not think I can extend any hope for this year, but I am convinced that either I or whoever may be the minister next year will be in a position to adopt a more progressive policy, not only toward Vancouver, but towards other cities as well.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. minister caused any report to be made as to the accommodation there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only report I have is that the accommodation is inadequate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yet, nothing is to be done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not this year. A new building at Vancouver would involve a very large expenditure. The hon. gentleman lives there, and perhaps could suggest something. I should be glad to have his views.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I can only speak generally of the condition of things, which, I believe is really disgraceful. I have had no communication with any of the officials, but one has only to be there a short time to see that the building is quite inadequate for such a large and growing and busy community. The expression is everywhere among business men that the accommodation is very poor indeed. And, as the trade is increasing at a very rapid rate and the revenues of the country drawn from the community are growing, the people there have been in hopes—pressure, I think, was brought to bear by the board of trade on the department—that the condition of things would be improved. I think there will be universal disappointment, if not surprise, that the minister has not found the means of improving the condition of affairs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend was a minister for more years than I have been. He knows that a minister cannot do everything. It is a question of policy, a question for the Council. There are demands from all parts of the country for increased accommodation. It takes a great deal of money to carry out all these improvements. In the meantime, if my hon. friend should, later on, have any suggestions to offer, I shall be glad to receive them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It struck me that if we could look so far into the future—and I have nothing to say against it—as to acquire an enormous tract of land that we did not immediately need, a community which gives so much into the general revenue would have a right to expect immediate action with regard to the demands which have been so long standing. I believe that this want of better accommodation in Vancouver began to be felt in the days of the old government when our revenues were not as buoyant as they are to-day. The need to-day is all the greater and the ground for dissatisfaction increased by the growth of the business of the city. Seeing that moneys are being voted to provide post office accommodation for communities that at present, whatever may be the hope of the future, are not paying so much into the exchequer as Vancouver is, the matter might well be brought to the attention of the minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am thankful to my hon. friend for calling my attention to the case; but he should not forget that we must be prudent—we are a prudent government. At the same time, by looking at the figures, he will be convinced that we have not done so badly for the province that he has adopted as his home—there are pretty large amounts of money in the estimates for public buildings in British Columbia. I have already reminded him that we have just built a large

and expensive building in Vancouver. The government will not lose sight of the requirements of Vancouver, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree that we must not spend too much, especially when we have done so well for British Columbia.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must know very well from official communications from the government of that province that they complain that this government is not doing well by British Columbia. This government is receiving enormous contributions from that province, out of all proportion to the expenditure made in it, and out of all proportion to the relative expenditure and receipts in the other provinces. That is a standing grievance in the province of British Columbia to-day, as represented by formal memorial from the local government. But it was not from that point of view that I rose to speak ; it was from a knowledge I had that one of the most enterprising portions of the province was not being well treated in the matter of public institutions. I think there is reason for great complaint. Several times the hon. gentleman has referred to the large expenditures being made, I think, in connection with the drill shed ; but I do not suppose it was ever pretended that the concession of that public building to the community of Burrard, or Vancouver, was meant to delay the accommodation they had long expressed a desire to have for a custom-house and post office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend may rest assured that I will not delay obtaining any necessary information a prudent minister should have before starting an important work. British Columbia has not failed to recognize lately that we have not done badly by that province. My hon. friend must admit that public opinion has demonstrated that British Columbia appreciates the efforts we have made on her behalf.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I happen to have a lively recollection of the manner in which that question was dealt with. I do not think the gentleman who was successful in the late election in Victoria would altogether endorse the position the Minister of Public Works takes. It is true that the opponents of the government complained against the niggardly treatment the province received at the hands of this government, considering the circumstances, and considering the amount of public money at their disposal. It is true also that the victorious candidate resorted to this method of reasoning : What can you expect if you send to parliament a gentleman who is opposed to the ministers who dole out the public funds ?—that is to say, according to the principles enunciated the other day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They have not read my speech.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The argument that sent that gentleman here was I think not to the credit of the government, but it was one that prevailed, namely, that this crying injustice to the province might be remedied by sending a gentleman here in accord with the government of the day, and by that means they might obtain justice where justice would be denied to a free and independent member of the House who was not giving them a slavish support. That was the argument. It was not that the government had treated Victoria handsomely in the past ; on the contrary, the gentleman who won the election said that practically all that had been given to that constituency was the result of his private conferences with the ministers of the day, though he had not been clothed with authority as a representative. Of course the argument was pressed home that if he were a representative he would obtain a great deal more at the hands of this government than could a free and independent member of the House, and particularly more than a man who did not see eye to eye with them on all public questions. I do not think that any member from the province of British Columbia, judging from what I have heard there, will rise in his place and say that that province is being treated at all fairly or at all generously by the government of the day, in connection with the vast expenditures that are being made in other parts of Canada. They do not complain of these expenditures, but I think the complaint is universal that there has been and there is a shameful neglect of the very pressing interests of the province.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My last argument then is to ask my hon. friend to be kind enough to wait until next year.

Nelson public building, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That work is under contract for the amount of $49,900. The contract is dated January 31st, 1901. Viau & Lemoine are the contractors. Mr. Viau is from Hull, and Mr. Lemoine from Pembroke. Public tenders were asked and they were the lowest.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did you ask for tenders in the press of the province ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How far has the work proceeded ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect tells me there is another story to be put up. They have got till the month of November to complete the work. Mr. J. A. McDonald, of Nelson, is superintending the work.

Rossland public building, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contractor for this work is Mr. Thos. Bradbury, of Vancouver. That was also advertised in the press, and the tender accepted was for $44,050. The inspector is Mr. R. W. Gregor. It is a general public building to accommodate the post office, customs and inland revenue.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How does that compare with the New Westminster public building in price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A little higher, I am told.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman include in these contracts made in British Columbia a clause in regard to the employment of oriental labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there has never been any complaint.

Public buildings generally—construction of armouries, $37,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would the hon. minister give an explanation in detail of the armouries he proposes building and state what the plan for each may be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The armouries that we are building now and for the completion of which this $37,000 is asked, are these : Baddeck, Victoria county, N.S., cost $4,222, by contract; Sussex, N.B., $7,095; Dundas, Ont., $3,854; Kaslo, B.C., $9,700 ; Kamloops, B.C., $9,700 ; Nelson B.C., $9,700 ; Revelstoke, B.C., $9,700. The contracts for the armouries at Kaslo, Kamloops and Revelstoke have not yet been given out, but the tenders are in, so my officers tell me, so that the figures I have given in connection with these buildings are estimates and not the actual prices of the contracts. I may give some explanation in regard to the buildings if my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) wants it. The armoury at Baddeck is going to be a wooden, one-storey building, on a stone foundation.

Mr. GANONG. May I ask the hon. minister if this is to be built by day labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the contract for the work has been given out. Mr. J. Treen, of North Sydney, is the contractor. The contract is for $2,250, but there are fittings, and so on, and that is the reason why we are asking for more money.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That will be a very poor affair. What kind of a building is it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a wooden building. These plans are prepared by the Militia Department and by my own department, the architects of both departments approving of them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the size of the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fifty-eight by thirty-four, containing four armouries each 20 x 8, and each having a room for the quartermaster's stores. For the armoury in Sussex the contractors are the Messrs. Wallace Bros. The contract is practically completed there.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What military buildings are there already at Sussex ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say. That I do not know at all. All I know is that this has been applied for and granted and is under contract.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). There are no buildings at Sussex of any consequence. The military property at Sussex had certain farm buildings on it. It was a farm which was purchased some ten or twelve years ago and there was a house and some outbuildings upon it, but there was no building suitable for an armoury such as is being constructed now. This armoury is for the infantry and for the cavalry, a very large cavalry regiment, one of the largest in New Brunswick, and the headquarters of it is at Sussex. The rifle ranges are located there, and the annual training takes place there. It is really the important centre of military affairs in New Brunswick.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What troops are there at Baddeck ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know ; I am only the builder, let the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence answer for the military side of it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The armoury at Baddeck is the central armoury for Cape Breton Island. The regiment there has six companies and is to be increased to an eight company battalion. It was necessary to have some place to take care of the arms and the colonel of the regiment decided, with the approval of the district officer comanding at Halifax, that that was the proper place to have it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it the policy of the minister to erect armouries for each battalion in every regimental district in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is really a question that would be better discussed on the militia estimates. However, I have no hesitation in saying at once that although that policy was decided upon when the new rifle was purchased recently, owing to the very great delay in getting suitable armouries and because the issue of the arms was kept back, it has been decided now, at once, to issue to all the rural battalions the new arms, whether they have central armouries or not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I presume rural officers will be allowed to keep the new arms at the company headquarters ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the minister had under consideration the propriety of erecting company armouries, small, inexpensive buildings, for the care and storage of these arms at the various company headquarters ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, but I am bound to say that in a great many cases I think it would be a desirable thing to do if it could be done at reasonable expense.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if this item includes the cost of the armoury, which, I understand, has been promised to the town of Cornwall ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. PRINGLE. There has been no provision made for an armoury in Cornwall ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are there any troops at Sydney, or is there any armoury at Sydney ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A contract has been let to Messrs. J. Bowman & Company for $8,870. The building is 60 x 37 feet, two stories, basement, brick on stone foundation. Dundas is the headquarters of the 77th Wentworth Regiment.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it the purpose to spend as large a sum as this on a headquarters armoury for each rural regiment in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why is the Wentworth battalion selected for such an expensive armoury as this ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is no doubt that the cost of this building is beyond what was estimated. Dundas is a very enterprising town and no doubt the battalion there will grow and may in time become a city battalion. It is necessary for us to anticipate the future to some extent and while we are about it, to build an armoury which will be capable of accommodating more companies than it will be necessary to accommodate at the time of erection. I was led to understand that in this section of the country there was some development, which is likely to become greater in military sentiment, and that it would be proper to exceed to some extent the real needs of the moment.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Now that we are discussing this point, I would like to know the views of the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) with his experience in military matters, tells us that we are erecting a too expensive building.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have not said so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has hinted that $8,000 is too much for an armoury at Dundas. The Minister of Militia and myself are met with constant demands for expensive buildings from military people and when we suggest that $5,000 or $8,000 is sufficient why they are ready to fly to arms. They want not only buildings, but expensive buildings, and on that score the province of Ontario does not come last.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am not opposing the item. I am glad to see Wentworth get the best armoury it can. It will be the largest building in the little village of Dundas. But great as the boom has been in the past, if the government go on for the next one thousand years, Dundas will probably not be entitled to a city battalion. It is toying with the House to talk that way. There are six companies in the Wentworth battalion and this $8,000 armoury will probably be used by perhaps two of these companies. Of course the arms may be stored there, but the armoury will only serve one or two of the companies. Why not give each company an armoury in the different villages throughout the county at a cost of $200 or $300 each. I will undertake to put nice little armouries at a cost of $250 each to hold the arms of each company in the Dominion of Canada. You do not want a parade ground. As a rule the arms are now kept in the captain's bedroom which may be 8 x 10 feet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Who would take care of these small buildings ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The captain of each company is bound to take care of them under the law.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And heat them ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They do not need to be heated.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That would not do at all.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that this armoury will only ac-

commodate one or two companies of the Wentworth battalion. The whole battalion will be accommodated at this armoury and this was arranged before the construction of this building was undertaken.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not say that this armoury will not accommodate the whole battalion, but there are not more than two companies in Dundas, and I think there is only one. Only the local company in Dundas can use the armoury except when the battalion is marching into camp.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Each company will have a room.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How can they use the rooms when they are twenty or thirty miles from the armoury.

Mr. PRINGLE. I wish to ask the minister if the question of erecting an armoury at Cornwall is under the consideration of the government. I understand from the local military authorities that there is a great necessity for an armoury in Cornwall, and during last session a very important delegation interviewed the minister and came away strongly under the impression that an armoury would be erected in that town. The military men of Cornwall are still under that impression. I understand that they even went so far as to select the site, and have been in communication with the minister on the subject. Is the matter under the consideration of the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The question is certainly under consideration. We have received petitions and representations. As to the choice of a site I did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. PRINGLE. I do not say that the minister has selected a site, but I understand that the local authorities have recommended certain sites.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nothing has been done towards the choice of a site. Representations have been made, but I do not know what fate they will meet with. I do not extend any promise.

Mr. BENNETT. I agree with the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) that it is highly desirable to have these armoury buildings in different parts of the counties. Take, for instance, the county of Simcoe, more particularly the east riding. The headquarters of the battalion are at the town of Barrie. I am not able to say who erected the building there, but I assume that it was the Department of Militia and Defence. It is a capacious brick building, and in it are stored the arms not only of the two companies of Barrie, but that of the adjoining township. At a distance of thirty miles is the town of Orillia. It would be unfair to ask that the arms of the Orillia company should be kept at Barrie, and as a matter of fact they are kept at Orillia. Then, at the village of Coldwater, fifteen or sixteen miles from Orillia, I know at one time the arms were stored over a store, a very poor and inaccessible place in case of fire. Further on, at a distance of twenty-five miles, is Penetang, which also has a company. Now, if there is one thing which to my mind tends to make the militia force of Ontario something of a success—and it is not as successful, I say with all due deference to military men, as it might be—it is the fact that a healthy rivalry is engendered in rifle competitions. In order to have successful marksmen it is necessary that they should have access at all times to their arms; but this is impossible if those arms are at a distance, in some cases of fifteen or twenty miles; and I quite agree with the hon. member for North Victoria that it would be desirable to have small armouries built at different parts of the counties. I am not quite so sanguine as to the cost of these buildings as he is, for I fear they would run considerably beyond the figure he has mentioned. I think each of these companies should be made more or less of a social club. Gentlemen who are conversant with the regiments in the cities know that the great success attained by them is due to the fact that to a certain extent they are social clubs. The armoury at the town of Barrie is fitted up as a gymnasium, and during the winter months the two companies of the town make it a place of resort; and if there were provided at the different towns headquarters not only for the storing of the arms of these companies, but with a fairly large sized room which could be used in the winter months for drilling and also as a gymnasium, I believe the success of our military organization would be very much promoted; and I hope the minister will make provision in the supplementary estimates for the establishment in East Simcoe of such armouries as I have mentioned.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the minister if the architect who designed the Sussex armoury had any previous experience in designing armouries ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans of these armouries are prepared by both the architect of the Militia Department and by my architect.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman who designed the Sussex armoury did not understand his business very well, because he made no distinction between the rooms set apart for the infantry company and those for the cavalry squadrons. A cavalry squadron requires a room double the size an infantry company does, because in addition to the clothing and equipment of the men there is the clothing and equipment of the horses to be provided for. I want to bring this to the attention of the minister, so that the necessary changes will be made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can only say that we never go on with work of that kind without the plan being approved by the Militia Department; and, as a rule, the military people in a place where the armoury is to be built, see the plans before they are carried out. If there has been a mistake there, it has not been represented to us.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned the fact. I will make inquiries to-morrow, and see who is responsible for my part of the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to inquire of the hon. minister if in this vote any provision is made for building an armoury at Gananoque. We have a battery of artillery as well as an infantry company there, and I understand that a few years ago the government purchased a site there, and paid a very large price for it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will the hon. gentleman tell me when it was bought ? I never bought one.

Mr. TAYLOR. Ask the Minister of Militia. You had a drill shed there, but you tore it down and purchased a site to build a new one, but went no further; and to-day the guns belonging to the battery and the arms belonging to the infantry are stored in a lumber yard down near the railway track. I think some provision should be made for taking better care of the government property than you are doing there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All I know is that my department did not pay for a site. The Minister of Militia and Defence thinks that perhaps a site was bought there.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would be very pleased to see battalion armouries built as well as company armouries. When I made the estimate of $200 for a company armoury, I had taken the precaution of consulting a good Liberal contractor. I furnished him with the sizes of what I thought would be suitable for a country armoury for forty-two men, in which to store their rifles and equipment, and he said he would undertake to put up nice little brick buildings all over the country for less than $200 each. All that is required is one room, though I would be glad to see the companies provided with such a room as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) suggests. My object is to get the whole country equipped with armouries as soon as possible; but if it were to cost $8,000 or $9,000 for each battalion, I am afraid that long as the hon. Minister of Public Works is likely to hold his job, some one else will be occupying that place before all the buildings will be completed. Reference has been made to the 77th Battalion getting this $8,000 armoury. That battalion has six companies. No. 1 company is at Dundas; No. 2 company is at Waterdown, to the east; No. 3 company is at Binbrook; No. 4 company is at Ancaster, on the other side of Hamilton; No. 5 company is at Stony Creek, between that and Niagara Falls, and No. 6 company is at Glanford. In other words it was simply a large public building for the town of Dundas. I am not objecting to the expenditure if the country can afford it. I am not opposed to any expenditure on behalf of the militia, but what I do say is that the rural companies should also have their armouries.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I really do not believe, speaking as a layman, that a $200 building would be suitable.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Make it $500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not believe that the country would entertain the idea of erecting $200 buildings and I would not encourage it at all.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I venture to say that more than half the arms in the maritime provinces and Ontario are stored to-day in buildings, the entire cost of which is not $500. I refer to the whole building in which the caretaker and his family live.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That does not prove anything.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It proves that the arms are kept in the back rooms of such buildings and kept in very good condition. We require the armouries, let the cost be what it may, and do not want the battalions to have to wait ten or twenty years for this accommodation.

Mr. SPROULE. As the hon. minister has invited an expression of opinion regarding the desirability of expensive armouries or the incurring of heavy expenditure to erect expensive buildings for the purpose of storing arms, personally my feeling has always been against such expenditure. While I would be disposed to vote any reasonable amount to keep up the efficiency of our militia, I have never felt that it is wise to spend such large sums in building these large armouries and drill halls in different towns and villages. I can understand, of course, the ambition of towns and villages to have fine and expensive buildings. Every town, if it gets a public building, wants to have it as expensive and showy as possible. That may be a praiseworthy ambition, but is it the part of wisdom for us to give way to it ? My opinion always has been that while we should provide suitable accommodation, we should provide it at the least possible outlay to the country, and that while we should do all that is required in the interest of the militia, we should be careful not to be carried away by too great a desire for display.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it intended to spend any part of this money in enlarging the

drill shed at Toronto ? Has anything been done since last session to give the additional accommodation so urgently required there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are just now engaged in re-building one of the walls of that drill shed. The wall to which my hon. friend called attention last year is being rebuilt.

Mr. CLARKE. Will that give any additional accommodation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That question is under discussion now. When the supplementary estimates come down we will know more.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it would be a great mistake to construct very expensive buildings, in very elaborate style, for the accommodation of the arms and accoutrements of the militia. If that plan were adopted, it would be a long time before we could obtain homes for our different militia battalions. I may be permitted to say that I have endeavoured to set a good example myself in my own county for my own battalion, by having an armoury erected there at an expense of less than $1,000, which is ample to accommodate a battalion of ten companies.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is only $100 a company, and I have suggested $200.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not want to occupy the time of the committee more than is absolutely necessary, but I feel bound to impress again on the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Militia the absolute necessity of giving additional accommodation to the military forces of Toronto in the drill shed. This is not the first time that matter has been drawn to the attention of the hon. minister. I shall not dilate on the subject, but will content myself with reading half a dozen lines from the report of the proceedings of this House on April 16th last. In that report, I quoted a letter from the commanding officer of military district No. 2, Colonel Otter, to the corporation of the city of Toronto. On the 22nd March last, Colonel Otter wrote from Stanley barracks to the chairman of the property committee.

Sir,—I have the honour to make application, on behalf of a portion of the local militia force, for the temporary use of the 'Arcade,' St. Andrew's market, for the purpose of storing guns, wagons and harness.

With the present strength of the city corps, it is impossible to find enough accommodation in the armouries, and pending the providing of such, I am compelled to appeal to the municipal authorities as no place adapted for the purpose in view can be obtained.

I cannot make a stronger appeal to the hon. minister than to read this request from the district officer commanding to the municipal authorities in Toronto for temporary accommodation of guns, stores and ammunition in one of the municipal buildings. Of course the municipal corporation are always very pleased to give accommodation, if they can, to the militia forces and meet the wishes of the officer commanding in that respect, but when I remind the hon. minister that the city of Toronto gave $140,000 for the site, upon which the present drill shed stands, I think it is not unreasonable to ask that the accommodation which has been so loudly demanded by the militia force be provided as soon as possible. I have not sufficient military training to know of the relative value of small armouries erected throughout the country or of a few large ones in cities ; but I do know that in Toronto we have provided a very fine site, as the Minister of Militia knows, and there is a very substantial building on that site, and surely it would be the policy of wisdom, when you have a splendid military organization which is no discredit to the military forces of the Dominion, to provide for it reasonable accommodation. I do not desire to take up the time of the committee pressing this matter. I have done so again and again, but I appeal once more to the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Public Works that, if it be not intended to devote any part of this item, for the purpose of enlarging the drill shed and providing additional accommodation, that a reasonable sum should be provided for that purpose in the supplementaries. I make this appeal as earnestly as I can on behalf of the militia forces in Toronto.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already given the names of the places where this money is to be spent. The hon. gentleman has stated that the military forces in Toronto would be very glad to have more accommodation. That is the case, not only in Toronto, but elsewhere. In Montreal the militia require a good deal more accommodation. But all that is a question of money, and my hon. friends often complain that our budget is large, that the public works is a spending department, and spends too much. The facts which my hon. friend has stated to the House are not new. Under the late administration, the position of affairs was just about the same.

Mr. CLARKE. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The military strength in Toronto is not much greater to-day than it was then, and the demand that is made by my hon. friend was made then. But governments must not spend too much money, even though some of us may be in sympathy with a more expansive policy, the financial position must be considered. The brakes must be applied, and they are often applied by the Finance Minister to-day as they were in the past. The Finance Minister is right, of course, and I cannot complain.

Mr. FRASER. Before all the money of the country is voted to hon. gentlemen opposite, I would like to put in a word on behalf of the best regiment in Canada, the 78th Highlanders.

Mr. CLARKE. The 48th.

Mr. FRASER. No, the 78th. The Minister of Militia knows all about that regiment. They are recruited from the counties of Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou. They have not a public building and never had.

Mr. McISAAC. They have trenches.

Mr. FRASER. But I am willing to come next to the hon. and gallant Colonel (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) who has just spoken. I would commend to the Minister of Militia what the hon. gentleman says, that arms have to be stored in bedrooms. How can one sleep in a room where arms are stored ? But seriously, I hope the hon. minister would take into consideration this splendid regiment and that before all the money for building is voted away, he will do something for this corps, who would be the first in the fray and the last out of it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I shall not attempt to reply to the jocular remarks of my hon. friend from Guysborough, but I want to say that the 78th is a good regiment, and, in that respect it is like 99 per cent of the rural regiments of Canada. I will appeal to those who saw the review in Toronto, where the 'hay-seed' regiments, without an hour's drill from the month of June until they paraded in front of their Royal Highnesses, held their own with the regiments of the city who have fine drill halls in which they can drill every evening. When I point out that these rural regiments who keep their arms in bedrooms and over driving sheds, and do not cost the country a dollar for armouries can hold their own on an occasion such as that, they are entitled to some consideration from the people. I have always supported the claim for armouries for the large cities, believing that the city battalions should have a place not only for the storage of arms but for drilling the men. But I do again suggest to the minister whether it is advisable to give these large sums of money for the headquarters of rural battalions, when, as the minister properly points out—I am afraid the hon. Minister of Public Works does not hear what I say. I wish to catch the ear of the hon. gentleman, for I have great faith in him, and always had. I hope he will convert the whole ministry.

Mr. TAYLOR. Make them protectionists.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly. He is educating them right along. The Minister of Finance himself will come around in time. I would like to impress upon the Minister of Public Works the policy which the Minister of Militia has outlined, of having inexpensive headquarters and armouries which can be provided at half the cost of these large buildings he proposes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In some of our public buildings in Quebec, we have adopted the plan of having a room for the storage of arms. For instance, in Victoriaville, we have an arrangement of that kind, and it is received with great favour.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not wish to take up time, but merely to say that the hon. minister was good enough to grant the regiment which I have the honour to command a room in the public building in Lindsay. I do not think it is larger than ten by twelve, and it contains the arms of the entire regiment. That is the only room which we have in the whole county.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, I find that the minister has given us items making a total of $53,800, and he is asking for only $37,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have $27,000 in the estimates of last year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What regiment is represented by this British Columbia armoury ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say; I am only the builder.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who made the request for the armoury ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So many requests are sent in—I cannot tell all.

Mr. GALLIHER. I may say to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) that these four armouries are in my district. I made the request for them, and made it pretty strongly too. You must not forget that the district I represent is nearly equal in area to the province of Ontario. So, if I have four armouries in my district, it does not necessarily follow that they are very close together. We in British Columbia are in a different position from the people of Ontario. A great part of our country is mountainous and we require not only armouries, but places where we can drill summer and winter. I do not think that any hon. gentlemen who have been in British Columbia will say that money spent in armouries in that province is not well invested. We are pretty well in the wilds, but we have a few citizens in that province who like to have reasonable accommodation as well as the people in the east. And the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Hughes) who is a colonel in the militia well knows that we sent from British Columbia to the South African war quite

a number of men—probably a larger number in proportion to our population than any other part of Canada.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Good men, too.

Mr. GALLIHER. And good men too. And we want to keep up our credit. When we have men enterprising enough to band together, we want to encourage them to do so. I have been associated with the militia myself for a number of years, and I can speak feelingly in the matter. I know that is necessary, and I agree with the suggestion thrown out by the hon. member for Simcoe that they not only want a place in which to store arms, but a place to drill in, and also a place in which to meet for social intercourse. A place of this latter kind is very taking in a western city, because we have not many places in those little western towns where the men can meet together to read the newspapers and magazines, and have a little social chat after their drill. Now, I am pleased indeed with the generosity of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Militia and Defence in giving us a drill shed in that community. True, we pay very heavily into the Dominion treasury from the province of British Columbia, and we feel in the past that we have not been getting what we were entitled to. I do not know that I would go so far as to say with one member from British Columbia that we are still complaining. We are, however, still saying that in proportion to the revenue we pay into the Federal treasury the expenditure made by the Dominion in that province is very small. However, I have nothing to complain of in connection with these drill halls that are being established in my district. I thank the minister for meeting my request in this matter. I will say this, now while I am on the subject, that in the town of Nelson where I live, the appropriation will not build a drill hall there, even according to the specifications, and I call the special attention of the minister to the fact, because I mean to approach him again for more money in connection with the Nelson drill hall. We have given in the town of Nelson two lots within the fire limits, and you all know there is a law against building a certain class of building within the fire limits. We have given two lots worth $4,000 to $5,000 as a free site to the government for a drill hall. The hall cannot be built of wood, as I believe is the present intention, for the reason that the city will not permit it to be built of wood. I am merely throwing out the suggestion, so that the minister may be prepared to see me come to him again to ask for a sum in the supplementary estimates which will be sufficient to allow us to put up such a building as the city by-laws will require within the fire limits.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) While this item is under consideration, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence and the Minister of Public Works to the fact that in the town from which I come, Souris, P.E.I., we have no armoury, and yet we have there a very efficient company of artillery. I wish to say to the Minister of Militia and Defence that I think he can build an armoury in connection with the drill shed there for $200 or $250, though it would have to be a wooden building. The minister knows that the Fourth Regiment to which this company belongs has an excellent record, and I hope, now that I have drawn the matter to his attention, he will take the application into consideration and if possible provide us with an armoury. It is a moderate amount, and comes very near the amount mentioned by the member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). Of course it would be a wooden building, and built as an annex to the present drill shed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What my hon. friend says about the artillery regiment there I know to be absolutely true. Certainly his request is a very modest one, and even if it were not as modest as it is, I should think it was one we might deal with promptly. And as there is in the militia vote a sum for repairs and additions of this kind, if my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is not particularly anxious to do this work, I think I may undertake to say that the Militia Department will look after it in the near future.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend is short of money I will do it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why is it that there is no sum brought down for an armoury for this Rossland company ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I suppose the reason is that apparently in the east the government have been buying sites for armouries, while in the west all these sites are being provided free to the government. If no selection has been made in Rossland, it is the fault of the people and not the fault of the minister; but I can promise that will be attended to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the reason for the distinction between the west and the east in supplying sites ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not know whether that distinction is general or not, but in listening to the discussion to-night I understood that sites in the east had been purchased by the government. If that is not the case, then I withdraw that remark. But I know that in British Columbia we are furnishing the sites free, and I may say that we are very glad to do so if we can

only get a decent class of buildings put up on them. The only reason Rossland is not mentioned is simply because they have not yet furnished the government that site, although I have requested them to do so. But that will be attended to, and then I shall come to the minister for a grant.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask what is the rule with regard to sites ? Are they only purchased in certain parts of Canada, and have they to be given free in other parts ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has never been any fixed rule. It is very far from being the rule in British Columbia that all sites are furnished free, because I have been obliged to pay large sums of money for sites for public buildings.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I trust that the minister, now that the matter has been brought to his attention, will consider this question of company and battalion drill sheds, and if it is possible, to give each company headquarters a room in which the arms may be kept, and also a recreation room where the boys can meet for social intercourse after going through their drill. I would be pleased if the minister were to furnish us with such a building, although I am satisfied the regiment will not even ask that much, but will follow the example which the Minister of Militia and Defence says he has set in his own county.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be only too glad if the militiamen will change their mind in the direction indicated by my hon. friend, because I am stating gospel truth when I say that these militiamen want very expensive buildings. Every time they come on a deputation, I am frightened, because they want so much money.

Experimental farms—New buildings and renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., in connection with existing buildings, fences, &c., $10,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not want to discuss this item farther than to urge upon the hon. Minister of Agriculture to look into the advisability of establishing an experimental farm in southern Alberta and one in the vicinity of Edmonton.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That would be a question of the extension of the experimental farm system which should not be lightly undertaken. It has been discussed several times in the House and has nothing to do with this vote which is simply for repairs.

Mr. SPROULE. What repairs do you intend to make ? Is this just a general vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this is a general vote for repairs on all the farms.

Mr. SPROULE. There are some important questions in connection with experimental farms which must be dealt with, but, I presume, they will more properly come up on some other items, on the agricultural vote, or the vote for cold storage. Perhaps the hon. minister will not be prepared to answer questions now on that subject.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This vote has nothing to do with the experimental farms. There is a vote for that purpose. When we take up the vote in connection with experimental farms these questions may be discussed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is simply for repairs at all the farms.

Mr. SPROULE. It must be for repairs to buildings on the experimental farms. It is not properly stated here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for general maintenance.

Mr. SPROULE. I must be right, or I must be wrong. If I am right this is a general vote for repairs to buildings, fences and other things on the experimental farms.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite true.

Mr. SPROULE. And has no connection with the work carried on at these farms, for instance in the dairy ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Public buildings generally, $5,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he can state whether the Vancouver drill shed has been taken off the contractor's hands ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not yet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Could the hon. gentleman state the amount of the contract and the amount paid to the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the information, but I will bring it down on Monday.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Showing the extras, the amount for which the contract was taken and the amount that will be paid when the building is complete.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers will take a note of the question and I will bring the information down.

Salaries to resident clerks of works, assistants, &c., $10,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are these resident clerks of works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is one in New Brunswick, one in Mont-

real, one in Quebec, one in Ottawa, Mr. Adams, the man who has supervised the work in connection with this building, one in Manitoba, and one in the North-west Territories.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the one in Manitoba ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Cyr. There is one in the North-west Territories and one in British Columbia.

Mr. SPROULE. We will take, for example, a building going on in Manitoba; I notice that Mr. Cyr is clerk of the work there. Is he not paid out of the estimate for that work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These clerks of works, for whom this sum of money is asked, are the general officers who supervise the works of the department in all of the provinces. They have special work in cities. For instance, Mr. Desjardins superintends the works in Montreal. Mr. Cyr lives in Winnipeg and supervises the works in Winnipeg and has his eyes open also to any works around Winnipeg. Sometimes we send him into the territories. These are general officers from whom we expect service all around.

Mr. SPROULE. They get a salary, I presume ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. That comes out of this $10,500 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. SPROULE. Then how is it they get their $3 a day over and above that for superintending works ? I will take in Winnipeg, for instance, the repairs going on there :

Some carpets and wall paper, also a flag staff, and ensign were supplied. . . . . Works carried out under the supervision of J. Ernest Cyr, clerk of works, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Then he has been paid out of this appropriation.

Mr. SPROULE. Take the next : Examining warehouse; he is the clerk of works there. Is his pay taken out of this vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, he supervised the whole of the work.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that he is employed on the post office as well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that in these cases the pay of the clerks of the works came out of the vote for the particular work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, not in these cases.

Mr. SPROULE. It does in regard to harbour works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In that case, we have no general officers. If we build a harbour at Port Hope, for instance, we employ an officer, who is not in the department. In this case Mr. Cyr is a permanent employee just as Mr. Desjardins is in Montreal. That is the reason why the hon. member for East Gray (Mr. Sproule) finds their names where he does find them.

Mr. SPROULE. I know, but you set a man over the building of a post office and he is paid out of the vote for that post office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is employed for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. If he is paid out of the vote for that building how can you pay him out of this sum ? Will you be paying him a double salary ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, Mr. Cyr is paid only one salary, and that salary is paid out of this appropriation. He is not paid out of any other appropriation. He will supervise three or four works but he is paid his ordinary salary out of this appropriation.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that it is possible to pay them sometimes double salaries. I have had brought to my notice only a short time ago the fact, in regard to which I asked a question and got a reply, that clerks employed in a certain department are employed in another department at the same time and draw pay there also. The answer was that the government has no knowledge of this. I am informed that it is a fact, and that it has been going on during the last few months. I give that as a justification for endeavouring to find out whether such a thing could happen or not without the knowledge of the minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this case it cannot happen.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood the hon. minister to say that there was a clerk of works for New Brunswick. I would like to ask if this is the gentleman who superintended the armoury at Sussex ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there is a local man at Sussex. Mr. Waterbury is at St. John. He has general supervision over the works in St. John, but at times we send him elsewhere.

Mr. FOWLER. The superintendent at Sussex is a local man ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister know the occupation of this man ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very glad this question is asked. Since

I have been in office I have taken very great care to secure the services of a practical man in each case. I may have been deceived on some occasions, but I think I have not been. Every time that a clerk of works is to be appointed I inquire whether he is a practical man or not. When the contract for the Sussex armoury was awarded, the name of a gentleman was suggested to me, and before I apopinted him I wrote to Colonel Domville, ex-M.P. for the riding, who replied that the gentleman he recommended was a practical man. On the strength of Mr. Domville's letter, which is in my office and can be brought down if necessary, that this gentleman was well fitted to be foreman of works and a practical man, I appointed him. No complaint has been made so far as to his competency.

Mr. FOWLER. I may say to the minister that the gentleman in question is a practical man in one sense, as he is a practical tailor, and a good tailor too. But so far as being a carpenter or builder, he is nothing of the sort, and has had no experience whatever along that line. He lives in the town in which I lived for a great many years, and I know whereof I speak when I say that he has no building experience whatever, except that he had a house built for him, and he may have superintended the erecting of that house. It is a very modest though respectable building, but it is not a very extensive one. That is his sole experience in the building line.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry that my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) did not call my attention to this state of affairs before now. I express my deep regret that a practical tailor has been recommended to me as a practical builder of an armoury. I remember distinctly having written to Mr. Domville—I have a copy of my letter and his reply in which he states that the gentleman he recommended to me was a practical man in building——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Building suits of clothes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What more could I do than appoint him. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) should have warned me before. He is guilty and not I. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) knew all about the practical tailor and he should have warned me. In future I suppose I will have to write Mr. Domville twice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What will you do with the tailor now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will not make him a present of a suit; I think I shall certainly change him. Before making such appointments I have always taken the greatest care to insure that a practical man gets the position, and my officers have received most positive instructions on that point. I am sorry that I have been deceived by a man from the maritime provinces from whom good things are always expected. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) should have warned me, and although he is not so much to blame as Mr. Domville, still he is somewhat to blame.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister must be deceived in all parts of the country, because last year he employed a painter from Toronto to do dredging.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But dredging is not made by the hand. I would hire a dredge from a medical man or a tailor provided the dredge does good work. That is different from a foreman of works. The profession of a man who owns a horse does not alter the colour of the horse.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a horse of another colour.

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Public Works was to some extent not to blame in this matter. As a matter of fact, I know that the minister did write, inquiring as to the occupation of the person who had been recommended to him as clerk of works. However, I am not to blame in the matter, because I was so satisfied of the honesty and integrity of the contractors, that I knew they would not go wrong whether there was a clerk of works over them or not, and it was for that reason I did not interfere, because I knew that the public interests would be well protected by the contractors, even though the clerk of works knew absolutely nothing about the business for which he was selected. I beleive the minister did his duty in the premises, but he was deceived by the gentleman who made the recommendation. In order to relieve the maritime provinces from any blame in the matter, I may say that that gentleman is not a native of the maritime provinces.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall inquire further into the matter, and if the man is not competent I will dispense with his services, not because of any ill-will I have towards him, but a minister cannot stand being deceived in that way.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What will you do with Mr. Domville?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot dismiss him now.

Mr. FOWLER. The building is finished, so that the work of the clerk of works is completed. What pay did he receive?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Three dollars a day, which is the ordinary pay to a foreman of work.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, the House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 10, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Duncan Alexander Stewart, Esq., for the Electoral District of Lisgar.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Duncan Alexander Stewart, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Lisgar, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and Mr. W. F. McCreary.

CONCILIATION OF TRADE DISPUTES.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 32) to amend the Conciliation Act of 1900. He said: The object of the Bill is to widen the scope and extend the application of the present Conciliation Act. That Act is restricted to the sphere of voluntary conciliation, but although it has only been in force during the past two years, it has become evident that its scope should be extended. During the past year there have been industrial disturbances which the Act was unable to touch. At present, when differences occur between employers and employees, the minister has power to order an inquiry, and then he may, on the application of either employer or employee, appoint a conciliator, and in addition, on the application of both parties to the dispute, he may appoint an arbitrator, who will proceed with the arbitration and make an award, but acceptance or observance of the award is not compulsory in any respect. The object of my amendment is to broaden the scope of the law by giving a greater initiative to the Labour Department, in the first place, and in the second place by giving the minister power to appoint an arbitrator, on the application of one of the parties to the dispute. This arbitrator will have authority to take evidence under oath, and give a decision, indicating a basis of settlement, a copy of which will be sent to each of the parties and be also published in the 'Labour Gazette.' In the present Act, public opinion and the desire to do justice is what is relied upon to make it operative, and it seems to me that the publication of the award of an independent arbitrator is likely to be more effective.

There is also in my Bill a further provision which I think very necessary, namely, that in no agreement arrived at, either as the result of conciliation or arbitration, must there be any clause compelling an employee to give up membership in any local, national or international trade organization. A provision of this kind has been rendered necessary by cases which have occurred.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Criminal Code.—Mr. German.

ALIEN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 34) to further amend the Act restricting the importation and employment of aliens, chap. 11, 60-61 Vic.

Mr. SPEAKER. Seconded by Mr. Ross?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to second any more Bills.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I will second the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Quebec and Lake Huron Railway Company.—Mr. Malouin.

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Sovereign Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 30) to incorporate the Sydney Land and Loan Company, Limited.—Mr. Kendall.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Buffalo Railway Company and the International Railway Company.—Mr. Osler.

QUESTIONS.

STEAMSHIP COOLING PLANTS.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth) asked:

1. What steamers has been fitted up with cooling plants to cool the compartments containing perishable products in conformity with agreement with the government of Canada?

2. What other steamships than those named in the House by the Minister of Agriculture last year have been fitted with fans to produce a circulation of fresh air in the compartments in which perishable products are carried, if any?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher):

1. The 'Ontarian,' of the Allan Line, the 'Tritonia,' of the Donaldson Line, the 'Devona' and 'Hurona' of the Thomson Line, carried products in 1901; other steamers have been and are being fitted for service in 1902.

2. The 'Corinthian,' 'Orcadian' and 'Sardinian,' of the Allan Line, the 'Cervona' of the Thomson Line, the 'Manchester City' and 'Manchester Commerce' of the Manchester Liners, the 'Lake Simcoe' of the Beaver Line.

I. C. R.—ACCIDENTS THROUGH CATTLE ON TRACK.

Mr. ERB asked :

1. How many cattle sheep and horses were killed by being struck by engines on the Canadian government railways during each year since 1890 : (a) At points of intersection of highways ? (b) Elsewhere on the lines ?

2. How many engines, if any, were derailed or disabled during each of the same years, owing to their striking cattle, sheep and horses : (a) At points of intersection of highways ? (b) Elsewhere on the lines ?

3. How many railway employees and passengers, if any, were killed or injured on account of engines colliding with cattle, sheep and horses : (a) At points of intersection of highways ? (b) Elsewhere on the lines ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I shall be obliged to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Erb) to move for a return. The information asked for is very voluminous.

I. C. R.—PURCHASES OF CANADIAN COAL.

Mr. KENDALL asked :

What quantities of Canadian coal have been purchased by the Railway Department during the last four years ; from what companies, at what prices, and at what points of delivery ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). In this case, also I shall be obliged to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) to move for a return.

ST. CATHARINE'S WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LANCASTER—by Mr. Fowler—asked:

What has been done by the government respecting the St. Catharine's water supply, as promised by the Prime Minister on the 18th February, 1901, as reported in 'Hansard' on page 109 :—

'Mr. Speaker, I cannot inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) if the report distributed of my speech on that occasion is accurate or not, I presume, however, it is substantially correct. The question to which it refers is now undergoing the consideration of the government ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). No action has been taken on the subject referred to.

PROPOSED RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. DAVIS—by Mr. McCreary—asked :

Does the government intend taking action during the present session on the motion of this House, passed in the session of 1901, approving of the appointment of a railway commission ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). My answer to this question is in the affirmative.

I. C. R.—WHEAT HANDLED BY GOVERNMENT ELEVATOR AT ST. JOHN.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

What amount was received by the Intercolonial Railway as its proportion of freight on the 146,087 bushels of wheat handled by the government elevator at St. John, N.B., during the year ending 31st December, 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The amount earned by the Intercolonial Railway as its proportion of freight on the 146,087 bushels of wheat handled by the government elevator at St. John, N.B., during the year ended 31st December, 1901, was $6,285.88.

I C. R.—COAL BY CHARTERED STEAMSHIPS.

Mr. BELL—by Hon. Mr. Haggart—asked:

1. What was the rate of time charter of the steamship 'Peter Jetson,' engaged to carry coal for the Department of Railways (as mentioned on page W—189 of the Auditor General's Report) ?

2. What quantity of coal was brought by the ship ?

3. What was the rate of time charter of the steamship 'Aladdin,' engaged to carry coal for the Department of Railways (as mentioned on page W—189, Auditor General's Report) ?

4. What quantity of coal was brought by this ship ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The rate of time charter of steamship 'Peter Jetson' engaged to carry coal was £1,550, or $7,543.33 per month.

2. The quantity of coal brought by this ship was 15,693 tons.

3. The rate of time charter of steamship 'Aladdin' engaged to carry coal was £1,541 or $7,499.53 per month.

4. The quantity of coal brought by this ship was 17,187 tons.

TRANSFER OF MAILS, ALLANDALE STATION.

Mr. LENNOX—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Who has been appointed to transfer the mails at the Allandale railway station ?

2. What is the date of appointment ?

3. What remuneration is paid ?

4. Is the employee solely under the control of the Post Office Department, or partly under the control of the Grand Trunk Railway Company ?

5. Is any portion of this employee's salary paid by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, by arrangement with the government ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). Where it can be so arranged, it is found more satisfactory to have the railway companies undertake and be responsible for the efficient and prompt transfer of the mails from one train to another at railway points, and this course is being pursued at Allandale, the Grand Trunk being paid at the rate of four hundred dollars a year for the service. The work in question is done under the direction of the Post Office Department.

MECHANICAL ENGINEER, GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Is the position of mechanical engineer of the government buildings in Toronto vacant ?

If so, who is temporarily discharging the duties of the office ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to appoint permanently the person who is now acting as such mechanical engineer ?

3. If the position has been filled who has been appointed ; and when was the appointment made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. Yes. James Cosgrove has been acting temporarily since the 30th of December, 1901.

2. The appointment is under consideration.

3. No appointment has yet been made.

TIMBER LIMITS DISPOSED OF BY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette)—by Mr. Henderson—asked :

1. What timber limits have been disposed of by the government since July, 1896 ?

2. Who were the purchasers in each case, and the price paid for each limit ?

3. Were tenders called for each sale, and in what papers or posters did advertisements appear ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This question covers a series of years, and it would be much more convenient to have the matter dealt with in the form of a motion.

PRICES OF BINDER TWINE FOR 1902.

Mr. BLAIN—by Mr. Ward—asked :

Is a circular issued giving the prices at which binder twine will be sold for the year ending July 1st, 1902 ? If so, what are the prices ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll). No circular has been issued.

I.C.R.—PURCHASE FOR YEAR ENDING 30TH JUNE, 1901.

Mr. BARKER moved for :

1. Copies of (1) all Orders in Council relating to purchases during year ended 30th June, 1901, for use upon the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, respectively, of :—

(a) Steel rails and fastenings including plates, bolts, spikes and rail braces.
(b) Railway ties.
(c) Locomotives.
(d) Cars.
(e) Wheels.
(f) Axles.
(g) Truck and body bolsters.
(h) Air appliances.
(i) Coal.

(2.) All contracts, correspondence, reports, vouchers, receipts and papers relating to such purchases and the payments therefor, and to the articles delivered, whether purchased under Orders in Council or otherwise.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BARKER moved for :

Return showing :—

1. The quantities and numbers of the following articles purchased for or received upon the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, respectively, in the year ending 30th June, 1901 :—

(a) Steel rails and fastenings, including plates, bolts, spikes and rail braces.
(b) Railway ties.
(c) Locomotives.
(d) Cars.
(e) Wheels.
(f) Axles.
(g) Truck bolsters.
(h) Body bolsters.
(i) Air appliances.
(j) Coal.

2. The prices paid for the same and the place of delivery.

3. The names and addresses of the persons from whom purchased, and place and date of purchase.

4. The names and addresses of all persons employed or engaged in connection with such purchases, as agent or otherwise, and the commission received by such persons in connection therewith.

5. The qantities of such new rails and fastenings, and of such other articles (excepting locomotives and cars) in store upon each railway at 1st July, 1900, and 1st July, 1901, respectively ; and the sums at which they were severally valued in store account at said dates. Also the quantity issued for use on each railway during the year, and the prices at which they were charged out.

6. The quantities of old rails and fastenings, wheels and axles in store at 1st July, 1900 ; the further quantities received into store during the following year ; the disposition made of any portions during the year; and the quantities on hand at 1st July, 1901 ; with the prices at which they were valued in store account at said dates, and the prices charged for any sold or reused.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The second motion embraces very much of what is contained in the first. I apprehend that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) will be satisfied with one return, if it contains all the information covered by the two motions.

Mr. BARKER. Certainly.

Motion agreed to.

GREAT LAKES AND ST. LAWRENCE—HEIGHT OF WATER.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria) moved :

That in the opinion of this House, in the best interests of the people of Canada, a joint commission should be appointed by the United States and Canada, to examine and report upon the diversion of the waters between the two countries ; and to investigate the conditions, rise and fall, supply and uses of the waters adjacent to the boundary line between the United States and Canada, including all the waters of the lakes and rivers whose waters flow by the St. Lawrence river to the Atlantic ocean.

He said : Mr. Speaker, this is a motion which does not require any lengthy dis-

cussion. I believe it has, from time to time, engaged the attention of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States. I am satisfied that it has engaged the attention of the trading public and the commercial men on both sides of the line. The people of Chicago, owing to the difficulty of draining that great city, have seen fit in their wisdom to construct what you may term a large waterway, 200 feet wide and averaging about 24 feet deep, connecting Lake Michigan with the Illinois river ; so that in place of the old Chicago river, as formerly, running down, there is now a strong current running up that river and leading down the Illinois river into the Mississippi. At various points along the line, as at Sault Ste. Marie, we have large locks on both sides of the river; there are also large power improvements projected at each of these points, as well as on the Niagara river. Coming down to the St. Lawrence we find that both this government and the American government have been engaged in dredging operations, undoubtedly affecting the outlet of the lake. Although these may not be important in themselves, and in view of the great volume of water in those lakes, would not materially affect the output at the present time ; yet it is hard to tell what in the near future may be the schemes advanced by business industries on each side of the line which might result in the reducing the water supply in these great lakes. Navigators complain at times of the impossibility of keeping the channel up to the normal level ; and, therefore, I desire to draw the attention of the House and of the country to the necessity of looking into the question at an early date in order that some understanding may be arrived at between the two governments as to the proper control of the waters for other than navigation purposes, and for the maintenance of the waters of the lakes at the normal level, so that navigation may not be interfered with by deepening the channels or reducing the water supply by turning it into other avenues. I shall not take up further time in speaking to the motion. My object is not to embarrass the government, but to draw its attention to this important matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). The question to which my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) has drawn the attention of the House is a very important one. I think, however, that before we undertake to obtain the co-operation of the American authorities we should understand our own position a little better, in other words, we should give it more attention than we have perhaps been doing in the past. My department has begun a survey of certain parts of the lakes and rivers, and I intend during the coming season to take some steps in the direction that my hon. friend has indicated. In the meantime, however, I think it would not be advisable to follow the suggestion of my hon. friend, and as he has now called the attention of the House to the subject, I would ask him not to press his motion.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has there been any information received from the American government on this same line ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). I may say that an intimation has been made, and my department is observing the proceedings of the American Congress in reference to this matter. I can assure my hon. friend from Victoria that it is receiving the attention of the officers of the department, and it will receive every consideration that is due to so important a question. I think under the circumstances my hon. friend would do well not to press his motion.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). My sole object was to draw the attention of the House and of the country to the question, in order to make sure that the interests of Canada might not be neglected in this all important matter. Inasmuch as the ministers have assured us that the interests of Canada will be carefully guarded, I should consider that the object of my motion has been secured, and I will withdraw it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the United States have already appointed a commission for this purpose, presumably with the object of co-operating with this government. I presume this government is in possession of some information with regard to that, and will be prepared to act conjointly with the United States authorities.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think any definite action has been taken by the American government as yet.

Mr. SPROULE. They have appointed a commission.

Motion withdrawn.

WHEAT BLOCKADE IN MANITOBA.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (East Assiniboia) moved for :

Copy of all papers and correspondence relative to the present wheat blockade in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and the incapacity and inability of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to move the crop of last year in such a reasonable period of time as to prevent the grain-growers of the country being subjected to serious financial loss.

He said : I desire to submit to the House some facts in connection with this wheat blockade in the North-west Territories. It so happens that the congestion is largely confined to East Assiniboia, the district between Moosomin and Moosejaw. I desire to submit facts for the information of the

House, with the hope that they may lead to the adoption of measures that will relieve the situation for all time to come. A few years ago we were accustomed to read that Manitoba and the North-west Territories were only fit for the buffalo, the Indian and the coyote, that it was not a country fit to be inhabited by white men. We even used to hear men from beyond the seas speaking of it as a blasted country. They came here to make money, and having made it, returned to their old homes to enjoy it with their friends. But that day has passed away. The old settlers have solved the problem, and are now seeking to make permanent homes in the country. There has been a vast increase in their activity in breaking up land and increasing their powers of production. We have had many splendid crops in that country, as the House well knows, but the crop of 1901 surpassed perhaps anything that has ever been produced in any country on the face of the earth. This is a wide statement, but we feel it cannot be contradicted. The crop in Manitoba is the result of an increased acreage, and showed the third largest yield. The crop in the Territories is the result of a large increase in acreage it is true, but chiefly the result of a very large increase in the yield per acre.

The principle underlying the production of wheat on the American continent is an interesting study. There is a principle that seems to come to light in connection with this bonanza crop in the North-west. It is that there is a tendency for the wheat producing area to recede from the south and to go northwards. It is a fact well known to us that the state of Illinois, at one time the greatest wheat producing state in the Union, has ceased to produce wheat and now corn and the hog occupy the soil. Then again, in North and South Dakota, it is found that the production of grain is not always a profitable employment. The principle seems to be that the area is moving from the south and gradually going northward and that the nearer we come to the northern limit of the wheat area, the stronger the grain becomes and the more profitable is its production.

An hon. MEMBER. Why is that ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will explain it in this way. You have a spikelet or bar across the grain of wheat. In Wisconsin and Illinois they were formerly accustomed to produce three grains of perfect wheat, but of late years they can only produce two grains on a spikelet and one imperfect grain. Two grains in this case ceased to be productive. In Manitoba we have always been able to produce three perfect grains and this year the exception has been that we have produced four perfect grains on one bar or spikelet. Whilst in Manitoba we have produced three perfect grains almost every year, to the north, around Prince Albert, in the Saskatchewan district, we have almost invariably produced four perfect grains. The wheat yield in the territories last year ranged from twenty-five to fifty-five bushels per acre. This immense yield has given rise to certain difficulties. These difficulties have arisen in connection with the transportation of the crop. We were assured that up to January the Canadian Pacific Railway moved something like 40,000,000 bushels, while the Canadian Northern moved 11,000,000 bushels. We are informed by the best authority to-day that there are at least 50,000,000 bushels more to be moved before navigation opens, and that will still leave 26,000,000 bushels for bread and seed for the coming year. You can see how far short the railway facility has come of moving the crop so as to secure the highest price in the market to the producer.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas) say that the wheat crop is 127,000,000 bushels ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am giving you the statement and I will give you the report of the warehouse commissioner which ought to satisfy every person.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is, all grains.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, all grains. With the view of perfect accuracy I wish to put on record the report of Mr. Castle, warehouse commissioner, who was appointed by this government under the legislation of 1900. The report is dated Winnipeg, January 15th, 1902, and addressed to Mr. Parmelee, deputy minister Trade and Commerce. Waiving the introduction he goes on to make the following statements :

Mr. General Superintendent Leonard of the Canadian Pacific Railway advises me that there are at present in use on the Canadian Pacific Railway western division 7,000 box cars and 256 engines divisable as follows :

Cars for use for carriage of general merchandise	4,000
Cars for use for carriage of grain	3,000
Engines in use, passenger service (ordinary season)	38
Engines in use, grain season	20
Engines in use, freight traffic (grain season)	236

It is stated that all grain has to be hauled on an average of 700 miles on western division while the number of miles an engine runs per day is estimated at 200. Below is given a list of the elevators and their capacity at Fort William and Port Arthur :

Fort William C.P.R. Co.'s. elevator (a).	1,250,000
" " " (b).	1,250,000
" " " (c).	1,500,000
" " " (d).	1,500,000
Port Arthur, King's elevator	350,000
Total	5,850,000

With this equipment worked at highest pressure the following table shows the amount of

grain actually delivered by that company into the Canadian Pacific Railway and King's elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, each week from the 1st of September to the 28th December inclusive.

I shall not give the deliveries of each week but simply the largest delivery in one week, being 1,335,414 bushels. The total delivery was 14,281,401.

In addition to this up to the 28th of December last there were delivered at Fort William 289,642 bushels of oats and 34,754 of barley, and flour the product of possibly 3,000,000 bushels of wheat; besides which about 1,000,000 bushels of oats were shipped to Montreal and eastern points, mostly from the Edmonton district, none of which appears in the above weekly elevator reports.

I may state that the facts given us in this report are based upon the condition of things reported to the warehouse commissioner each day and may be regarded as being correct.

From the foregoing it will be seen the Canadian Pacific Railway with their present equipment was unable to deliver at Fort William from Manitoba and Territorial points, more than 1,355,414 bushels of wheat in any one week, while deliveries for the same period at country points were, I should judge, about double that amount. There is not the slightest doubt that had there been proper facilities for handling it, over 3,000,000 bushels of grain would have been marketed weekly at all country points during the last part of October and all of November. Not counting sidings the Canadian Pacific Railway draws grain from 187 points at which there are elevators and warehouses If one and a-half cars per day or nine cars per week (averaging 350 bushels) were supplied to each of the 187 grain points above mentioned, the amount so delivered weekly at Fort William, would be 1,430,550 bushels, that is, nearly 100,000 bushels more than were actually delivered at Fort William and Port Arthur in any one week during the season—exclusive of flour, oats, barley, and flax. In view of the rapid growth of this western country and taking into consideration the large amount of money, time and energy which have been expended by the government in bringing producing settlers into the country, I consider the Canadian Pacific Railway in its own interests and that of Manitoba and the North-west, should at once take steps to provide equipment sufficient to deliver at Fort William at least 2,000,000 bushels per week. Efforts as you are aware, have at various times been made to obtain from the railway companies a ten per cent per hundred freight rate on wheat to the lakes. Even if this were obtained the advantages so accruing would be of little or no value to our producers without adequate transportation facilities; in support of which I would draw your attention to the following facts, viz. :—On the 2nd of November last there were reported to be in store at points on the Canadian Pacific Railway lines 5,306,400 bushels and from the 2nd to the 30th of November there were (exclusive of flour) delivered at Fort William and Port Arthur 5,038,601 bushels or 267,799 bushels less than there were in store at Canadian Pacific Railway country points on the 2nd of November. This clearly proves the lack of proper means of transportation. The following illustrations will show the immense loss this entails

Mr. DOUGLAS.

to producers. October purchases having been made on basis of lake and rail shipment, it naturally followed that dealers would during that month, place sufficient orders for cars to ship out grain bought by them during the month. However it became apparent on the first of November that it would be impossible to ship out all October purchases in time to reach Fort William before navigation closed (7th December). Therefore November purchases were made subject to 6 cents per bushel carrying charges, as evidently no grain purchased during that month could be shipped out until after the opening of navigation next spring. It costs per month as follows to carry 50 cent wheat :—

Storage ½ cent.

Insurance ¼ cent.

Interest at 6 per cent equal ¼ cent, in all 1 cent per bushel for one month, and 6 cents for six months. Under such circumstances, therefore, the producer selling grain during November would lose almost three times as much money as the government could secure or save for him were the 10 cent rate established.

With reference to the present terminal elevator facilities, I would consider them inadequate, and in my opinion, at least 2,500,000 bushels storage capacity should be added at Fort William at once. Grain traffic will almost be suspended in two or three weeks time, owing to lack of room in terminal elevators at Fort William, and all eastern elevators have been reported to me as filled. While the Canadian Pacific Railway has nominally 5,500,000 bushels storage capacity, their actual working capacity is about 5,000,000 bushels. I do not think that more than 300 cars per day can now be unloaded into elevators at Fort William, while, as I before stated, if on an average of two cars per point per day were delivered at terminals from the 187 grain points along the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's system, it would necessitate the unloading of 374 cars per day, which at 850 bushels per car, would amount to 1,901,400 bushels weekly. With the vast increase in acreage under wheat each year all over the North-west, and the large number of settlers now annually arriving, it is safe to say that from 50 to 70 million bushels of wheat will be exported annually in the immediate future.

My own observations lead me to the conclusion that a scarcity of engines, almost solely, and not box cars as is generally supposed, is the key note to the situation. In the year 1895 there was a large crop. The round trip per car was (I understand) then made in eight days, but the reason that was accomplished was that 15 per cent of cars from Fort William coming west were then returned loaded, while 75 per cent were returned loaded last fall, and that precluded the company providing an eight day service, as Mr. Leonard informed me last July, he expected to be in a position to give. In consequence of this, it took a much longer time to return cars to country points and it has been frequently reported to me that cars were held over for days at a time at sidings after they were loaded, before engines were obtainable to take them eastward.

(That the Canadian Pacific Railway had and have insufficient equipment to handle as much of the present crop as they should have done this fall and winter, cannot well be denied; but on the other hand the immense volume of traffic carried by that company east and west this fall with the present equipment certainly re-

flects the very greatest credit on all the officials of this road. Everything that it was possible to do in this regard, during that time was done.)

When the present terminal elevators were built some years ago, no one could dispute that they were erected ahead of the then requirements. Elevators 'A' and 'B' can each load out about 25,000 bushels per hour. Elevators 'C' and 'D' about 15,000 bushels per hour. The Duluth terminal elevators can today load out about 60,000 bushels per hour. In my opinion, all terminal elevators built at Fort William should be equal to loading vessels at this rate. It is no uncommon occurrence for boats of 250,000 bushels capacity, to call at Fort William for Manitoba grain, and if this port is to hold its own, it is evident as rapid handling of grain must be there provided as at Duluth.

There is another very important feature of the Manitoba grain traffic which it is well should not be lost sight of, viz., the grain carrying capacity of the lake marine, now available for transportation of western grain.

The port of Buffalo was congested early last fall owing (I am informed) to shortage of cars at that point; therefore any surplus of Manitoba grain that should have been transported by rail to Fort William, above what was actually shipped, would have been required to have been taken out of Canadian vessels.

Query.—Were Canadian boats in a position to take care of this increased traffic if offered? If so, are the present facilities at foot of Lake Superior and Huron on Canadian side, now capable of handling such increased traffic. Further, were there cars available at these points to transport this extra grain to Montreal or seaboard terminals?

It might be well for the government to inquire into the whole question of facilities now available for handling grain between Fort William and the seaboard.

In this report I have not had occasion to refer to the Canadian Northern Railway, as shipments from points along that system have to date gone out via Duluth, which port is out of my jurisdiction.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) CHARLES C. CASTLE,
Warehouse Commissioner.

Now, Sir, from this report of the warehouse commissioner it is perfectly evident that the rolling stock, and especially the motive power of the Canadian Pacific Railway is far short of what is required to-day to get the grain to the seaboard before navigation closes. In consequence of this defect the producers are reported to have been subject to serious loss. Considering that the Canadian Pacific Railway has taken out 40,000,000 bushels, say up to January, and that the producer has lost about ten cents per bushel, here is a loss equal to $4,000,000. Then again the Canadian Northern Railway is reported to have moved about 11,000,000 bushels and the loss sustained by the producers on this quantity is said to be $1,000,000, so that the producers have lost in all $5,000,000 by reason of imperfect transportation. Speaking of Assiniboia where the congestion really exists, there was no competition between the roads there, and naturally business men will try to protect their own business and their own pockets, with the result that cars were sent to those points in Manitoba where there was competition and the Manitoba producers have in this way not suffered to the same extent as the people in the territories. The loss in Assiniboia has been great. I could scarcely give you an idea of the congested state of things between Moosomin and Moosejaw. Any one who looked at the 'Globe' of Saturday last may have noticed photographs showing how things were congested in the town of Wolseley, and the efforts made by the farmers to accommodate the grain they had still on hand. In Assiniboia the total production of grain last year was 15,468,345 bushels. This statement is based on the report of the government, which in turn is based upon reports received from men engaged in threshing the grain. This may be regarded as the quantity reported up to January. It certainly does not represent the total production; but even on this amount there is a loss to the producer of $1,546,834.

The loss on grain still in hand to be shipped cannot be fully estimated. Those who are acquainted with the country know well that very few farmers have proper granaries, fitted to protect the grain against a shower of rain. Then, they are not in a position to keep the grain till the summer; and, indeed, to haul it in the summer would cost so much, necessitating the taking of their horses and men off their farms when they ought to be occupied in the cultivation of the soil, that it would render the production of grain wholly unprofitable.

Then, there is a great loss to the producers who are off the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Many of them cannot have marketed a dozen loads of grain this season. The result is that they have not been able to pay their liabilities in the town or village, and have been obliged to borrow money at 12 per cent interest to pay their hired labour.

There are heavy losses in all these directions—from imperfect storage, from the paying of heavy interest on loans to meet current expenses, and from the expense of temporary buildings. In every town and village you will find every vacant house or warehouse, every implement storehouse, every baker's shop, filled with wheat. You will find wheat piled up against the elevators, on the side-walks, in front of stores, and in every conceivable place, waiting for transportation.

Then, many, of whom I am one, have been forced to build temporary buildings in order to have the grain hauled during the winter and not to draw on the summer, which should be devoted to other work. This involves a great deal of expense.

I remember contending on the floor of this House during the past few years for the necessity of having flat warehouses. I was

informed time and again that it was a retrograde movement, that the flat warehouse was antiquated, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were exceedingly liberal when they granted us one flat warehouse at each shipping station. When I tell you that to-day in the town of Wolseley there are 46 flat warehouses, which have been built by private individuals, you will come to realize that there was some point to my argument. Then, at Indian Head, where this season 2,500,000 bushels of grain will be marketed, I personally counted 75 wagons standing waiting to be unloaded, most of them having two loads, while the farmer had been obliged to return to his home with his horses and leave the grain, for days, until it could be unloaded. At Indian Head the people have built 115 small warehouses for their own accommodation, and 35 more are in course of erection. I remember being told on the floor of this House that we would make each Canadian Pacific Railway yard a village of warehouses. Well, what are we doing ? For the very lack of these warehouses a veritable village of temporary graneries is being erected in the neighbourhood of every Canadian Pacific station. And all this indicates that we came far short of realizing that our western country would develop at such a rate as to make the present facilities altogether inadequate. The difference between winter and summer hauling, I do not wish to dwell upon ; but the loss to the country is very great, and will continue to be so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are these warehouses erected along the line of the railway ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. As near the railway as they can get. So that you see the elevator system does not meet the needs of the case. I have never opposed the elevator system ; but I hold it to be unjust on the part of any government to force the people to deal through the elevator system exclusively. Let me tell you what took place this year all along the line. When a farmer went to the elevator with No. 1 Hard, he was told, 'We are not buying No. 1 Hard at the elevator.' This was the case, not at one elevator only, but all along the line, as if there were some concocted plan to rob the public. They simply said, 'We are not purchasing No. 1 Hard, we have no means of storing it.' The result was that the producer had to sell his grain as No. 1 Northern, losing on it about 5 cents a bushel. It certainly looked to me like the method of the highwayman.

It is highway robbery. I am sorry indeed to have to make this statement, but the Bill of 1900 provides against such a state of things, and the warehouse commissioner has it in his power to withhold the license from these elevator companies unless they do business along the line of our legislation. Such action as this by the commissioner would have put an end to the difficulty. But the objection I see is that we are putting upon the commissioner a responsibility that is more than any one individual ought to bear, and I would recommend to the House the appointment of a commission, composed of a representative of the farming community, a representative of the trade, a representative of the railway company, and a good solicitor, to sit during the grain season and adjust all irregularities in connection with the administration of the law. I believe it was within the commissioner's power to have notified these elevator people that unless they did business along the line of the legislation of 1900, they would not get a license—that they must either stop doing business or do it in accord with the Act. But such notice was not given, and consequently the farmers were obliged to accept a lower grade, which was a very serious loss, taking into account the large crop.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to tax further the patience of the House by calling attention to certain resolutions adopted by what is now known as the Territorial Grain Growers Association. The congested state of affairs led our people to come together and discuss the situation. They formed an organization and drafted a constitution and held meetings at various points. I have on my desk resolutions from a number of associations, but I shall confine myself to the proceedings of the central association, which met at Indian Head and to which delegates were sent from all over the territory, especially from Moose Jaw down the boundary between Manitoba and the North-west Territories. At this meeting, which was held on the 12th of February, the following resolutions were adopted, and they were forwarded to me by Mr. Miller, the secretary-treasurer, in order that I might bring them to the notice of this House.

Moved by R. J. Phin,—

Whereas the farmers of the North-west Territories have not been able to market their wheat owing to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's refusal to furnish cars to move it.

And that there is still remaining in the farmer's hands one-half of the grain grown during the past year.

And that a large quantity of wheat has been sold to the elevator and milling companies at a less price and on a lower grade that its value, caused by the companies stating that they only have bins to receive wheat of the lower grade, and owing to this the farmers have been forced to take from 7 to 9 cents per bushel less than the value of their wheat at Fort William.

And that there is now an elevator at Port Arthur ready to receive wheat, and also plenty of elevator space at Duluth.

And that it is a well known fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not at present the motive power sufficient to handle the business of the country.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company be asked to furnish sufficient cars to forward the grain as it is offered, and the shipper be allowed to ship to Winnipeg, thence by Canada Northern to their elevator at Port Arthur, and also to ship to Duluth, both via Winnipeg and the Soo line at the rate of freight charged to Fort William; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Superintendent Leonard of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Minister of Railways, the superintendent of the Canadian Northern and the Department of Inland Revenue.

I might say that I saw a telegram the other day stating that the Canadian Pacific Railway have undertaken to send grain over the 'Soo' line to Duluth, and is thus giving a measure of relief to that congested country.

Moved by W. R. Motherwell, seconded by J. Morrison,—

That the transportation facilities of the Territories has not kept pace with the settlement and productive capacity of the country, with the very natural result that at the present time a complete standstill has been reached in the marketing of our wheat, and with over the half of it yet in our granaries and likely to remain there during the greater part of the coming summer. A tremendous loss to the country even at this date has already been sustained. That never again in the history of our country should such a disastrous occurrence be permitted and that the granting of full provincial powers to the Territories and with it the power to build railways would without doubt be helpful in that direction.

Resolutions passed by the Balcarres and Kenlis local Territorial Grain Growers' Association.

1. That section 43 of the Manitoba Grain Act be amended in such a manner as will empower the warehouse commissioner to compel all railway companies to erect every loading platform, approved of by said commissioner, within thirty days after said approval is given, and in default, the said commissioner shall have the power to impose penalties on such defaulting railway companies and collect same through the courts. And further, that this amendment come into force not later than the first day of May, A.D. 1902, and that height of said platform be level with floor of car.

2. That railway companies be compelled to provide farmers with cars to be loaded direct from vehicles at all stations, irrespective of there being an elevator, warehouse, or loading platform at such station or not. And further, that this amendment come into force the first day of May, A.D. 1902.

I shall not weary the House by reading the further resolutions passed by the different associations at different points in the territories. They all point in the same direction, and deal with the same difficulty. While the Bill of 1900 provided for the loading of cars from the farmer's vehicles, and while a number of these platforms were constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway; yet when the pressure came the Canadian Pacific Railway seemed unwilling to construct further loading platforms and our farmers were denied the use of cars altogether and have been up to date.

It has produced a state of feeling which is not at all desirable or pleasant. Sometimes we men from the west are said to be breezy. I would not like to say anything very strong or injudicious, but were I to interpret the feeling which exists in the west to-day, I would certainly rend my garments and put ashes on my head. It would be much easier to-day to raise a rebellion than to raise the taxes. But the question is: What remedy do you propose? The Canadian Pacific Railway, we understand, are likely to seek an increase of their stock to the extent of $20,000,000, with the view to increasing their rolling stock, extending branches and doubling their track from Winnipeg to Fort William. That, certainly is all in the right direction. I am not in favour of doubling their main line through the territories, because it would not relieve the settlers who haul grain a great distance or the new settlements that are continually springing up. But if the track be doubled from Winnipeg to the lakes, it will certainly be an advantage. If the North-west Central had been built two or three years ago, as we North-west members struggled so hard to secure its building, but were defeated, the congestion along the main line in Assiniboia would not have occurred, because the new line would have relieved it. I am glad to state that now the company is prepared to build probably one hundred miles as a branch from the main line out to File Hills. This will largely meet the necessities of the case and will relieve the main line through the territory of East Assiniboia. But there must be a large increase in the storage capacity at the 187 points at which the Canadian Pacific Railway loads grain. The storage capacity at country points in Manitoba and the Territories amounts to something a little over 21,000,000 bushels. We are informed by Mr. Castle, the warehouse commissioner, that at least three million bushels capacity ought to be added to the Canadian Pacific Railway storage at the lakes. I am pleased to see by Saturday's paper, that the Canadian Pacific Railway are taking steps to increase their storage capacity from 5,500,000 bushels to 9,000,000 bushels, the cost of which to them will be about $1,000,000. This is in the direction of relief. But I do not know why this government might not consider the propriety of assisting in building storage capacity at the lakes. Certainly it would only be carrying out the same principle that they have adopted in assisting to build elevators at Montreal. Then we want a large increase in the transportation facilities. We want the government to take into consideration as soon as possible, the perfection of a water way to the sea. The sooner the grain can be got to market in the autumn, the greater the value to the country, the greater the price—and I am sure

the country is worthy the trouble and the expense. I am satisfied there is more gold in the soil of the prairies than in the rocks of the Yukon, and we ought to be willing to spend some money in providing such transportation facilities as the country demands. Wheat is a cash article ; it will pay its own way to the sea. The farmers are not asking for protection. I would like to say a word to our protectionists in the old provinces. The best protection any government can give to you is to attract a large population to the North-west to produce abundantly and make a market for your products. Moreover, you cannot protect the farmer of the North-west—no government, I do not care what its name may be, can protect the farmer of the North-west. Why ? Because he is out in the wide world of free trade with his products ; he must compete with all comers in a market where he has no artificial advantage. You may protect manufacturers, but there is no protection you can give them that will be better than to fill the North-west country with an industrious population of great producing power whose wants will give a home market for home products. I do not wish to take up longer time, but I thought it most important that the resolution I present, and this report and also the important facts I have given, should be placed on record.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Douglas) one question, for information. I understood him to say that the elevator people told the farmers that they had no bins for hard wheat. Was that because they reserved no bins for No. 1 hard or was it that the bins, though reserved, were full ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, the answer was : We are not purchasing No. 1 hard.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did they allege as a reason that the bins reserved for No. 1 hard were already full ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They had no provision made for it. But you can easily understand why. If they can purchase No. 1 hard at the price of No. 1 northern, they can mix it with a lower grade of a less value and still have it grade No 1 northern. If this be done they make money. They have robbed the public, it is true, but they have made money. That is a line of business that is being practiced very largely. A remedy is provided, however, in the legislation of 1900. But if the law had been strictly carried out, this practice might have been stopped and that suddenly. I am glad to say, so far as I know, our legislation of 1900 has been most effective. It needs some additions. I believe some additional power should be given to the warehouse commissioner, for example. This subject will be brought up in due time, before this session closes. What we want is perfect freedom—access to the market independently of the elevators. We want neither legislation nor anything else to say to our people : You must go along this line and not along that line. They have a right to perfect freedom in the presentation of their stuff at the railway station, and they ought to have the facilities which the Dominion Railway Act has ensured to all Canadian citizens. This has become very apparent in the trade of this year. The people have been denied cars. I had a telegram no longer ago than Friday from a man who had bought in considerable quantity in Grenfel. He applied for cars to ship the wheat to Brandon. But he was informed by the Canadian Pacific Railway officials that they could not grant him cars—that the Dealers' Association objected. What does that mean ? I sent the telegram with a note to Montreal asking what it meant, but I have not yet heard the explanation. I know there are gentlemen from Manitoba who know, perhaps, as much about the grain trade as I do, and there are other members also, no doubt, who have given this matter attention and who will address the House. In bringing my remarks to a close, I desire to express the sincere hope that before this session closes the government will take this whole situation into its serious consideration and will manifest such an interest in it as will show the people that it is the country's welfare we seek and its prosperity we desire.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I would like to say a few words on this question that has been brought before the House by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) with reference to the grain blockade. There is no doubt at all that we have been seriously troubled in that way in the North-west Territories and in Manitoba during the last season. But we must take into consideration that we have during the season that has just passed, raised not only one crop in the North-west Territories, but we have raised something like two crops; and the shortage of cars, I fancy, is not so much due to the neglect of the railway companies as it is to their not being prepared to move two crops in one season. However, I think any person who has listened to the speech of the hon. member for Assiniboia must come to the conclusion that it is high time the government of this country did something towards the appointment of a railway commission to settle all these disputes.

Now, my hon. friend has told us this afternoon that the grain Act is very good in itself, but he mentioned some defects in it, and some respects in which he thought it did not meet the wishes of the people of that country. However, so far as I could gather from his speech, he thinks that while the Act itself provided for all the different things he complained of, the commissioner had not enforced the Act. Now, I noticed that in one part of his speech he alluded to the fact that the commissioner might, if

he so wished, refuse a license to any person that was desirous of providing a flat warehouse or an elevator. I think if the hon. gentlemen will look over the Act, the Grain Act of 1900, he will find that the commissioner has no power to refuse a license to any one. That Act provides that a license should be granted to any person operating a flat warehouse or an elevator, on the payment of a certain fee, and when the party operating an elevator or a flat warehouse has conformed to all the regulations laid down in this Act. That being the case, if the conditions of the Act have not been fulfilled, we must take it, either that the commissioner has neglected or refused to do his duty as provided in this Act, or that the parties who have a grievance have failed to apply to the commissioner for relief, or to make official complaint to him. It is either the one thing or the other. If the parties had officially complained to him that they were not receiving proper treatment with regard to grades, it would be the duty of the commissioner under this Act to take the matter up and to see that the parties were properly dealt with, because the machinery is here for that purpose.

Now, to my mind this whole matter is closely related to a question that has been discussed in this House for many years, and that is the transportation problem. That is the greatest problem to-day that the people of this country have to deal with. There lies the secret of the whole thing. We have not sufficient railway accommodation in the North-west at the present time. We have this year raised something like a hundred million bushels of grains, and when we take into consideration that about 400,000 people all told have produced 100,000,000 bushels of grain, not to speak of the quantity of other grains they have produced, I think the House will agree with me that it is about time something was done to provide better facilities for carrying our grain to market. We have had this year only one road from the city of Winnipeg, only one railway for taking away that grain, the railway running from Winnipeg to Port Arthur. Of course, the Canadian Northern line was opened up towards the latter end of November, but on account of not having elevators prepared at Port Arthur the people could not take advantage of it, and it was of very little use to the people of the North-west this year. So we had to depend on the one track, and I am not prepared to say that in every case the railroad company have acted in a right spirit with the people, but they have done well in the whole.

Now, with reference to the flat warehouses and the loading platforms my hon. friend speaks of, there is a provision in this Act, which I have under my hand, that if a certain number of farmers wish to have a flat warehouse at any point they may send a petition to the commissioner and the commissioner shall give them permission to build the warehouse, and shall see that the railroad corporation furnishes the necessary facilities in the way of side tracks, &c. If they are not satisfied with one flat warehouse, they can apply again to the commissioner and can get others built, providing they pay 6 per cent on the cost of putting in the sidings and pay for the land on which the warehouse stands. If they had made application to the commissioner, I have no doubt he would have seen that they had the privilege granted them of building these warehouses. However, taking the Act as a whole, while I think there are some things in it that could be amended, it has worked out pretty well indeed. But the fact of the matter is we want more railroad facilities ; we must have more railroads to the lakes.

The hon. gentleman spoke about canals. To my mind this country has been spending enough money on canals. Of course, I am only expressing my own opinion when I say that I think the time has come that we will have to have a quicker mode of transporting our produce to market than by taking it down through the canals. Under present conditions very little of the wheat crop of Manitoba is taken out in the summer months. It has to cross through the lakes to the canals, and as soon as navigation closes we have to depend on storing it at Fort William or some other place. Now we find that grain that is stored at Fort William over winter depreciates in value something like six cents per bushel; in other words, the farmer loses six cents a bushel on account of having to store his grain over winter, including storage charges, insurance, &c. So if we had some means of sending the grain direct to market, direct to an ocean port, we could take advantage of a rise in wheat when such takes place. But we are not able to do that now because it is stored at Fort William or some other place and has to lie there over winter. However, that is a matter that belongs to the discussion of the transportation problem, and that may come up in the House shortly.

I wish to say again that the remarks of the hon. member for East Assiniboia have demonstrated to this House the necessity that exists for the appointment of a railway commission. No matter how good a man you may appoint as grain commissioner in Winnipeg, when the rush is on in the fall it is impossible for him to deal with everything that comes up, like a shortage of cars. That is not his business. His business is to deal between the farmer and the elevator man about grades, &c. With reference to a shortage of cars, the only way you can deal with that is by a railway commission. Over in the United States, I think, in every state in the union, they have at the present time a railway commission, whose duty it is to deal with this matter. Other matters that come up such as cattle

guards, would all be dealt with by a railway commission. I hope that the government will take that into consideration, and the sooner they appoint a railway commission to see that all these things are looked after, such as a shortage of cars and everything else, the better it will be for every person interested.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). Before this discussion closes, as the two hon. gentlemen who have just spoken have not referred to the province of Manitoba, I desire to say a few words. In the first place, an impression would be conveyed from the statement of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) that the car shortage did not affect the province of Manitoba. As a matter of fact, there are now lying in bins in that province 20,000,000 or 25,000,000 bushels of wheat that could not be moved out to the lake ports this fall. I have an important resolution passed by the Winnipeg Board of Trade at a meeting held in January last. It is quite lengthy, and if the House will permit me, I will hand it to the 'Hansard' instead of reading it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. McCREARY. Then I will read a portion of it. It sets out the matter so fully that I think it ought to be brought before this House. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the car shortage and loss that has been occasioned in consequence is one of the most important matters that can be brought up in this House.

The loss in Manitoba alone has been estimated on the car shortage at $7,000,000, sustained by the 250,000 people in that province. If the farmers in the province of Ontario who number ten times those in Manitoba were to make in one year a loss of $7,000,000, we would hear from some hon. members on the other side of the House representing the province of Ontario. I attended a board of trade meeting that was called to deal with this question. On the first day of the meeting a resolution was brought up by three or four gentlemen, one of whom at a former time was a member of this House. It was thought that the resolution had been a little too strongly worded and it was a debatable question. That resolution was subsequently amended by a committee composed of men who are probably among the best citizens of Winnipeg and who are largely interested in the city of Winnipeg and in the province of Manitoba. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was chartered by the Canadian parliament and large grants of money and land were made to that company as an inducement to their undertaking the construction and operation of a line of railroad through Manitoba and the North-west, with a view of the development of the country; and,

Whereas, further large grants either in money and in lands, or both, have been made from time to time for the purpose of securing the construction of branch lines and extensions thereof to the same road; and,

Whereas, a strict monopoly of the carrying trade of this country was for long years secured and has been attempted to be maintained up to the present time; and,

Whereas, under these circumstances the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories and the Dominion have a right to expect that the road will provide and maintain adequate facilities for handling the traffic of this country, and especially of the outgoing produce thereof; and,

Whereas, the said company has failed in the carrying out of the crop of the year 1901 to such an extent that with the elevators at Fort William, as also along the lines of the said road in Manitoba and the North-west full of wheat alone, there yet remains in the farmers' hands over and above the quantity required for consumption and for seed an amount which may be reasonably estimated at the present time at twenty million bushels of wheat.

That is in the province of Manitoba alone.

—which surplus they are unable to market; and,

Whereas, a very large acreage was prepared for cultivation during the year 1901 by new settlers, and the prospect for immigration to Manitoba and the North-west during the year 1902 is extremely good, consequently the area of land broken up and to be broken up and brought under cultivation the coming year will materially add to the grain producing area; and,

Whereas, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company still exclusively possess the carrying trade of a very large proportion of the grain area in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and with a full knowledge of the increase of acreage under crop, did not provide what was reasonably necessary for the crop of the past year;

Therefore, be it resolved——

And here is what I wish the members of the government to observe that is the remedy, proposed at this large meeting:

—that this board in view of the facts call on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to relieve the present situation, so far as is within their power, between this time and the opening of navigation, by carrying grain forward, all rail, from Manitoba and the North-west to eastern points, to the greatest extent possible, and at a rate of freight which shall not exceed the rate charged by lake and rail between the same points;

That with the view of providing against simliar difficulties in the future, they should, during the current year, double track their line from the Red river to Fort William;

That they should materially increase their elevator capacity at Fort William and also afford every facility for the building and operation of elevators at Fort William by private enterprise;

That they should provide ample motive power and cars for use on the western division so as to be in a position to handle the traffic of the country duriag the period of greatest necessity with sufficient expenditure and to get the bulk of the crop out before the close of navigation.

As I said, at this meeting of the Board of Trade of the city of Winnipeg, composed

of 200 or 300 of the most prominent commercial men of the west, this question was discussed at great length, in fact, for two entire afternoons. Mr. William Whyte, superintendent of the Canadian Pacific Railway was present and made out a very able case for the Canadian Pacific Railway. He took credit to the Canadian Pacific Railway for having purchased during the previous year 62 new engines and 1,200 new box cars, and for having hauled out 32 per cent more wheat and 125 per cent more oats than in the previous year, and he pointed out that in fact they had taken every possible precaution to meet the new situation and were doing everything possible to provide new rolling stock to take out the crop in the comparatively short time which was given them to move it. It may surprise some hon. gentlemen to know that the wheat crop begins to move about the first of September and keeps on usually until the first of December. But this year on account of having a considerable rain fall the farmers were not able to thresh their grain, and consequently the total number of days that was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway to move the crop out before navigation closed was forty-three days. As a fair minded man I do not know that the Canadian Pacific Railway could be asked to provide rolling stock, engines and box cars, necessary to move that immense quantity of grain in so short a time. I do not know whether, if it had been moved as rapidly as required, there would not have been just as bad a blockade at Fort William and at Buffalo. Touching upon that question, I may say that the Board of Trade of Winnipeg, in their annual report took up that same question, and, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I will read a clause of the report dealing with that phase of the question :

> The tonnage of the Canadian lake vessels is not keeping pace with the annually increasing tonnage handled at Fort William, and it behooves Canadians to move in this matter with despatch, or an unduly increased percentage of Manitoba grain will seek the Atlantic seaboard via Buffalo and American lines. It is doubtful whether, if all the grain offered to the Canadian Pacific Railway last fall had been taken to Fort William, there would have been Canadian vessels to have taken it across the lakes, even when excluding the quantity actually taken to Buffalo in American bottoms. Late in the fall Buffalo was blocked, and owing to the coatsing laws American vessels were not allowed to carry grain from Fort William to another Canadian port. Either the Canadian fleet will have to be largely augmented or the coasting regulations suspended, for Manitoba grain cannot be held back at Fort William or Port Arthur, because Canadian vessel tonnage is inadequate to handle it.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary), but may I ask him a question ? I have heard the statement made that when navigation closed there was not a bushel of wheat in the elevators at Fort William to be taken out. I would like to know if that is a fact.

Mr. McCREARY. I dare say that may have been the case.

Mr. CLARKE. That, in fact, two or three vessels went up to Fort William to get cargoes, that they were unable to get them, and that they had to remain there.

Mr. McCREARY. I dare say that may be the case. Owing to the trouble caused by the serious rain fall that we had in Manitoba, the farmers were not able to thresh the grain. If you ask the 20,000 men who went up there to help thresh the grain, they will tell you that they could not get employment when they arrived and that many of them returned home again, but, a very few days after the boats were loaded for the last time at Fort William there was enough grain to fill up these elevators again. The hon. gentleman for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) put the matter in a nutshell when he said that on the 2nd of November there were 5,000,000 bushels of grain in the elevators in our country and that during the entire month of November they had just moved out about 5,000,000 bushels, consequently all the wheat threshed during November must have been bought at six cents anyway a bushel less than it was worth. My own county is not as much affected by this question as some other parts of the province of Manitoba, but during the last two or three weeks before I came down here, I happened to be on a little missionary tour in the county of Lisgar. That is one of the largest grain producing counties in the west. I met with many farmers there and discussed the question with them. I tell you, Sir, it was pretty hard to talk Liberal principles in view of the fact that across the boundary they were getting six to sixteen cents a bushel more for wheat than our farmers were. I endeavoured to find an explanation for this. The explanation is not due entirely to the car shortage. There are many reasons for it. The town of Snowflake where I had a meeting is situated in the southern part of the county and right across the line is the town of Hanna in North Dakota. The price of wheat was six to sixteen cents a bushel more there than it was in Snowflake. I asked a farmer 'how is that '? He said there are different reasons. I said 'What about the rate,' He said 'Well the rate from Snowflake to Port Aruthur on the Canadian Pacific Railway is 16 cents.' 'What is the rate on the Great Northern from Duluth,' I asked. He said : 'the rate is 17 cents.' I said : 'It cannot be the railway.' 'No,' he replied. Well, what is the reason ? One farmer said the reason was that the millers of Minneapolis were booming the price on account of shortage of feed in Nebraska and South Dakota and they were paying $26 a ton for

bran, and consequently they wanted to grind the wheat and sell the bran and make a profit that way. Another man said there was no restriction whatever on the farmers selling to them wheat in the United States, and consequently the competition there was more lively. While these may be some of the reasons they still do not explain the great discrepancy in the prices. My own impression is, that before this question is finally settled, we will have to select a body of men who will act as a commission to decide on these matters. They must be men who understand the business, and they will have to study the elevator system at Duluth and follow it up over the branch line of the Canadian Northern and the Northern Pacific throughout this prairie country, in order to ascertain why there is this difference in the price. I think our present Grain Act was not sufficiently considered at the time it was passed, and I believe a good deal of amendments could be made to improve it. The member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) said he thought our grain Act could be worked out all right, but I think the Minister of the Interior when he returns intends to bring down important amendments to this Act. For instance, one clause provides that if a car is placed on a siding for a farmer he can only have a limited time to load that car, and if he exceeds that time it is taken away or there is a charge for demurrage. The time given to the farmer in many cases is not long enough. Another clause of that Act provides that if you make a request to the Canadian Pacific Railway for a loading platform, they are given three months in which to construct that loading platform when it should be constructed in three days. Five men could easily build it in three days and consequently that clause in the Act is of very little use. These are some suggested amendments to the Act which should be looked into carefully. No doubt when the minister (Hon. Mr. Sifton) brings his Bill to amend the Act, all the questions which have been brought up to-day will be discussed at greater length. There is another phase of this question which seriously affects our western country. A large number of these farmers who are now coming into Manitoba and especially along the Sault line in the North-west, are men who have large means and some of whom bring in five or six cars of mules and horses. They are going into the country to raise wheat as a speculation. They have followed that occupation down in Dakota and Minnesota and they have been making money out of the raising of wheat alone. The moment they come in there and see our farmers with from 5,000 to 10,000 bushels of wheat lying in the warehouses and unable to get cars to carry it out, they are at first disposed to treat the matter as a joke. They cannot understand the situation at all. They say: If the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot supply you cars to ship your wheat what is the use of raising it. If some of these men who are possessed of large means get it into their heads that our railway system is such that we cannot get the wheat out, then they will not come into our country at all. It behooves the government of the day to look seriously into this phase of the question, because it is a very important matter to the people of Manitoba and the North-west. I have noticed since I have come to this parliament, that there has been a very lengthy discussion on some occasions on comparatively unimportant questions. Last year the cultivation of beet-root sugar was discussed for one or two days in the House, and it is, I think, a question which need not be seriously discussed in this country. But here is a question of vast importance to this country. We have 100,000,000 bushels of grain raised by 400,000 people, and we have to solve the problem of populating our Great North-west, but I remark how very few of the hon. gentlemen opposite are present in the House to hear the discussion of this vital matter. I regret indeed to say that the seats are very poorly filled on either side of the House. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the question should be very seriously considered by us all, and I trust that the government will do something to relieve the situation.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). I quite agree with the last speaker (Mr. McCreary) in his statement with regard to the empty seats in this House when such an important matter is being discussed. This is a question of greater importance to the Northwest and Manitoba than anything that has been brought before the House during this session or any session for the past five years, and yet, how many of the ministers of the Crown are in their seats at this moment? Just three. We have only three ministers of the Crown present notwithstanding that their supporters are bringing forward this question which is perhaps the most important that can engage the consideration of the people of this country. And, Sir, the minister who is leading the House to-day is the man who used the words, or who supported the men who used the words quoted by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) when he said that Manitoba and the North-west was a home for buffaloes and coyotes, and that, if the Canadian Pacific Railway was built it would not pay for the axle grease used on the wheels. We cannot expect that any interest will be taken in this question by that kind of men. That is the position we find this government in to-day. This is a question that has engaged for months past the attention of the whole people of Manitoba and the North-west. The papers have been full of it, and nothing has been said

on the question to-day that has not been published in the press throughout the country since November last. I thought, judging from the remarks of the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) that he was paving the way as it were to make it easy for the government to support the Canadian Pacific Railway in their proposition with reference to their $20,000,000 outlay. I will not say that this is the case, nor will I say that it would be wise in the interests of the country as a whole that this should not be done. But, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that when I had first the honour to speak in this House in 1893, I remarked to the present Prime Minister who was then in opposition: That if the Liberal party would admit that they had made mistakes about that western country; if they would say that they did not understand the capabilities of that country, and in order to show their repentance propound the policy that they would go so far as to build another railroad into that country; they would retrieve their position a great deal. But the present Prime Minister shook his head, and a number of the Liberal newspapers amongst others the Ottawa 'Free Press' castigated me for suggesting such an outrageous doctrine. We now find, Mr. Speaker, that the foresight of the Conservative leaders who opened up that country has caused them to be regarded as the real benefactors of the North-west, and probably some of the old time Liberals view with regret the fact that the pessimistic prophecies they made with regard to that country have, like some of their other prophecies, turned out to be false. We have to-day the spectacle of the supporters of the Liberal government pointing out to that government that the prophecies of the Conservative leaders made in days past, have already been fulfilled.

The question, as I say, is one of the greatest importance to Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and to the whole of this country, and I regret, beyond words of mine to express, how little interest is being taken in it by the members of this House. If it related to some trifling bridge, or breakwater, or oyster hatchery, of some scandal, the seats would be full, and each ear set so as not to miss the slightest sound. But here is a question involving millions to the people of this country, and there is general indifference. There is no use of this government trying to shirk responsibility in regard to this question, nor the Canadian Pacific Railway Company trying to shirk responsibility in regard to it; because it was well known during the whole of last summer, while the crop was growing, what might be expected, and the Canadian Pacific Railway should have provided—and it was the duty of this government to see that they did provide—the necessary equipment to take the crop out of the country. This government has enacted the Grain Act, and must assume all responsibility for the working of it; and when any man in this House says that that Act has proven a success, and is working satisfactorily, all I can say is that he does not know what he is talking about, because it is working most unsatisfactorily. Whatever idea the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) may have had when he was putting that Act through this House, it has certainly failed to accomplish the object for which it was enacted. It is such an Act as was never applied to any other business. In what other business is a man compelled to take out a license before he can do business? The grain dealers say: In order to protect ourselves we have found it necessary to do as we have done; and what has been the action of the grain men? This government should look into this matter, because when they were in opposition they declared that they would remove all such restrictions and combines. A greater combine never existed than exists in that country to-day, under the very Grain Act passed by this government. It works just as the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia has described; and, as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has said, some six or seven millions of dollars have been taken out of the pockets of the people of this country in connection with it, and not all on account of the shortage of cars. Wherever there was an independent buyer, the grain combine would send one or two men to raise the price on him to such an extent as to put him out of business unless he was willing to join their exchange. I will cite one case which happened at the town of Douglas, thirty miles west of Carberry, where there was an independent buyer. At that point on a certain day the price of wheat was 61 cents a bushel, while 60 miles nearer to Winnipeg, at a point where there was not an independent buyer, it was 51 cents a bushel. This is the way matters have worked under the grain Act of the government. Flat warehouses are useless to meet the case, because the Act provides that they must be built to hold two or three car loads. The result is that a man must be put at each warehouse to look after it, and there goes your warehouse—the expense will eat it up.

Mr. Speaker, there is one way to get over this difficulty, and if the government will not adopt it, I will introduce a measure into this House, so that we shall have them put on record, and see exactly what they intend to do. That is, that they shall demand of the railway companies that they shall provide cars for the farmers at all times, within a reasonable time. If you compel the railways to do that, and put a penalty on them if they do not do it, you will have no more trouble with elevators, blockades or anything of the kind.

Mr. HEYD. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. How many cars

would it be necessary for the Canadian Pacific Railway to have on hand to do as he wants done—to have a car whenever any farmer wants one ?

Mr. BOYD. I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, and when we did prophesy you would not believe us. I am not prophesying the number of bushels of grain that will come out of that country ; but I say that the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway going into that country to move the crops should be prepared to meet the necessities of the case ; and I am not submitting anything unreasonable. The western states, which control matters of that kind, and not the central government, have such laws as I have mentioned, and have solved the grain difficulty in that way, because they compel the railway companies to give the farmers an equal number of cars with the elevators. When that is done, the farmer can sell to whomsoever he pleases ; and I now ask the government—because it is evident that the measure for aiding the Canadian Pacific Railway is coming down—to see to it, before any further concessions are made to that company, that the farmers shall be protected in the way I suggest. When they do that, there will be very little further difficulty in regard to prices or anything else.

The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) spoke of double tracks. If we have to wait for double tracks, it will take longer to double track the road between Winnipeg and Fort William than it would to build a new road. Three years would not see that portion of the road double tracked.

I could give many details to show the iniquitous working of the present grain Act, but I feel that it would be merely taking up the time of an indifferent House—because the indifference of the House is displayed by the empty benches we see to-day—and I will leave the responsibility with the government. It was well known that the abundant crops which we have had was coming ; and you need not suppose that that is the only abundant crop we are going to have. We have had many crops equal to the lact crop ; but the acreage under crop is increasing both in Manitoba and the North-west Territories ; and the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories are going to hold the present government responsible for protecting the farmers.

I want to say a word to the hon. Minister of Public Works in regard to this matter. Instead of talking about spending three hundred millions or so on the Georgian Bay canal, he had better give a little consideration to keeping the Lake Superior ports open. That is something that is being done in other northern countries. One-fourth of the amount of money which it is proposed to expend in some directions, if spent in building the proper kind of vessels, would keep open, probably the whole winter, Fort William and other ports on Lake Superior which can be reached by railroad lines. This is a matter which should engage the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works, and I trust that the members from Manitoba and the North-west will be able to bring such pressure to bear upon him and the government that they will feel obliged to give some attention to that matter.

Mr. TALBOT. Would the hon. gentleman from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) tell us whether that is not the same speech he made in Lisgar during the last campaign ?

Mr. BOYD. I am not like the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). I can make more than one speech.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). I have no intention of taking up the time of the House at any length on this question, but as it is one in which we are all interested I wish to give my view of the situation. It is not only gentlemen from the west who are interested in the development and the general welfare of our great western country. We all have a deep interest in its future, for on its development and progress depends in a very large measure the prosperity of the whole country . And in considering this question—which is a very fair one to bring before the House—we should not look merely at one side of it, but discuss it in a reasonable manner from every point of view. The hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Boyd) appears to be under the impression that no matter how great may be our development in any given year, that development should be foreseen by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other railway companies, and the Canadian government, and every possible preparation made by them to meet it. He seems to think that they should provide every possible facility to meet an extraordinary development of trade without any regard to the risk that their expectations might fail entirely in realization and the requirements be far less than anticipated. What are the conditions to-day not only in Canada but over the entire continent of America ? We are told that in the United States a commission regulates this question. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no commission in the United States, there is no body of men—

Mr. BOYD. I did not say anything about a commissioner controlling this matter in the United States. I said it was under state law.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, I say that there is no man or body of men who could have foreseen and been ready for the immense commerce that was developed on the North American continent this past year. Why, two years ago the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canada Atlantic and all the other railway companies went into building cars as rapidly as they

could, but the expectations of the railway companies, not only in Canada but in the United States, have been greatly exceeded, and the development had been such as to tax these carriers far beyond their capacity, even with all their preparations. I defy any hon. member of this House to name any railway company on the continent of America which has been able to supply all the cars required of it in the past six or nine months. I have no desire to underrate in the slightest degree the importance and the necessity of attending to the requirements of Manitoba and the North-west to the greatest extent possible, but I wish to point out that while Manitoba and the North-west are a great portion of Canada and the North American continent, they are not the entire country. There are other interests which are also entitled to some consideration.

What has been the position ? Simply this, that great and small shippers have had to wait all the way from one week to months for the car supply they required. That has been the condition throughout the entire breadth, not only of this country, but of the United States. To show the great stress to which our carriers have been reduced, let me point out this one fact. Every car which has gone into the United States from Canada has been coralled there, and our Canadian railways have not been able to get them back. For weeks and weeks and months and months these cars have been kept there by the American companies. That is the position. Manitoba and the North-west having doubled their products, naturally have suffered and they have all our sympathies, but I would like to throw out a suggestion. In the short period of time between the harvesting of the crop in the North-west and the following winter, it is perfectly impossible for any railway system to move all that crop, and it will become more and more necessary, as that country develops, for a very large portion of its grain to be stored there until the following year. One of the great difficulties is that the people of Manitoba and the North-west themselves have not taken the means to take care of their own grain ; but they will have to provide against the inevitable and do this, for it is certainly perfectly impossible that any railway system or government can supply the means of taking care of the whole crop of that country in the short time demanded. It would be just as reasonable to expect them to take care of all the produce of the eastern portion of Canada and supply warehouses for it. While the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway are doing everything possible, the people of that country must do something for themselves. The farmers must provide means for holding their crops until these crops can be shipped. Besides it is an unwise policy, from a business point of view, to insist on the grain being moved into warehouses and forced out of that country so rapidly. The inevitable effect of such a policy would simply be to weaken the price. Let the farmers make some provision to take care of their grain so that they may command the best prices, and they will then be much better off than they could possibly be, even if they had all the facilities they ask to be furnished with by the railway companies and the government. I simply wish to point out the situation as I understand it, as a business man. I know what it means, for I myself have suffered severely. I venture to say that I have suffered to a far greater extent than many farmers put together, but I do not necessarily jump to the conclusion that it is the fault of the government or the railway companies. Not at all. It is in the interests of the railway companies to facilitate, in every way possible, the requirements of the shipper, and they are doing their very best to meet these requirements. They are doing that for their own profit. I know what car building has been going on. Why, in the past two years car building has gone on to an extent that it never did before, and if the business of America develops in the next two years, as it has done in the past two years, it will be perfectly impossible for the railway companies to overtake the business.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). I do not pretend to be a practical man on this question but I have listened with a great deal of interest to what has been said, and can approach this subject with an open mind. I think that our farmers, who seem disposed to lay the blame on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the government, are not as reasonable as they would expect other people to be. I do not see how they could have expected either the government or the Canadian Pacific Railway to have prepared facilities for bringing their grain to market as rapidly as they would wish. How can they expect one or two railway companies or a government to move the entire crop of the North-west and Manitoba in the short period of three months. It seems to me that in expecting this, they are very unreasonable. They must give us time to realize what a tremendous country we have in that North-west, and make adequate provisions to remove all that grain. There is a great deal in what was said by my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) that the people of Manitoba and the North-west should assist a little more than they are doing, instead of looking to the government to relieve them of the necessity of doing anything to help themselves. The farmer of Ontario has to make provision to take care of his stuff and to sell it when the market is right. But our friends in the North-west want to make no provision at all ; apparently they want everything to be provided by the government or the railway, so that they may be saved the expense of

building barns to store their own grain. I think they are a little unreasonable.

Mr. McCREARY. I submit that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) has no justification for any such impression in any speech that has been made here. The statements made were statements of fact—that such a state of affairs existed; and the government is asked to look into that state of affairs and, if possible, provide a remedy. There is not a man in the North-west but gives full credit to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the work it has done this year. I myself cited the figures showing that they had moved 35 per cent more wheat and 125 per cent more oats than up to the same time in 1899. One of the remedies the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) suggests is that the farmers should be encouraged to build granaries for the storage of their wheat. No doubt, that is one of the things that the government would consider, and possibly, recommend. The hon. gentleman should not state that we condemn the Canadian Pacific Railway or that our farmers are unreasonable in their demands, for nothing is intended to be conveyed that would justify such an impression.

Mr. HEYD. I gather from the addresses made here to-day that the Canadian Pacific Railway was condemned because they had not omniscience to foresee the tremendous development that would take place in Manitoba and the North-west and make provision in rolling stock to move the whole crop within three months. But none of these hon. gentlemen told us what the Canadian Pacific Railway would do with this tremendous equipment if, instead of the enormous crop that was gathered, there happened to be a poor crop and no need for these transportation facilities. These are things that must be reconciled. We must not expect too much of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I was out in the North-west country this year. I was in places where wheat fields had extended as far as the eye could see; and it was plain to me that one railway, or two railways, or even six railways, could not move the crop that had been gathered. Our friends must be reasonable. They are anxious that we should provide them with railway and shipping facilities so that their grain may reach distant markets, but they do not want to do what they might do. They want to impress it upon us that they are the country. But they must do a little do not want to do what they might do. They want to bring the money back to Manitoba and then go to the United States and buy their agricultural implements.

Mr. McCREARY. Then, let us ship our grain by Duluth.

Mr. HEYD. The Ontario farmer and the Quebec farmer and the agriculturist in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia do not care two pins whether you move your grain from Manitoba in 3 months or not. They are not interested in that question, for you are competitors with them in the market.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I beg the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Heyd) pardon—we are interested in the general prosperity of the country.

Mr. HEYD. I am willing to admit that we are all interested in the general prosperity of the country. But I am dealing with a phase of this question which has been presented to us by one of the hon. gentlemen who spoke. He objected, apparently, to any attempt to develop any interest in the country except that of raising grain and building up the North-west, while the interests of Ontario and the North-west are not exactly identical. We are quite willing that they should raise grain in the North-west; we are quite willing that the people of Ontario should be taxed to carry that grain to the European market. But we want the people of the North-west to buy their agricultural implements from the people of Ontario, and not go to the people of the United States to buy them. Therefore, holding the views I do, I think the people of the North-west should modify their expectations considerably. And, I would not be willing to tax the people of Ontario and Quebec to build railways and assist them in marketing their products in Europe, unless they are willing to assist us in securing the Manitoba trade.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) one question. Is it a fact that the manufacturers of Canada can sell agricultural implements at a much lower rate in foreign countries than they do in Manitoba and the North-west Territories ?

Mr. HEYD. I am not in the agricultural implement business, but I do not believe they do.

Mr. Wm. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I do not rise with the hope of adding anything to the debate, as the ground has been pretty well traversed, but to enter a protest against some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) who has just taken his seat. He says that the people of the eastern provinces are not interested in the moving of the grain from the North-west. That is a remarkable statement.

Mr. HEYD. I did not say that. I say that we are not interested in the same direction as the people of the North-west.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Not to the same extent, possibly.

Mr. HEYD. Well, to the same extent.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) speaks as he does because we are in the habit of buying a portion of

our agricultural implements from the Americans. The hon. gentleman must remember that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has given a very good reason, and that is that, to-day, the agricultural implement makers of Canada are exporting implements and selling them cheaper in the commonwealth of Australia, than they sell them in the Dominion of Canada. That is a fact that has been stated by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) is fond of calling one of his leaders. I do not desire to make any unreasonable charges against the Canadian Pacific Railway for their inability to move the crop in the short space of time between harvest and the close of navigation. We know that, with their present facilities, it would be impossible for three Canadian Pacific Railways to move the crop we have there in that length of time. But we say that they could have anticipated the great crop which was gathered as early as the month of July. Our provincial government issues a crop bulletin every month. I have here a copy of the bulletin for July, and in that bulletin it is stated that there was a prospect of fifty or sixty millions bushels of wheat alone being raised in that country. We ask why it was that the Canadian Pacific Railway did not take care, in anticipation of that crop, to prepare the facilities to move the grain and so give the farmers relief ? Now, of course, in one way that is not an unmixed evil. In fact, it is a splendid advertisement for us that we in the province of Manitoba alone have been able to raise 65,000,000 bushels of grain and have harvested far more than the railway can carry away. But, as we look to the future we see the prospect of a rapidly-increasing crop year by year. The hon. gentleman from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) stated that it was unreasonable to expect the Canadian Pacific Railway to load themselves up with rolling stock to move our extra big crop, because in other years, we might not have any grain to move. That condition, I believe, has not arisen in the past, and assuredly it will not arise in the future. Population is flowing into that country, and every year we are bound to require additional facilities, because our crop will be increased each year. To-day we find this condition of affairs—not only are the terminal elevators at the head of navigation full, but so is every elevator in Manitoba and the North-west. Every elevator and flat warehouse, every place where grain can be stored is full to overflowing. And not only that, but we find that at each little station, not only along the main line, but on the branch railways, are piles of grain in bags standing out exposed to the weather for two months past. Had the Canadian Pacific Railway taken precautions, they might have had sufficient rolling stock to relieve this congestion. One portion of our population is dependent on the other, and when the hon. member states that the farmers of the east are not particularly interested in the moving of the wheat from the west, he must remember how far this chain of interdependence runs. If a farmer of the North-west cannot sell his grain, he cannot pay his debts. Then the merchants and other trades people who are doing business with him cannot make their collections and cannot pay the wholesale men. It is largely to the wholesale men of the east that we have to look for our supplies, as the west is not a manufacturing country, and we have to import largely from the manufacturers of eastern Canada. So it is absurd to say that the people of the east are not interested in seeing that the western farmers have facilities for moving their crops, for we are all one people dependent on each other in that respect. Times are not so good in that country this winter as they should be, as they would have been had the farmers been able to dispose of their immense crop. We have found great stringency in the money market, comparatively speaking, in consequence of the farmers having had their grain tied up; indeed much of it is in their hands even at the present time. So that everything that can be done by this government to bring pressure to bear upon the transportation companies to increase their facilities, will be welcomed by the people of the west. At this time especially when the Canadian Pacific Railway is making an application to pariament for a loan, I believe, to assist them in the construction of their lines——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). To increase their stock, the government should take advantage of the opportunity to bring pressure to bear upon that line before these favours are granted, and they should insist that something more shall be done in the future than has been done in the past to assist the farmer in moving his grain from year to year. So far as the province of Manitoba is concerned, owing to the agreement that was made between the Manitoba government and the Canadian Northern Railway during the past year, we do not expect that in the future we will be tied up to the same extent as we have been during the past year. Notwithstanding the wail and the lament that was made by many who opposed that bargain last year, it has turned out to be one of the most popular measures the Manitoba government has ever undertaken. As a result of that agreement additional facilities have been afforded during the last few weeks by the Canadian Northern elevator at Fort William to an extent of 1,000,000 or 1,500,000 bushels. But the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern will have to quadruple or at any rate treble their rolling stock in order to move the succeeding crops of that country. The Winnipeg Board of Trade, I believe, have

recently waited upon the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities and asked them if they would divert some of their grain to the line of the Canadian Northern until this elevator at Fort William was filled up, but the Canadian Pacific Railway have absolutely refused to do so, they have absolutely refused to have any interchange of traffic; but they have declared, I suppose merely for the purpose of putting the people off, that it was their intention to enter into negotiations, and I think they say they have completed negotiations, by which they will divert some of their grain via the Great Northern to Duluth and other American ports. However, we are not very particular at the present time to what port the grain goes so long as we can get it to market in proper time, and the farmer gets his money for it.

I was pleased to hear from the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that it is the intention of the hon. Minister of the Interior, upon his return to the House, to introduce some amendments to the Grain Act. There is no doubt that our farmers have been compelled, because of lack of facilities during the past year, to take very much less for their grain than they would have otherwise received. It has been proved by investigations made by the local legislature of Manitoba during the past few weeks that a combine has existed in the grain trade in that country, and this Grain Act has largely assisted in rendering that combine possible, and as a result the farmers have had to take much less for their grain. I have no doubt that the Minister of the Interior, during his campaign in the constituency of Lisgar, brushed up against many farmers who pointed out to him the great opportunities afforded in the present Grain Act for fraud, and I am pleased to hear that it is his intention to bring in amendments to make this Act more perfect.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). I agree with most of the remarks made by the hon. member (Mr. Roche, Marquette) who has taken his seat, and with the larger portion of the remarks made by other hon. gentlemen this afternoon. But the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) gave some advice to the people of the North-west, based possibly upon imperfect information. My hon. friend from Russell contended that the farmers of the North-west themselves should provide sufficient warehouses to safeguard their wheat crop.

Mr. EDWARDS. No.

Mr. SCOTT. I am referring now to some advice which was given by the hon. member for Russell, if I recollect his remarks aright.

Mr. EDWARDS. Entirely wrong.

Mr. SCOTT. At all events, who ever made the remark, I think it will have to be admitted by hon. gentlemen who were in the House two or three sessions ago, that the contention the member for East Assiniboia made was that liberty should be given to the farmers of the North-west Territories to build warehouses along the line of railway where they are demanded—

Mr. EDWARDS. May I be allowed to correct the hon. gentleman? I made no suggestion at all about building warehouses. I merely suggested that in view of the short time available for moving the crop in the autumn, it was in my opinion detrimental to the farmers themselves to force their crop upon the market. I said nothing at all about building warehouses. I said I considered it advisable, in the interests of the farmers themselves, to make some provision whereby they could hold at least a portion of their crop for a time, and not force it so rapidly upon the market.

Mr. SCOTT. I may say to the House that in my district one farmer and his six sons last season raised a crop exceeding 70,000 bushels of grain, which is not an unusual thing in that country. This fact I think will be sufficient to convince the House that it is unreasonable to expect that the farmers of that country are going to build granaries and barns on their farms sufficiently extensive to house their crops. That is not done in the western states where the conditions are somewhat similar. In the western prairie states the land is somewhat similar to that in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The interest of the farmer lies in having as much grain as possible taken directly from the thresher to the elevator on the line of railway. I venture to say that if liberty is given to the farmers to build as many warehouses as they please upon the line of railway, they will take advantage of it to safeguard themselves against such a condition as exists in that country at the present time. The heat, if I may so call it, that has been shown this afternoon by some hon. gentlemen from the west, is in my opinion entirely warranted by the circumstances. The heat exhibited by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) for instance is entirely warranted by the conditions that are found in his district, and would be warranted by the conditions that exist in the district of West Assiniboia, and those conditions are my excuse for speaking on this subject to-day. In one respect, however, I think my hon. friend from Macdonald rather misdirected his remarks. I regretted that he seemed desirous of interjecting a little bit of party discussion into the subject. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that it would benefit the farmer who has five, eight, or ten thousand bushels of grain on his farm unprotected, which he is unable to get out of the country and obtain the price that it is worth—I say I do not know whether it would benefit him very much to know that the gentlemen who

were leaders of the Liberal party twenty years ago admitted, as he seems to think they should admit, that they had held mistaken opinions at that time.

Possibly some of the leaders of the Liberal party, 20 years ago, did not realize the great prospects before the North-west Territories and Manitoba, but, during the time intervening from 1878 to 1896 neither the opinions held by the leaders of the Liberal party nor the platform of the Liberal party had very much to do with the government of affairs in that country. It was the opinions of the leaders of hon. gentlemen opposite which governed during the period. I think every person who understands what took place from 1878 to 1896 and who understands thoroughly the conditions in that country, is bound to admit that such a series of blunders in government never was seen in any country under civilized government. These blunders in government and the shackles that were put upon the trade in that country, together with the iniquitous railway bargains that were made, kept progress back so that the prophecies which the leaders of the hon. gentlemen opposite made in 1880 and 1882 were impossible of fulfilment. It is only to-day, after five years of Liberal administration, when some of the shackles have been taken off, when some of the injustices have been removed, not to as large an extent as we had hoped to see, and still hope to see, but even now, when some of the shackles have been removed and some of the injustices cancelled, these prophesies are commencing to be fulfilled. It is perfectly true that the subject which the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) brought before the House this afternoon is exciting a very great deal of interest throughout the country west of Lake Superior. This is undoubtedly the most serious question that has confronted the settlers in that country for a great length of time, and I am sure the House will see the force of the statements made by the hon. member for East Assiniboia and by other hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House on the subject. My hon. friend said in his remarks that probably no country ever had a greater crop than that with which the North-west Territories was blessed last season. I think it cannot be contradicted that in no country in the world, on unfertilized land, was such a crop ever raised as was raised by the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories last season, but, it seems that there can be no ointment without the fly, and the inability of the transportation companies to carry out the crop so as to enable the farmers to reap the full benefit of their industry is the fly that is to be found in the ointment in this case. It is true that the harvest and the threshing were late. There was wet weather following the harvest which delayed threshing somewhat, but it is not my opinion that this handicapped the Canadian Pacific Railway which was practically the only company hauling our grain. It is my opinion that as soon as the company was ready to handle the crop, because as hon. gentlemen will recollect last year there was a long strike on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the trackmen's strike, the grain was ready and had harvesting and threshing gone on at the usual time, it is possible the company would not have been able to begin to handle the crop. At all events, my opinion is that the company's facilities were fully taxed just as soon as they had these facilities ready and commenced to handle the crop. It very soon became apparent that there was going to be some trouble in getting the crop to market. In my opinion we have no very great right to complain against the company on account of its lack of facilities to entirely cope with the conditions of the North-west. Referring to the remarks that fell from one hon. gentleman, I would say that I do not think any company or government or person who had studied the crop conditions realized before the month of September that there was going to be as large a crop as turned out to be the case. Some time in August, I recollect, the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' which had a commissioner around for several weeks, made the estimate that there would be about 50,000,000 bushels of wheat in the whole of the North-west. The actuality was something like 63,000,000 bushels. I recollect, also, that the premier of Manitoba, Mr. Roblin, was in Ontario at the same time as the Manitoba 'Free Press' grain estimate came out. It was his opinion that the 'Free Press' estimate was not too large and some of the Ontario papers, and some of the North-west papers as a matter of fact, drew attention to the position the Manitoba premier was taking and advised him that he should not endeavour to excite expectations that could not be realized. So, I think it may be taken as a fact that there was no person up to the month of September who realized that we were going to have such a large crop.

Mr. BOYD. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) if he is not aware, and if the country is not aware that a month before the date he mentioned, the Manitoba government had advertised for 20,000 men to take that crop out ?

Mr. SCOTT. I believe that is a fact and that of the 20,000 men, or whatever number of men came up, all were required and that more would have got work had they come. Even had everybody known that we would have had that amount of grain, I think it is quite likely that the Canadian Pacific Railway would have found it impossible to provide more facilities than they did when they came to handle the crop. But, this is the complaint we have against the Canadian Pacific Railway ; up to the close of navigation they did the best they could with their facilities. Navigation closed some time

about the end of November, or early in December, and before the first of January every terminal elevator and every elevator in the country was full to the brim of wheat and since the first of January the blockade has been complete. Practically everybody in the wheat section, boards of trade, town councils and governments, have been exercised over that question and have been passing resolutions. I have here a large number of these resolutions but I will not detain the House by reading them. In these resolutions it is urged that pressure should be brought upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to do whatever is possible to relieve the situation. One suggestion made by the Minister of Agriculture in the Territorial government was that grain might be taken over the Soo line via Minneapolis and Duluth. At Duluth they had storage capacity open for 10,000,000 bushels during January and February, but the Canadian Pacific Railway refused to take any grain over the Soo line and refused also to hand grain over to the Canada Northern Railway Company, which had space for 1,500,000 bushels at Port Arthur. It might be said that it was open for the farmers to ship over the Soo if they desired to do so, but the grain rate from Moosejaw to Fort William is twenty cents a bushel and to Duluth thirty cents, so that it would be unreasonable to expect farmers on their own account to endeavour to ship their grain over the Soo line. The fact that this suggestion was a feasible one is proved by a telegram which was published in the Toronto Globe' on Saturday last, and which is as follows :

Wheat shipments in the west are again lively. Along the C.P.R. points yesterday there were 110,000 bushels of wheat marketed and the company claim that they will ship from now on, so that wheat can be stored at country points at the rate of over 100,000 bushels a day, or 1,000,000 bushels a week. Shipments are now nearly all being made over the 'Soo' line. The freight department have discovered that it is good policy to allow shipments to go over this route to Duluth. There is an enormous amount of wheat still in western farmers' hands, which will have to be delivered at elevators at stations along the C.P.R.

Had the Canadian Pacific Railway been ready to make shipments to Duluth, during January and February, if this statement is true that from now on they can remove 1,000,000 bushels a week by that route, they might have taken 8,000,000 bushels more wheat out of the country and the congestion would have been relieved to that extent. It is not alone because of the liability of their grain to destruction that the farmers have been losing. They have not of course lost in that way yet, but there is a great likelihood that the farmers will lose very largely by the spoiling of their grain in the spring when wet weather comes, because very much of it is stored in places not weather proof. In several ways there have been serious losses. One of the most serious has been the depression of the price, about which there has been so much discussion this afternoon. There cannot be any doubt at all about this depreciation in price. The existing conditions have enabled a grain combine to be formed there. I quite agree with remarks made by the hon. gentlemen opposite to the effect, that there was this year a hard and fast grain buyers combine in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I agree in that opinion entirely. There is no question but that this is a fact. The possibilities of a grain combine have been brought about by the congestion, and that of course was because the railway company was unable to take out the grain in proper time. In my own town of Regina, at present, I believe that the conditions are depressing the price to the extent of eight or nine cents a bushel, and that means a tremendous loss indeed. The day before I left Regina, last week, a farmer who lives about four miles from the town and who is one of our largest farmers, growing a considerable amount of wheat, showed me a letter which he had received from a commission dealer in an eastern city, offering him in Regina 58 cents for No. 1 Northern, while the street price in Regina at that time was only 49 cents. There is no question at all but that the difference of nine cents a bushel was brought about directly by a combine among the dealers, and indirectly by the congestion.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the aggregate capacity of the elevators in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

Mr. SCOTT. It was stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas) that it is between 21,000,000 and 22,000,000 bushels. That is in addition to the space in the terminal elevators.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was pointing out the serious losses entailed on farmers of Manitoba and the Territories during the past season by the want of transportation facilities—the loss through the depreciation in price and through the degradation of the grade. This was alluded to by my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), who stated that the elevator men refused to buy No. 1 hard wheat. At Regina and other points with which I am familiar, I am not aware that the elevator men stated that they were not buying No. 1 hard wheat; but what did occur was this : When a farmer arrived at the elevator with a load of wheat, which would grade No. 1 hard, or possibly No. 1 northern, he was told by the elevator manager that the bin for that grade was filled, but that if he was willing to sell it as a lower grade, it could be taken. For weeks

farmers at Regina were obliged to sell No. 1 northern as No. 2 northern, at a loss of three or four cents a bushel. Then, there was serious loss occasioned to the farmers after the middle of December and during the months of January and February by their total inability to sell their grain. A farmer might have 3,000 or 4,000 bushels, and he might be obliged to purchase some articles in town. If he was unable to dispose of his grain, he had to borrow money at a high rate of interest to procure his necessary supplies, or else go into debt to the merchant, in which case he was obliged to pay interest on his debt, and the merchant in turn was obliged to pay interest to the wholesaler. In this way serious loss was occasioned to the whole country; and this condition of things made money tight and business not as good as it would otherwise be.

Whatever the farmers ought to have done, there is no question that up to the present time they have not made provision for storing grain on their farms, and it is my opinion, from what I know of the conditions in our North-west, and from what I have found the conditions to be in the western states, that this will never be feasible in the west, as it is in Ontario. Imagine such an instance as I mentioned this afternoon—that of one family that raised 70,000 bushels of grain. Imagine their making provision for the storing of the grain in the straw, or even the threshed grain, on their farm, some miles from the railway. The conditions of farming in the west are such that to carry on the business the farmers are obliged to get their grain to the nearest railway point as speedily as possible. The usual plan is to draw it from the thresher to the warehouse on the line of railway. Then, there is the liability of loss by destruction of unprotected grain by spring rains, due entirely to the inability of the railway company to carry the grain out. The loss through depreciation in price and the degradation of the grade was due to the operation of the grain-dealers' combine. Some of our hon. friends opposite declared there was a combine, and in my remarks before six o'clock I agreed with that statement. There has been a grain-dealers' combine in operation during the last season, notwithstanding the existence of the Manitoba Grain Act. That combine was made possible through the congestion of the traffic. The Manitoba Grain Act has not yet had a fair trial. In the year 1900 we had a light crop, and the Act worked very well; but in that year it had not a fair test. In 1901 conditions were at the opposite extreme; compared with other years we had two crops in the one season. I believe—and the farmers of my acquaintance with whom I have talked and who are willing to be fair about the matter, believe—that the Manitoba Grain Act in principle is a fair Act, and will under ordinary conditions remove to a large extent the grievances that existed before 1900. Last year there was an absolute congestion of traffic, and the railway company was unable to furnish cars to be loaded by the farmers at their pleasure; so that the farmers had not that freedom which the Manitoba Grain Act contemplated they should have in the disposal of their wheat. I quite agree that some changes in the Grain Act are required to make it more perfect in its operation. While I am quite willing to admit that it would have been totally impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company last season to furnish cars to every farmer who wished to load on the cars, still it is a bad commentary on this government and this parliament that they should pass an express provision declaring that the railway company should furnish cars to certain people on request, and the company should disregard that provision and state openly that they would not obey it. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company last season more than once issued instructions to their agents not to furnish cars to farmers; and these were cases in which they could have done so. For instance, a farmer would go to an agent at a station where cars were standing idle, and the agent would tell him that he had instructions not to allow farmers to load their grain on to the cars. The railway company denied that they had issued such instructions; but I have good reason for stating that at the present time there exists an order issued from the headquarters of the company at Winnipeg to their agents throughout the North-west Territories, not to give a car to a farmer to be loaded with wheat. That being the case, it behooves the government and parliament to take some notice of the matter. Is this railway company strong enough to flaunt its refusal to obey an Act of parliament in the face of the government and parliament?

Contrary to what an hon. gentleman opposite said this afternoon, I have been pleased to see the interest taken by the House in this question. While the views of some gentlemen from Ontario do not coincide with mine or with those of other gentlemen from the North-west, still we are glad to see our friends from the other provinces taking an interest in this very important matter. I was glad to notice this afternoon the interest which the members of the government were evincing in the question. I do not remember that last session on any subject more members of the government occupied their seats for a greater length of time than was the case this afternoon; and I thought it was a little unfair for the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) to choose a moment when the Prime Minister was called out of the Chamber for a few minutes, to call attention to the fact that his seat was vacant. This afternoon nearly every one of the government seats was filled during the discussion of this question. Now the points on which I wish to lay emphasis are these :

First, the grain warehouses for the accommodation of the prairie settlers must necessarily be on the line of railway. This is one respect in which I think it is possible to improve the Manitoba Grain Act. At the present time there is some restriction placed on the farmers in regard to the building of grain warehouses. To be most convenient they should be on the line of railway. My hon. friend from East Assiniboia spoke of the number of warehouses built by farmers in the attempt to relieve the congestion—in Wolseley, 64, and at Indian Head 115. I came through there a little later than my hon. friend, and I was told that at that time there were 127 erected and a number of others in course of construction. These small warehouses or granaries are all off the line of railway, not being permitted by the Grain Act to be built on the line of railway. The result is that the farmers will have to load the wheat on wagons and drive it to the railway and load it on to the cars. I think the Grain Act should be amended so as to remove that restriction, and to permit all needed warehouses to be built on the line of railway, so that farmers will be enabled to load their wheat direct from these granaries to the cars.

Some hon. members say that it is unreasonable to expect the railway companies to have facilities to move the tremendous crop in the short time at their disposal. Now no one expects them to move the entire crop. That tremendous crop will never be all offered for shipment during the season. This year, not more than one-third—certainly not more than one-half—was offered before the close of navigation, and after the close of navigation people do not expect to have their wheat carried away. They do not wish to pay the extra freight necessary to have it carried all rail. This year, however, when a great deal of their wheat is lying unprotected, ready to be spoiled by the first rain, they are willing to pay any price in order to escape from that unfortunate position. They do not expect to have all their wheat moved before the close of navigation, but they expect to have facilities provided so as to enable them to sell sufficient during the season of navigation to give them the money they require to carry on their operations during the winter. That is all they ask, and they can wait until the spring to ship the balance. In the United States the railways have facilities to accept and satisfactorily handle all the wheat offered, and no other condition will be satisfactory to our people or conduce to the progress and prosperity of the country. What is absolutely required is the necessary facilities to handle all the wheat offered and thus avoid the congestion of traffic which has existed during the past season and still exists.

I do not wish my remarks to be misunderstood. I do not wish to be understood as making a complaint—very much of a complaint at least—against the railway companies. I am not complaining of the railway companies for not having had the necessary facilities. I do not think it is reasonable to say that they should have had them. No one of us could have foreseen or did foresee the crop we have had, and even had we foreseen that crop, the conditions were such that no railway company could have procured the equipment required. The unprecedented yield made a car shortage inevitable. I may say the term 'car shortage' is a misnomer. What was lacking was not railway track or cars, but locomotives, motive power. But what I do complain of is the refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway to send out wheat by the Soo route. According to the despatch I have read, it might have taken out seven million or eight million bushels by that route during January and February.

Nor do I wish to be understood as making any serious complaint against the government. The government were powerless to order the Canadian Pacific Railway to purchase so many cars and locomotives. But when I refer to what a government can do, let me say that a poor weak government did succeed in doing something for the people by exercising what persuasive influence it had and prevailing on the Canadian Pacific Railway, as the Commissioner of Agriculture of the North-west Territories did, to send out wheat by the Soo route. Well, if the Commissioner of Agriculture of the North-west Territories could bring that amount of persuasive influence to bear on the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is just possible that had the powerful influence of this government been exercised, the decision of the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry grain by that route and thus relieve the congestion, might have been reached sooner than it was.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has referred to the condition of things which, I was going to say unhappily—but I will not say unhappily because the reverse is the case—the condition of things which happily existed in Manitoba and the North-west during the past year. It was fortunate for the people of that country that they had such a very large crop, and that the difficulties of which they complain were due to their good fortune. The crop in that country was much larger than expected, and proper provision had not been made for the handling of it as rapidly as the necessities of the country required in order to obtain the best results. There was consequently a congestion in the elevators and a shortage of cars which prevented the railway companies from handling the traffic as effectively and rapidly as the necessities of the case demanded. There was a shortage of elevators, not only in that country but outside as well—in Port Arthur and the various ports on Georgian Bay. At

present, however, a vigorous effort is being made to remedy that shortage. We see by the reports in the press, a few days ago that the Canadian Pacific Railway are beginning already to build a very much larger elevator at Port Arthur, and no doubt the various companies are now undertaking the construction of a large additional number of elevators in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, which will help to improve the situation. But the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) endeavoured, at the outset of his remarks, to fasten upon the previous government the responsibility for the unfortunate conditions that exist to-day. In my judgment, he did not succeed very well in his attempt. He said that the previous government had fastened shackles on trade. I would like to ask him what shackles on the trade of that country did the previous government fasten. What would that country be to-day, what would the condition of its farmers be, had it not been for the conduct of the previous government in building the first railway that traversed that country and really the only railway service which it has had practically up to within a few months. There may have been some conditions that prejudicially affected the situation, but the hon. gentleman forgot that his friends had pledged themselves to remove all hampering conditions as soon as they got into power. Well, they have been in power nearly six years, they have had every opportunity to bring their great ability to bear on the situation, and yet we to-day have complaints made on the unfortunate condition of the farmers in that country. Evidently the hon. gentleman's friends have not been very successful in their efforts to remove all evils and all cause of complaint. My hon. friend referred to the Grain Act that was passed a few years ago, and gave this government credit for some important provisions in that Act which have inured to the benefit of the farmers. Well, I believe there are some good provisions in that Act, but when it was under discussion the very provisions which, in the judgment of many members of Manitoba and the North-west—especially the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas)—and which that hon. gentleman endeavoured to get incorporated in to that Act to meet the requirements of the situation, were the very ones which the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and the present government fought against.

Mr. SCOTT. Was the hon. gentleman not with the Minister of the Interior then ?

Mr. SPROULE. No, I supported the contentions put forward by my hon. friend from Eastern Assiniboia, because I believed they were in the interests of the country. It is the hon. gentleman's own friends who are responsible for the present condition of affairs. It was they who pledged themselves to redress these grievances and give the people the advantage they were entitled to, and it is their failure to carry out this—as they have failed to carry out all their other pledges—to which is due the difficulties now complained of.

Now, could the present government have remedied the situation ? Well, what are the troubles complained of ? The first is that a railway company will not allow to farmers the same use of cars that they allow to the large grain buyers and elevator owners—in fact, the railway, it is said, discriminates against the small buyer, and the small shipper. The government has power to remedy that evil. The Railway Act provides that there shall be no discrimination as between shippers, and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council was especially established to enforce these rights when application was made to it. Had that body fulfilled its duty, we should not hear the complaints we do to-day. The government, then, has the power to remedy the evil and if the evil is not remedied, the government and the government alone, must be held responsible. The hon. member stated, as also did one of the previous speakers—and I believe correctly, that there was some sort of combine or understanding among the grain buyers. Are these hon. gentlemen not aware that the present government asked to be returned to power to fight these combines, and declared that if the people would give them their confidence, they would make it one of their first duties to break the combines and prevent the dangerous results of their operations ? These hon. gentlemen have been in power nearly six years. And have they broken the combines? Not at all ; we have these complaints as much now as we did five years ago. These hon. gentlemen who support this government, and who, I suppose, speak by the book, declare that these combines exist to-day, to the detriment of the farming interest in the North-west. If these grievances are not redressed, the government must be held responsible. The farmers complain that they have not the freedom to load on cars from the platform. Who could give them that right ? The government, certainly, The farmers say that they should have the right to build small elevators along the railway. Who could secure to them that right ? The Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Yet, they have never done it nor, so far as we know have they ever even made the effort to secure this right to the farmer. It is said that the people of the country require more railway facilities. We know they do. That grievance is being remedied very rapidly. Another road has reached that country, and the people of Manitoba and the North-west will soon be in the position of not being obliged to depend upon one road. I have no doubt that both the railways that are operating in that country to-day desire to extend their lines as

rapidly as possible so as to enable the people of that country to carry on their operations to advantage, and also to gain success for themselves. The hon. gentleman tells us that the farmers require the same freedom that has been secured to the farmers of the United States. There is no power in this country to secure for the people their rights except the government; and if the farmers still complain, they must hold to responsibility those who have the power to remedy grievances, but do not use it. No doubt the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) will tell us that the great remedy is to make the French river canal and allow the grain to have an outlet by water to North Bay. That would be a remedy, but it is for the minister to show us that it is wise to spend so much to accomplish so little. But that would not directly meet the wants of the farmers of the North-west. No doubt, the operations going on to-day in the ports of Georgian Bay are calculated largely to help the people of the North-west. Take the elevators that are going up at Midland, Owen Sound, Collingwood, Meaford and Kinkardine. All these improvements are designed to assist in handling the products of that country. The number of these elevators is increasing every year. Last year, just before the close of navigation a large elevator was built at Meaford, and a splendid harbour and other facilities provided, and a large amount of trade was actually handled in the short time between the completion of these works and the close of navigation. I say this to show that conditions are changing and that, in the future, large, if not ample provisions will be made to handle the trade which we may expect in a successful year to originate in the North-west. The people of that country require more railway facilities. These, I say, are being rapidly provided. They require greater elevator facilities at Port Arthur—double, or even treble what they have to-day. They require a large number of elevators throughout the country. And they require the greatest freedom to every farmer or combination of farmers to build elevataors along the track, and the right to load their cars from the platform. And, I say that the government should force the railway company to concede that right. They have the power to do it, and if it is not done, it is because the government refuses to exercise the power with which it is clothed. If the government will do their duty in these matters, they will soon relieve the glut and do away with all the trouble that exists. So far as the members from Ontario can assist in accomplishing these reforms they are anxious to do so. For we feel interested, knowing that the progress of Manitoba and the North-west is of great advantage to us. None of us are living for ourselves alone or for the locality alone in which we reside. We have an earnest desire to remove all obstacles from the prosperity of the people of the North-west, knowing that their prosperity will bring the best results for us. So far as these grievances can be remedied, the government of the day must be held responsible for them, for, by an exertion of their power, they could relieve the farmers of the grievances of which they complain.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). The question now occupying attention is one of the most important questions ever discussed in this House; for, it is not too much to say the future of the North-west is the future of the whole Dominion of Canada. The fact must not be lost sight of, Mr. Speaker, that our North-west covers more territory fit for cultivation than even the western states of the Union, and that Manitoba and the North-west will be the grainery of the world before many years are over. Instead of exporting forty or fifty millions of bushels of wheat, we shall, in a few years, export each season hundreds of millions of bushels. Therefore, while discussing this question, we must not base our calculations upon the crop that was raised last year, but must look to the future and to the rapid increase of wealth from that new country. Forty millions last year will mean, perhaps, sixty millions this year and eighty millions next year, and so on. For the acreage is increasing wonderfully every year, and the population, we hope, will increase accordingly. Judging from the accounts we hear now, a large number of people will go into that country this year. In fact, I believe that we will drain some of the western states of the Union in order to populate our vast territories in the North-west. Therefore I say that in dealing with this question we must leave out all these little political harangues that may be made from one side or other of the House; we must treat it from a broader standpoint; we must look upon it from a national standpoint. Whatever may have been the faults of this or of that party, let us forget the past and let us look to the future.

It is said that the railway companies have not been in a position to handle the crops we have had this year. That is true, Mr. Speaker, we have had a crop of 40 million bushels, and it is idle to expect that it can be removed within three or four weeks. It is impossible for any existing system of conveyance to do such a tremendous work in so short a time. Therefore, some other means will have to be found so as to distribute that work, without impeding trade, and so as to procure the largest benefit to the farming community. My hon. friend who has just spoken says we want more railroads. Well, perhaps we do. He says we want more elevators. Indeed we do, Sir, we all say that. But the question is how are we going to get these elevators. I for one would say that it is the duty of the government to step forward and provide them, and handle the

grain of the North-west. My Ontario friends will say, Have we got to pay our share of that? Yes, I say, you must pay your share of that, because the wealth of the North-west is your own wealth. If we in the west are called upon to pay bounties for your fishing industries in the east, and for your iron industries in the east, and if we are called upon to pay duty on all the implements we use on our farms in the North-west, why should we not expect you to contribute something in return, in order that we may dispose of that great wealth we are producing in the west? I say that if the industries of the east require to be protected in order to succeed, our grain producing country in the west also requires to be protected. To that end I say let the government take possession of this elevator business—not the railways. I do not go so far as my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean). But let the government take possession of the elevator system; let them establish an independent system of elevators where the farmer may go and deposit his wheat and get a warehouse receipt, and raise money on his receipt if he needs it, or ship his grain when the price is good.

My hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) said this afternoon that it was not prudent for the farmers to carry all their wheat to market at once, because it had the effect of reducing the price of grain. There is some truth in that. But if the government establishes such a system as the one I suggest, then the farmers can afford to wait for fair prices, because they will have a place in which to store it. As to the suggestion made this afternoon that the farmers of the west should do like the farmers of the east and build barns or granaries, the thing is impossible. We cannot do it in the west; it is out of the question. But some of my friends will say, Why should the government build these elevators? Why not let the farmers themselves build them? Well, we must not lose sight of the fact that our farmers in the west are beginners, they have not been settled there many years, they have not had time to become wealthy, they have no money to invest in building elevators or similar buildings. Therefore, I say it is the duty of the government to come to their relief and help them out of the position that they are in to-day. It is a national question. It is in the interest of the whole country that our western farmers should be successful, and that they should get as high a price as possible for the grain that they produce.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). The discussion in which we are now engaged should be sufficient to prove that we have a great country, that we have a magnificent future before us. We have raised this year 100 million bushels of grain in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. We have a powerful system of railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway in fact is one of the great railway systems of the world. But in spite of its vast resources that system has been unable to grapple with the situation. Before the close of navigation that railway carried to Fort William 12,000,000 bushels of wheat. I am sorry to say that out of that 12,000,000 bushels nearly 5,000,000 bushels were carried to Buffalo, in other words, we have not been able to handle more than 7,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canadian waters and through Canadian channels. Evidently there is something wrong, we are not in it. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has invited me to pay more attention to the situation in the North-west and a little less to a project which, in his estimation, would involve an expenditure of $300,000,000. Sir, where is the crazy man, where is the fool who contemplates an expenditure of $300,000,000? If there is such a man I would like to see his face, either in this parliament or out of it. True, I read in the 'Globe' a few days ago a correspondence signed by Mr. Loughrin to the effect that I contemplated spending $300,000,000. Mr. Loughrin is well known to me. He is an agent of fire extinguishers. But upon my word, I am surprised that such an important paper as the 'Globe' has given so much attention to the ideas of that gentleman. Able as he may be as an agent, I decline altogether to be responsible for the expenditure he wants me to incur on the French river. Nobody thinks of such an expenditure of money. What I said to the House on a former occasion, and what I say now is, that it is my belief that for four or five million dollars the French river could be improved and made a magnificent water way. Sir, I venture to make this prophecy, that before we are very much older that project will impose itself on the enlightened public opinion of this country.

I respect very much the views of the 'Globe'. The 'Globe' is one of the great papers in this country, but, if I may be permitted to say in all deference to my confrere of the 'Globe,' the 'Globe' has always been, to my knowledge, essentially an opposition paper. It is necessary to have opposition papers. I fully recognize the importance of opposition papers. The 'Globe' has opposed nearly every large scheme or project that has been carried out in this country. The Canadian Pacific Railway had not a stronger opponent than the 'Globe' for a time. It was very well then that such a large project should be discussed fully, and the 'Globe' did that work. It was a useful work. The 'Globe' is opposing the French river scheme. I make this prophecy that within a short time the 'Globe' as all men of good faith, will be obliged to come around and recognize that the best policy for this country is, Canada for the Canadians in every possible way and manner. Now, Sir, we have not carried

out every large project in the past, not because we have not been willing, but because it has not been possible to do everything at the same time. I have listened with very great attention to the suggestions made this afternoon. Some of our friends from the North-west have invited us to build new railways, but, before making up our minds upon such projects we must think a little. We have already two important railways in Manitoba and the North-west. The Canadian Pacific Railway has done, as must be admitted, all that was possible to expect from a large corporation this year. They have not been able to grapple with the situation in a successful manner, but it is admittedly known that they have done everything they could. They bought as many locomotives as money could buy, they bought as many cars as money could buy. Now, they must add to their elevating power and rolling stock. The government have allowed them, under certain conditions, to issue new stock for $20,000,000 to increase their power all over the country. Our friends from the North-west and Manitoba will derive very large benefit from that increase of capital. It is not a favour that we have granted them. I strongly object to the word that has been used by some hon. gentlemen. It is no favour. The Canadian Pacific Railway have simply asked permission to add to their debt, because, by adding to their debt, they are increasing their power and strength for the benefit of this Canadian nation. Now, our friends in the North-west have a population of 400,000 people in round numbers. That is about the population of Montreal. We expect a great many things from them in the future. Canada is deeply interested in the development of the North-west, but our friends from that section of the country must not forget, as they were told to-day, that they are not the whole country.

Mr. McCREARY. You did not think we were, when you only put $5,000 in your estimates for public works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My estimates have always been fair to Manitoba, the estimates of the country have always been fair to Manitoba, and if I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to other parts of the country it is only in answer to what the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) has said. He has invited us, or a good many of us, to renounce the heresy of protection altogether. Well, I have never tried to hide my views upon that point. I do not intend to do that in future—not by any means. This country is one country. If we are going to be something, if we have confidence in ourselves, and if we have the hope that we will be a nation, we must be one nation from beginning to end, from one end of the country to the other. The country is prepared, I may say, to give to the North-west Territories cheap transportation, as cheap transportation as it is possible to give to them, but, they must not ask us to destroy our cities, or to destroy our national industries to do that. We could not do that. I am sure that I am expressing the feeling, the sentiment and the opinion of the vast majority of the Canadian people in stating the view I am stating here to-night. It is impossible not to admit that cheap transportation and a tariff, in a large national sense, go together. We will carry Manitoba wheat, Manitoba oats, and Manitoba products cheaply. The railways, and the fleets that will carry Manitoba wheat freely and cheaply, will carry to the west, the products of the east. We are not going, I hope, to give up the idea of having winter ports. Portland is a nice port, New York is a fine port, Philadelphia and Boston are very nice ports, but we must have Canadian ports. We must have winter ports as we have summer ports. In other words, this country must be bound together solidly. There is no reason why the manufacturers of this country cannot supply our Manitoba and North-west friends with their products just as cheaply as the Americans will do it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why do they not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They do; I am going to take issue on that point with my hon. friend now. He, or some one else has asked the question : Why do not the Canadian manufacturers of agricultural implements sell us just as cheaply as they sell to the foreigner ? The question has been put in that way. My answer is this : The American manufacturer sells outside of his own country, on many and many an occasion, cheaper than he sells in the American market, and the Canadian manufacturer does the same thing on many an occasion. But, I am free to admit that that does not prove that the Canadian manufacturer cannot sell just as cheaply as the American manufacturer can. The Canadian manufacturer, if he wants to compete in a foreign market, must meet his American rival in the foreign market at the same price. It does not prove that if the tariff were lower we would get our goods cheaper. Very far from it. My friend should never lose sight of this fact that if we would allow our Canadian industries to be slaughtered by the Americans, the very day the Americans would be masters of this Canadian market the prices would be raised and I, for one, as long as I have a seat in this parliament, will stand by the doctrine that we must take care of our industries with the same deep attention as we must take care of our transportation. Mr. Speaker, let us be Canadians. As I said a minute ago, we have a great future. What immense possibilities have we not ? When we remember that with a population of less than 400,000 souls in the North-west Territories, we have been able to produce this

year 100,000,000 bushels of grain, I say that we have possibilities that it is difficult to foresee or understand now. We must provide for railway facilities; we must provide for elevating facilities. Our elevating power represents only 15,000,000 bushels and it is not available at all seasons of the year. At Fort William, the Canadian Pacific Railway have to-day, if I am well informed, an elevating capacity of but 5,000,000 bushels. I am glad to be able to say to-night that at this very moment the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities at Montreal are engaged in making arrangements for an addition of 4,500,000 bushels to their elevating capacity at Fort William. At this very moment while I am on my feet they are negotiating with a large firm in Buffalo for that addition to their elevating capacity. It will be so much gained. I have great hopes also that the Canadian Northern will bring relief to the situation.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the capacity of the Canadian Northern elevator at Fort William ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not quite sure that their elevator is quite completed there, but it will be in a few days. It is about 2,000,000 bushels. Now, Sir, when our Canadian grain has reached Fort William and Port Arthur, are we to allow it to be carried to American ports ? Once more I call the attention of the House and of the country to that important question. We have no Canadian bottoms to speak of. I have already said in the House, and I say it again, that the Canadian bottoms on the lakes represent only about 4 per cent of the whole tonnage available for grain. I have here the names and number of the boats and they present only 4 per cent of the lake tonnage. What are we going to do ? What is the Canadian North-west asking the country to do ? Hon. gentlemen from the west here have spoken of Duluth and they have reproached the Canadian Pacific Railway for not having sufficient facilities to bring the grain faster and faster and in larger quantities to Duluth. Duluth is not a Canadian port or a Canadian city. I fully recognize that in the present crisis our Canadian friends have to look for an outlet. They are justified in carrying their eyes to Duluth, but I say again that Duluth is not a Canadian port of a Canadian city and it is a standing reproach to all of us here that we have not sooner foreseen the great possibilities of the North-west. Why should Duluth receive 7,000,000 bushels or 8,000,000 bushels or 10,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat. There is the port of St. John in the winter; there is even Halifax although it is further away, and in the summer months we have Montreal, Three Rivers and Quebec. We have all the ports on the Georgian Bay. I have been accused by some of our friends on the other side, that while I was making a trip on the Georgian Bay I was in favour of everybody. I am for everybody on the Georgian Bay, and for the excellent reason that all the avenues of trade we have there are not too many to handle the immense quantity of traffic there is in store for us. We are only speaking to-night of Canadian grain, but we must remember that nearly all the centres of trade on the lakes—Duluth, Chicago, Milwaukee—are tributary to the St. Lawrence route. I am amazed and surprised; I am scandalized if I may use the word; when I see and when I read that there are Canadians who decline to open their eyes to the great necessity for having all our Canadian avenues of trade exploited. Why, what have we to-day ? We have only our canals. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has invited us to close our canals because he says they are no good. He tells us that we must build railways from the North-west to the sea to carry our grain and that we should have no more waterways. If my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) will pardon me, I invite him not to repeat that statement. Our waterways are essential during the time they are opened. They are not sufficient for the reason that they cannot be opened for the whole year round, but I say that our waterways are the necessary implement of our national trade. All the products of Canada cannot be carried at one and the same time to a winter port. That is out of the question, and so our grain has to be stored somewhere and the great problem is to store it just as near to the seaboard as possible. Fort William is one point and Port Arthur is another. We will have other points. Lake Nipissing will be the next point. We will avail I hope of the harbours on the Georgian Bay.

I am glad to see that the Grand Trunk Railway authorities seem to have changed their views. Hitherto it looked as if they had made up their minds to stand by Portland, first, last and all the time. I am glad to have learned during the last three or four days that the Grand Trunk Railway contemplates a change of policy. Let us welcome that. Let us welcome Mr. Hays. Mr. Reeve who was a Portland man is gone and we wish him all sorts of good things; but let us wish better for Mr. Hays, who I think we may welcome very soon as a Canadian for good. Well, Sir, if the Grand Trunk Railway Company make up their mind to stand by the St. Lawrence route, it will be a great help indeed to our national Canadian transportation. I do not think it is necessary to say much more to-night. I want to raise my voice once more in this parliament to invite our friends from the North-west not to be sectional, but to remember that we wish well by them, and that we understand the great national importance of the vast territory and the magnificent heritage we have in the North-west. But they must belong to this coun-

try. They must be Canadians in the broadest sense of the word. We must all be Canadians. Let them remember that we have different conditions existing in different parts of the country, and that we have industries that we cannot possibly sacrifice. My hon. friend from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross)—whom we are all glad to see in good health in spite of his old age—cheered the sentiment that was expressed in favour of free trade. He cheers free trade every time it is mentioned in this House. Well, we all respect him very much indeed. We would all like to be free traders. I would like to trade with the whole world. But the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross) must not forget—he does not forget, I am sure—that if his province enters to-day on the path of prosperity and development, it is because we have—I do not say that we have gone back on free trade views—it is because we have not applied these views as severely as he contemplated them in the past.

This country must not stand by any theories. We are a people of business men, let us do what ordinary business communities do. If our American neighbours wanted to trade with us, if they were willing to give us advantages, we would be very glad to try to make some arrangement with them; but they do not want to do so. They would raise their tariff to sixty or seventy per cent, and they would make a slaughter market in Canada. Well, how could we allow them to do so? I would like, I will say it again, to trade with the whole world; but you cannot do it, because the whole world does not want to trade with you. Our friends from the North-west must not forget that the large cities are greatly interested in their future development, and we will stand by them every time. They must stand by us every time also. We will give them cheap transportation both by our summer and our winter ports. We are doing it now. I was very sorry to hear some friends on the other side of the House, especially the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), telling us that this government had not done anything. I do not think it is a boast in my mouth to say that the present government has given more attention to the transportation question that any other government has done in the past; and we have accomplished and are accomplishing more than any other government has done. I admit that the Conservative government built the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it was a great feat. Who denies it? Nobody does. Now this government is engaged in the solution of the transportation problem. We are solving that problem now. The St. Lawrence is deepened and widened; all the harbours on the lakes are being equipped; the port of Montreal and the port of St. John are being equipped.

Mr. BOYD. No wheat is going that way.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Wheat may go there some day. The Canadian Pacific Railway to-day is taking wheat to the port of St. John direct from the west.

Mr. BOYD. Not very much.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, a good deal of it. But why does the Canadian Pacific railway not take more grain there? Because we have not enough elevator accommodation. When the season closed this year there was not one single bushel of wheat in the elevators at Fort William; they were all cleaned out. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway is taking millions of bushels of grain to our winter port; and when the line is improved, as it will be with the additional stock to be issued, it will take more traffic.

Mr. BOYD. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that they are taking millions of bushels this winter to St. John?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and more than that, they are taking every week over twenty-five cars of American meats, canned goods, and so on. The trade at St. John to-day is larger than it has ever been before, and when the Canadian Pacific Railway is improved, I have no doubt that the port of St. John wil receive an immense amount of trade. Our hon. friends from the North-west should not disparage Canadian ideas. I do not see any reason why the Canadian Pacific Railway should not take to the port of St. John, and even to the port of Halifax, a very large quantity of trade. I say even to Halifax, because my hon. friend the leader of the opposition will admit that the same quantity of trade cannot go to a remote port as to a near port. When the fast line shall be established—and it will be established, it is only a question of time—the port of Halifax will necessarily receive a large amount of perishable traffic, which will be a paying traffic. I wanted to say only a few words. The House indeed owes a good deal to my hon. friend from Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) who has brought to our attention that essentially national problem of transportation. So far as I am concerned, I believe in Canada from that standpoint as from all others. We only need to have enough confidence in ourselves to see the transportation of our products through Canadian channels in both summer and winter. We have only to stand by ourselves also to see our industries develop, so as to be as independent as a nation can be of any foreign nation.

Mr. CLARKE. Before the hon. minister takes his seat, during the course of his speech he referred with satisfaction to a contemplated policy under the new management of the Grand Trunk Railway. May I ask him what winter port the Grand Trunk Railway will use?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know as to the winter port. I was speaking especially as to the summer port. For instance, Midland is one of the ports which I think they intend to develop ; and instead of sending their trade during the summer months to an American port, as they have been doing during the last two years, they will send it through a Canadian port.

Hon. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) The hon. Minister of Public Works paid a high compliment to me, and expressed pleasure that I was healthy. Well, I am glad to say that I am ; but I want to define my own position on this question. I happened to be in this House when the purchase of the great North-west Territories was under consideration, and I may say frankly that I do not believe that any of those who were in the House at that time could foresee the greatness of the inheritance which we were acquiring. We from the east have as much interest and rejoice as much in the prosperity of the North-west as the people who reside in that great country, and we do not wish it to be said that we have any sectional views on the subject. I am one of those who were present when a platform was laid down by the Liberal convention held in this city, and I have never forgotten the principles of that platform to this day. A strict adherence to those principles, as far as possible, was the means of bringing the present government into power ; and the moment we recede from that platform, we forget what is due to ourselves, and what is due to our constituents. I do not at all despise or undervalue Canadian industries or manufacturers. I am pleased to see them occupying the position of prosperity that they do now, but the moment the present government begins to inflict higher burdens on the people they will do something that will lower them in the estimation and confidence of their friends. I am quite satisfied with the present tariff, because I do not think any one would be sufficiently insane to believe that this country is prepared for free trade pure and simple. A revenue tariff is necessary for the prosperity of this country. I am glad to find that the question of transportation is engaging the attention of the government. If our manufacturers are to increase their output, they must seek foreign markets as well as cater for their own. They must send their goods to South Africa and Australia, they must find out what are suitable for those countries, and be furnished facilities to carry our own products to other markets by means of steamers subsidized by our own government. I have a letter from Sydney, N.S.W., in which my correspondent states that that colony—not the commonwealth but New South Wales itself—is sending out five travellers—one to India, one to China, one to Japan, and to different other places in order to seek new avenues for its surplus products, and that is what our Canadian people and manufacturers should do. They should show more enterprise, and find out what markets can be had for the goods they can supply. I did not intend to speak on this subject at all, because the question will come up in a different way and in more ways than one before the session is over, but I was called to my feet by the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Public Works when I cheered the idea of free trade. Why should the farmers of the North-west be compelled to buy Canadian agricultural implements, if it is in their interest to buy their agricultural implements from the Americans. If they buy from the Americans, it is because they find it more advantageous to do so. It is no doubt because the American manufacturers begin to understand what our people require and give them better terms, because they give them more time to pay and are perhaps not so sharp in their dealings with them as are our Canadian manufacturers. I understand that some Canadian manufacturers have treated some of the earlier settlers in our North-west perhaps not as considerately as they should have done. I am not in the slightest degree alarmed at the amount of American manufactures which come into this Dominion. Our people are simply buying where they can get the goods on the best terms, and will buy from the Canadian manufacturers when they can sell them what they require as cheaply and on as good terms as do the Americans. I am not going to deny my free trade principles, as far as they can be carried out, with due consideration for the revenue we require, and the moment the present government begins to increase the tariff, let me say that it will then be taking a step in the wrong direction.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Centre Toronto). It is not often that I am able to agree with a member of the present reform government and on this occasion I rise to do so with a great deal of pleasure, for it is really a pleasure to find that common sense will sometimes prevail even in the present Cabinet. I endorse, to a considerable extent, the remarks made by the Minister of Public Works this evening. I endorse those remarks which were distinguished for their common sense. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Hon. Mr. Ross), with the distant voice of the past, remembering old things, forgetting that this country is moving, cannot possibly have listened to the voice we heard this evening from our great North-west. No government can disregard that voice and continue in office. We have heard from the farmers of the North-west. They are making great demands on this country, which we are all very much inclined to meet as far as possible. All we ask of them is, as the hon. Minister of Public Works has done, to be reasonable. We ask of them to remember the other provinces. We ask them to re-

member the province of Ontario from which many of them have come. We know what were the struggles of the farmers of Ontario for many long years. No government chopped down the trees and cleared the land for them. But the farmers of the North-west have been placed in possession of a country, when a man can plough the ground at once and raise a crop the very next year. Should they forget their predecessors of Ontario, who spent ten, twenty, thirty years of their lives in clearing their land, and who, when their lands were cleared, were, many of them, old rheumatic men. These are the men for whom I have very great respect, and I would ask the North-west to be reasonable in their demands. The farmers of the North-west demand that the duty be taken off farming implements. They are making great demands upon the government, to which the government never can acccede. Let them be reasonable. The North-west is not a poor country. It does not desire to come here as a beggar, and I would ask the people of the North-west to remember that the bankers in the older provinces have done a good deal to assist them in moving their grain. The merchants in Montreal, Toronto and elsewhere are carrying very heavy loads very often for these farmers of the North-west. Do they not receive every day letters of apology from their western customers instead of remittances in cash. Therefore I would ask our farmers in the North-west to be a little reasonable and to remember the very wise words that have fallen from the Minister of Public Works. If you would ruin the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec, do you suppose then that the Americans would sell their goods cheap ? My hon. friend from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) looks upon the Americans as great friends because they sell cheap. But how long would they sell goods cheap if they did not meet competition on this side. How long will they sell goods cheap here if they are not meeting competition on this side ? I can assure you that at the present time, as a merchant, I can go into the United States and buy goods cheaper there to be delivered in Canada than the American merchant can buy them for consumption in the United States. That is constantly done. Their overplus is thrust on this country continually. And I only regret that the leader of the government, whom we respect so much has not had more commercial training and knowledge that he might be able to see through these matters. We are not endeavouring to impose on the merchants and farmers of the North-west: we know that competition in our own country will, at all events, keep prices not only of farm implements but of everything else at low figures. We have never had, in the history of Canada, such cheap goods as we have to-day. This is due to competition, and that competition comes from our own people. Therefore, the farmers of the North-west have no just cause of complaint, except in so far as the present government have been dilatory in pressing a policy which they have adopted, but which they opposed to the teeth while they were in opposition. If there is one thing that is really disgusting in politics, it is the contemptible position in which politicians will sometimes place themselves. I can understand a man standing up and saying : I have made a mistake; I was wrong. But to quietly put on the clothes of his opponent—well, even that I do not mind so much. But to try to make the public believe—you cannot do it however you may try—that they were your own clothes, that is one of the disgusting things of politics. I did not exactly agree with the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) in his allusion to that friend of the present government, the 'Globe' newspaper. The 'Globe' is a great newspaper. The management of the 'Globe' feels bound to publish in its columns letters that come from any part of the country. A letter appeared in that newspaper not very long ago dealing with the project that the Minister of Public Works seems to have set his heart upon—the French river canal. But that work is only a beginning. If it is to be of any benefit to the farmers of the North-west, that canal must be built through to the city of Montreal. This writer—and he speaks with some authority—calculates that the total cost of that work will be somewhere in the neighbourhood of $300,000,000. The Minister of Public Works calls for the fool who is going to put his money into it. I do not believe he will find him. But you have to find a person who is not very wise to find one who will spend $5,000,000 on a little patch of canal that will begin nowhere and leads to nowhere. It would be better for the country if the government could see its way to securing an increase in the number of tracks in our railway system. This is an all-the-year-round country. We cannot bring our grain that is grown in the North-west, if we work only in the summer time. We must hold out inducements to the railway companies and great transportation companies to move the grain all the year round—and it will take the whole year to move it. In the interest not only of the farmers of the North-west, but of the great financial institutions that are putting their money into moving the grain crop, it must be kept moving continually, and not only for the few months of canal navigation. I would therefore ask the government, before they commit themselves to this expenditure of $5,000,000—which may be regarded as a small thing but, like other small expenditures may be the entering wedge to another of the unfortunate investments which this country has already made in the shape of canals—to consider this whole question very carefully. Hon. members from the North-

west seem to wish to gather in a great deal of prosperity at once. They want to make the North-west an enormously wealthy country in a few years. But the only solid prosperity that has ever been known in commerce is that kind that is slowly and steadily built up. Let us not be in too great a hurry. Let us take time and consider what the results of our present investments are going to be. During last session, I urged very strongly that the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Public Works should come down to this House with some comprehensive scheme of transportation. I did not ask the Minister of Public Works to devise a canal costing $5,000,000 to be built at public expense, and to be used, probably, by a private corporation, but a general, comprehensive scheme, which would take in the whole North-west, and I hoped, carry the grain through by our great waterway, the St. Lawrence. But, so far, we have had only shreds and patches, not a comprehensive scheme. I would strongly urge the government and the country not to spend $5,000,000, unless the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways and Canals, in fact, the whole government, come to us with a comprehensive and reasonable scheme. The Minister of Public Works has made us one of his usual magnificent protection speeches. Here is one of the things we have seen too often in this House and this country, and which, I say, are the disgusting things in politics. I do not doubt that the hon. gentleman is thoroughly and sincerely honest in his expression—I do not say that he says one thing and means another. But he is a member of a government many of whose members are absolutely opposed to his idea. The hon. gentleman himself has stated to what extent they differ. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I might say a word to the hon. members from the North-west who have so ably put their cases to this House I would ask them to apply their great business ability and their capacity for handling important questions, to do what the Minister of Public Works urged upon them—take a broad view of this question, try to take in all Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Let us not regard this question only from the point of view of the wheat grown in the North-west, important as that is, but let us remember that we are endeavouring to make a nation on this northern half of the continent. Let us not accept unquestioningly the views of respectable old gentlemen who have inherited their views from their free trade forefathers. We cannot make a great country in that way. These gentlemen and their ideas pass away, but the North-west remains. If we are to develop that country and make it a means of bringing greatness to Canada, we must take a broader view of these questions, it appears to me, than that which was indicated by the expression we have heard from these hon. gentlemen this evening. Let us not consider only the gentlemen from down by the Atlantic Ocean, and their threats against the present government that in the event of their not accepting the idea of these gentlemen they will withdraw their support. There are greater things in this country than governments. If this country is ever going to be great it must be because you gentlemen from the North-west, representing a great country, which is increasing enormously in population and in wealth, take broad and patriotic views of the questions that come before you. We have discussions in this House brought up by individual members who, though living in this country, and under its protection, we know are not patriotic, and who desire that the great British Empire should be disrupted. But remembering that their influence is infinitesimal, that they are few in numbers, that they are contemptible, I would ask the members of the North-west that they would join the representatives of Ontario and Quebec and the maritime provinces and try to make this country by being united and by thinking of the welfare of all and not by being small and selfish. If the bulk of the manufacturing happens to be done in Ontario at the present time, let these hon. gentlemen look forward to the time when it will be done in the North-west and British Columbia. Join with us, and you will find that from this side of the House we will loyally and patriotically assist you in any policy that is in the best interest of Canada, rather than of any particular section of it.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). It would be uncourteous on the part of the members from the North-west, opportunity being given them, if they did not respond and acknowledge the very kind advice that has been tendered to them as to the attitude they should assume on public questions. I am glad to hear the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Brock) and so many other hon. members, lecture those of us who come from the North-west on the principles of patriotism. Since when did we of the North-west require to be lectured on the principles of patriotism, of Canadian nationalism ? Our presence in the North-west is evidence of our nationalism ? Otherwise we would be along with the million and more of our countrymen who are residents in the United States to-day. Those of us who are in the North-west are there because we are patriotic Canadians, because we are nationalists in the large and complete sense of the term, rather than for any other reason. We do not have to be taught nationalism at the hands of anyone, no matter how highly respected he may be in this House or elsewhere. Particularly let me say that we do not require to be lectured on the duty of holding a broad national

view of national questions, when we are dealing with a subject that involves a matter of between $25,000,000 and $50,000,000 of the wealth of this country, produced in one year, we do not need to be lectured by men who to-day are badgering the government for an increase in the duties on woollen goods, a matter that interests a section of the people, a section of the country, something that requires attention possibly, but I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does it bear any proportion, any comparison, to the interest involved in the matter that has been engaging the attention of the House to-night?

We have been discussing a question involving the prosperity, the growth, the welfare of the North-west, and thereby involving the growth, the prosperity and the welfare of the Dominion of Canada. For, I ask you, where else have you an increase of wealth? Where else have you an increase of prosperity, as shown by the census returns, but in that great west? Would not Canada be retrograding in population but for the great North-west? Where does that increase come from of which Canada boasts within the last few years, except from the country west of Lake Superior? I take the liberty of saying that this Canada of ours would be but a poor Canada, would offer but a poor inducement for a man to proclaim himself a Canadian, were it not for the country west of Lake Superior.

Mr. BROCK. That is hard on your political friends who refused to build the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. OLIVER. That is all right. There are to-day over a million people of Canadian birth in the United States, enough to have populated that North-west with loyal Canadians, enough to have furnished a market for your woollen manufacturers and your implement manufactures, and every other manufacture that you have in this country, to have helped pay your taxes, to have helped build up this country, as we hope yet to see it built up. But they are in the States because they did not have faith in this country, because you had not faith in that North-west country. And the proof that you had not faith is the fact that to-night you stand up here in the House; one after another, and express surprise, you are astonished, you marvel at the progress that has taken place, progress that, had this country been true to itself, had the leaders of public thought in Canada been true to Canada, would have occurred fifteen or twenty years ago instead of occurring only now. You are surprised. That is proof that you did not know what was coming, that you did not believe in the future of that country. You put that forward as an apology for a condition of affairs that exists to-day. You say that no one could tell. Well, if no one could tell, everybody should have been able to tell that, with such opportunities and with an energetic people, such a result must come.

I was astonished to hear the hon. member compare the conditions of pioneer life in this country with the conditions in the North-west. The conditions in this country were those of hardship, they were conditions of struggle, but of triumphant struggle, and the result has been creditable to those who took part in that struggle, and will redound to the credit of their children and their children's children for untold generations. But if any man thinks that settlement in the North-west has not been a tragedy, a tragedy repeated year after year, in settlement after settlement, then I say he is badly mistaken. The people who went to the North-west went there with higher hopes, with greater expectations, than the people who settled in this country, and they suffered in many cases greater disappointments. Do not think, because to-day we can boast of a yield of 100,000,000 bushels of grain in the North-west, of having contributed to the wealth of this country between $25,000,000 and $50,000,000, that it has all come about by chance, that it is an accident. Sir, it has come about by hard struggle, by privation, by energetic exertion, by the exhibition of all those qualities that make men strong and a country great.

But I did not get up on this occasion to talk generalities. I did not get up to talk tariff, transportation, or nationalism, or the advancement of special interests. I got up to talk on this fact, that to-day a large part of the products of the North-west, of the wealth of the North-west of last year's production, is lying useless, is to-day lying unused; and if to-day my hon. friend is receiving apologies from the North-west instead of remittances, it is largely because of the condition of affairs that we are complaining of. That condition we seek to have remedied to-day—not to-morrow or next day, or next year, or year after next, but to-day, in this House, and now. That is what is wanted. Certain facts have been brought out in this discussion. One is that there is a wheat blockade, another, that there is a grain combine, another that the people of the North-west have suffered certain serious financial loss already because of that blockade, and because of that combine, and that the loss is not yet ended, that in fact is only begun. What is the loss? It has been said here to-day that wheat is being sold throughout the North-west at about 10 cents a bushel under its value. Now, if that statement is correct, and those who make it speak with authority, on a saleable product of 50,000,000 bushels of wheat, at an average price of 50 cents a bushel, a 20 per cent loss would mean $5,000,000. That means $5,000,000 of a loss on one season's operations of 400,000 people as a result of existing conditions; and that is not by any means the total loss. There

is also the loss caused by the fact that about one-half, or one-quarter of the grain is still in the farmers' hands, is still where it cannot be turned over to pay those bills that my hon. friend speaks about, to go into the general circulation of trade in the country. The people of the west are losing it, and the people of the east are losing it, as well. There is still a further loss, the loss of a large part of the grain by actual damage from weather, as it cannot be got forward for shelter and transport. There is still another loss in consequence of the fact that people will have to be hauling grain in the spring when they should be putting in next season's crop.

This, I submit, is a serious condition of affairs. It is a serious condition for you of the east as well as for us of the west, because, if the money does not come from that crop you cannot handle the money; and let me tell you that every dollar that comes from that crop you do handle in one shape or another. That is the difference between the meaning to this eastern country of the crop of the North-west and the yield of gold from the Yukon. Suppose the yield is equal in both cases, $25,000,000 worth of crop in the west and $25,000,000 worth of gold yielded by the Yukon; of the gold from the Yukon possibly not one-quarter of it enters the ordinary trade channels of this country, while, of the $25,000,000 worth of the produce from year to year of the crop of the North-west, every dollar enters the trade of this country and is turned over and over and over again. So that, when it has been pointed out in this House, as it has been, that this loss is occurring this year on the crop to the people of the North-west Territories we point out to you that the loss is occurring to the trade of this eastern country as well as to the western country, and it is not in any spirit of sectionalism but in a spirit of the broadest nationalism that we call upon the House and the government for assistance in this matter.

In regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the wheat blockade; I am prepared to admit, as I think we are all prepared to admit, that as soon as the threshing began so soon the Canadian Pacific Railway put forward every effort to send the wheat to market, and that state of affairs continued until some little time after the close of navigation. We have no complaint at all up to that time beyond a complaint that possibly a little more foresight might have been shown by the company. There was no lack of effort on their part, but we do complain that as soon as the lake elevators were full there began an absolute deadlock; and that since that time they have practically not rolled a wheel to carry grain to market. For over two months the grain blockade has existed and there has been no effort to break it on the part of the railway company. While that condition of affairs has existed, and which is the cause of all this loss that is occurring, the company has come to the government and secured authorization for the issue of $20,000,000 more stock. They have raised the price of their land in the North-west Territories by a dollar an acre; by one sweep of the pen they have added $10,000,000 to their capital and added $20,000,000 to their stock. I take the liberty of saying that when they did one or the other of these things—they were allowed to do one, the other they could not be prevented from doing—was the time that means should have been taken to compel them to roll their wheels and break the blockade. It may be said that it was impossible for them to do so. We have information here to-day, that to-day they are doing so. They are doing to-day what they should have done two months ago. We do not know to what extent they are doing it; perhaps it is only in a half-hearted way, but the fact that they are doing it to-day is proof that they could have done it and should have done it two months ago. The fact is this; they said: 'Our elevators are full, the grain is there, it is our meat any way, we will haul it when we get ready and the country can take care of itself.' That is the position, and you say: Why not? The company is an independent corporation and it is not under government control. But a railway company, from the nature of things, is necessarily a monopoly, and being a monopoly, is necessarily brought under government control; and there are, and there must be means taken, to provide that it shall not be in the power of any railway company or any corporation whatever its name may be, to simply sit back and say: 'There is a blockade in trade, in grain, in everything and it can just stay until we get good and ready to lift it.' That is the condition that the North-west Territories have been in for the past two months. It is an intolerable condition, it is a condition that if there is nothing on the statute-books, if there is no precedent for administrative action in regard to it, then, a condition has arisen that requires a precedent to be created, or requires a statute to be put on the books, that will meet that strange condition, that condition which requires something to be done, so that the people of the country shall not simply be thrown backwards for such a large proportion of their earnings during the past year.

It was said by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that the means of breaking the blockade is by sending the grain by Duluth, but Duluth is not a Canadian city and therefore it is not desirable to break the blockade in that way. I quite agree that it is not desirable to break it in that way if anything better can be done. We would all wish it to be done, in another way, but if nothing better can be done, then we want the blockade broken

any way. But, let me say that if it is a business proposition for the farmers of Indian Head, Wolseley and the farmers all over Manitoba and the North-west Territories to build small warehouses to store their own grain in, to hold that grain until spring, it is just as good for the Canadian Pacific Railway to build flat warehouses at Fort William of a sufficient capacity to contain the grain and keep their wheels rolling during January and February filling these warehouses so that the grain shall be shipped through a Canadian port.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) allow me to ask him if the Canadian Pacific Railway has any elevators at Duluth ? Is my friend aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway was in a position to make arrangements at Duluth ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the point.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say whether the Canadian Pacific Railway was in a position to make arrangements to get elevator capacity at Duluth on the 1st of January, but it has been given here on authority that the Canadian Pacific Railway is in a position now to make arrangements for elevator capacity at Duluth and it is making arrangements.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very well, that is the point.

Mr. OLIVER. They have made the arrangement quite recently. Now, navigation was closed in Duluth on the 1st of January, just as it was closed at Fort William on the 1st of January. Therefore, it is not reasonable to suppose that they were less able to make arrangements for that elevator capacity on the 1st of January than on the 1st of March. There was no means of relieving any elevating storage there might be in Duluth in the meantime. If the capacity was there on the 1st of March it was there on the 1st of January, and the arrangement was not made simply because it was not wanted to be made. It was quite practicable for the company to have put up flat warehouses at Fort William of sufficient capacity to hold all the grain there is in the North-west, if they had seen fit to do so. It may be said, that would not be a good business proposition, but in passing through Winnipeg I saw that the Northern Elevator Company had a large flat warehouse alongside of their elevator at the station to hold one-quarter of a million bushels. If it paid the Northern Elevator Company to do that at Winnipeg which is not a terminal point, why would it not pay the Canadian Pacific Railway to do it just as well at Fort William, which is a terminal point ? I say that to my mind it is simply a case of dog in the manger. They did not have to and therefore they did not; and they were so shortsighted that they did not see that the country at large and themselves, as well as the North-west farmers would suffer. As long as it was only the farmer who was going to lose—why he could lose. But when it came to their attention that a good many other people were going to lose as well, then the situation was changed and the outlet was secured by way of Duluth.

In regard to the combine and the Grain Bill, let me say this: It has already been said, and I back up what was said, that in order to break the combine it is absolutely necessary to have absolute freedom in the delivery of grain, either to flat warehouses or directly to the railway cars.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no other way whereby the combine can be broken. A combine exists. That combine is skinning the farmers of the North-west to-day to the extent of from three cents to ten cents a bushel on their wheat. I ask you, is that a condition to be submitted to by this parliament and by this country ? Is it a sectional matter ? Is it something that we beg for from this House and from this country ? Is it a thing that is costing somebody else something ? We are only asking for bare justice and that we be not robbed in our own houses. We are asking for nothing but the most ordinary protection to our ordinary rights. The fact that so many small warehouses have been built in the different towns along the line for the temporary holding of the farmers' grain, is all the evidence that is necessary of the propriety of permitting the erecting of such warehouses at switches on the railway right of way, for the prompt loading of the farmers' grain or any other man's grain who desires to load it there. The question at issue in the Grain Bill when it was up, was whether the companys right of way should be taken from them so to speak, for the purposes of allowing these flat warehouses to be built. I say that the company's right of way was given to them for the purpose of carrying on their business as common carriers, and that when and whenever it is necessary that right of way should be used for the purpose of facilitating the business they are engaged in; for the purpose of enabling the better shipment of products on the railroad; then and then always the right of way is entitled to be used for that purpose. There is no confiscation; there is no trespass in the matter.

We ask then that this government shall take such measures as may be necessary, at the present time, and without delay to secure the breaking of the blockade in the grain business of the North-west. We then ask that the grain combine be broken by insisting on the spirit as well as on the letter of the Grain Act, and in compelling the railroad company to permit the erection of flat warehouses on their right of way for direct shipment to the cars, and compelling

them to accept grain from anybody who offers it by any means he may choose to offer it. That is the inherent right of the citizen, that is all we ask. As was said by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) matters have got into a very serious state when it is possible for a railroad company, specifically to set aside an Act of parliament as they have done once and again this winter, by issuing orders to their employees to refuse cars to anybody but elevator men in certain cases.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to emphasize the point; that in bringing this matter to the attention of the House, we are doing it not as sectionalists, but as nationalists. We are asking neither money nor favour from anybody. We demand our elementary rights as citizens of this country, and as producers to get the best returns the markets allow from the result of our year's labour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not the local knowledge in regard to these matters in the North-west which is possessed by a great many of the gentlemen who have addressed the House to-day on this subject, and for that reason I do not profess to speak with any authority on the question. I would like to say, further, that while gentlemen on both sides of the House from the North-west very often put their demands emphatically, I do not think that we should necessarily conclude from that, that there are not legitimate grievances in the North-west which should be redressed. In listening to this discussion, I have been impressed by the necessity that some action should be taken by the government of this country with regard to the combine which is said to exist among the men who are engaged in the business of warehousing in the North-west. If the facts are as stated by hon. gentlemen on both sides, I do not think there can be a doubt that it is a situation that urgently demands the action of the government. The sooner we have that action the better. For my part, I hope that action will be taken far more promptly than has been the case in regard to similar matters in the North-west, the delay in reference to which it seems to me has raised a legitimate case for complaint against the government. I might mention by way of illustration, that we have not heard a single word during this session with regard to the question of the taxation of the lands owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-west. A year ago we were told that that matter would be referred to the courts promptly and would be dealt with. I made a suggestion to the government at that time which seemed to me reasonable, and which I had hoped the government might have seen its way to act upon, namely, that the government should inquire promptly and at once as to what the cost would be to this country of removing these lands from the exemption from taxation to which they are said to be subject. I suggested that the government should investigate the question of what it would cost this country if parliament should at once promptly declare that these lands are not exempt from taxation, in case it should afterwards turn out that under the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway they are not subject to taxation.

I ventured to suggest to the House last session that I thought it would be a statesmanlike proceeding on the part of this government, in view of the great interest which the whole of the country has in the North-west, to remove that exemption from taxation, to let the whole country bear the cost, and to indemnify the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for any interference with their vested rights which would be occasioned by taking that proceeding. Although I made that suggestion to the government last year, and promised to give any measure in that direction which they might bring down my most favourable consideration, we have not heard this session that any progress whatever has been made towards having that vexed question settled by the courts, or that any action has been taken on the line of the suggestion I made a year ago.

Coming back to the immediate question before the House, I venture to think, as I have said before, that the existence of this alleged combine is a matter which should at once, during the present session, engage the attention of the government. It should not be left, as the matter of taxation has been left, from year to year, to be brought up by members from the North-west each session, and to have these gentlemen answered with some vague promise by the government that the matter would engage their consideration during the recess. If the state of affairs is as these gentlemen allege, it is one that should be dealt with during the present session, and not left over to the recess or to next session.

There is another question which I think might legitimately engage the attention of the government, that is, whether or not, having regard to what these gentlemen state, it would not be advisable for the government to take under their control the system of warehouses in the North-west, deal with them as government warehouses, and put an end to the condition of affairs which, if it be as these gentlemen state, is a disgrace to this country and a great detriment to the development of the North-west.

My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, in the remarks he made to the House to-night, went very far afield. He succeeded, for example, in calling up my hon. friend from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross), on the question of protection; and I presume that if the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) had been in his seat to-night, that hon. gentleman would also have been found

protesting against the pronounced protectionist principles enunciated by the hon. Minister of Public Works. We know that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has only recently announced that he is for a revenue tariff only, first, last and all the time; and he could not have retained his seat in the House--possibly he would not have retained his seat in the cabinet—if he had heard the hon. Minister of Public Works announcing on behalf of the government the policy he did to-night.

There is just this to be said about the views which my hon. friend enunciated, that when he talks about a national transportation system for Canada, he announces in a general way a policy which no gentleman in this House would for a moment disagree with. But the difficulty with the propositions of the hon. Minister of Public Works is that they were not definite enough to enable us to judge whether they should receive the support of every man in this House or not. The action of this government in the past has not been such as the hon. gentleman lays down for our guidance to-night. Their action a few years ago with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway did not look in the direction of a Canadian port.

The hon. gentleman speaks highly of the port of St. John, and I for one rejoice that the port of St. John has succeeded to a considerable extent in becoming a winter port of Canada. I was glad to see, in passing through that city in the month of November last, that it was doing a splendid business in the freight coming over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I hope that business will increase from year to year; but I do not know of any action of this government which has contributed to any great extent to that success. I think it is rather due, in the first place, to the enterprise of the people of St. John themselves in putting their own money into their terminal facilities and thus inducing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to engage in that business; and, in the second place, to the enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway in building elevators there and in making an attempt to establish an export trade from Canada through that port. Instead of the railway policy of this government contributing to that result, it has been the very reverse; and when the Minister of Public Works speaks of 'even Halifax' in this connection, I venture to think that that port has some expectations with regard to the export trade which need not be thus qualified. It is true, that port was put aside by the Minister of Railway and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) in dealing with the export trade. It is true, he did not pay much attention to the arguments we presented and the showing we made that by carrying the freight ninety miles further from Moncton to the port of Halifax, it would have the advantage of a splendid harbour and 250 miles of ocean carriage over the port of St. John. It was therefore pointed out that Halifax stood at least on equal terms with St. John in seeking that export trade. But as far as those two cities are concerned, there is not, nor will there ever be in the future, the slightest jealousy. I can say as a Halifax man that we rejoice that St. John is meeting with such splendid success in its enterprise, in establishing itself, to some extent at least, as a winter port for Canada.

It did not seem to me that the hon. Minister of Public Works dealt with the main difficulty in this case when he addressed the House to-night. The difficulty is not so much in regard to the freights over Lake Superior as in moving the grain in the short season of transportation from the harvest fields to the lake ports. There is no use of providing means of transport, on the lakes, unless you provide proper means of transport from the west to Fort William and sufficient elevator accommodation there. When the minister has once accomplished that, and met the difficulties pointed out to-night by the gentlemen from the North-west, it will follow as a corollary that we should provide a means of transport on the lakes, in order that we should retain the transportation over Canadian lines to Canadian ocean ports; and when the hon. gentleman brings down any reasonable scheme for increasing the means of Canadian transportation—any scheme by means of which the grain grown in the Canadian North-west shall be assuredly carried over Canadian lines to Canadian ports and shipped thence to Europe—he will have my support and I believe the support of every other man on this side of the House. But we want something definite; and we want some remedy for the immediate grievance so well placed before this House to-night by the members from the North-west who have spoken. I do not mean by that, that I agree with every idea or suggestion which every one of these gentlemen has put forward; but I do realize most clearly that a great grievance exists there, and I feel as fully, I trust, as any of them does, how great an inheritance Canada has in the North-west, and how absolutely important it is to us all that every grievance of this kind which may put back the settlement and the development of that country should be dealt with, not from any party standpoint, but in a broad national spirit, and dealt with promptly, by the government to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no objection whatever to bringing down the papers called for. The discussion we have just had on what is certainly one of the most important questions that can engage our attention, has revealed a condition of things between Lake Superior and the Rocky Mountains which

is not at all satisfactory. It has, however, this redeeming feature, that it is due to an excess of prosperity. It is because we have had in the past year in the North-west Territories a two years crop in one, that our transportation facilities have been found inadequate to move that crop to the markets of the world. This is perhaps not at all to be wondered at. We are glad to believe that of recent years the prosperity of the North-west has exceeded all our expectations. Up to last fall there was only one single track from the prairies to Lake Superior, and the government has not been oblivious of the fact that this single track was not sufficient to meet the development expected and which has taken place. My hon. friends from the North-west are aware that three or four years ago the government did not hesitate to subsidize another line of railway which will tap the prairies and bring the crop of the North-west to Lake Superior. The government did not hesitate to subsidize that railway at a very heavy cost, and the money for which we asked parliament was cheerfully given and has been well applied. Unfortunately however that railway was completed too late in the season to be of any advantage to the settlers of the North-west, but it is to be hoped that it will be available for next year's crop, and then we shall have two rival roads competing to Lake Superior. But even this addition will not be sufficient. There has been this year a car shortage in the North-west Territories, and should we have as abundant a crop next year as we had this, even with two competing roads, there may be another car shortage. I would remind my hon. friends in the North-west that they are not alone the sufferers. There is not a portion of Canada which is not clamouring for more cars, and all the resources of Canada at present are inadequate to move the products of the Canadian people. This is indeed very satisfactory in one way, but it renders the duty of government and parliament all the more imperative to try if possible to grapple with the situation and furnish an adequate relief. My hon. friends on both sides will credit us with having done all we could, with the means at our disposal, during the present year. The Canadian Pacific Railway themselves have not been oblivious of the difficulty and intend to remedy the situation as far as they possibly can. They propose to increase their stock by $20,000,000. They propose to raise their present capital of $65,000,000 to $85,000,000. They applied to the government, and the government cheerfully gave their sanction to the proposal, but at the same time stipulated that a large part of that expenditure should be applied in doubling the track from the prairie section to Lake Superior and in providing for a large increase in their rolling stock. This will be done, and done shortly, during the present year, and when it is done, when the Canadian Pacific Railway have doubled their track and perhaps more than doubled their rolling stock, and when there is also the competition of the Canadian Northern, something will have been done to materially relieve the present situation. But I am not sure that even then sufficient will have been done, because I believe that the development of the North-west will continue at such a rate that there will still be a shortage of cars for the removal of the crops. The only method that can be devised to remedy the evil is one rather difficult to grapple with. The only way after all is to provide more transportation facilities—not so much to Lake Superior as to Eastern Canada. The idea has been thrown out by hon. members who addressed the House to-day, that it is not sufficient to have the crop moved to the head of Lake Superior there to remain during the winter, and be shipped the following spring, but that some method should be devised to have it moved to the seaboard in winter as well as in summer. To this proposition every one will readily agree. It is the most practical that has been submitted to-day. If we could possibly have the grain of the North-west removed from the prairie to the seaboard during twelve months, we would do a great deal to relieve the present congestion. But so long as the wheat is only brought down to Lake Superior and there stored until the opening of navigation, there will never be that adequate relief given which must be provided some time or other. If we had a continuous prairie section all the way through from Winnipeg to the seaboard, there would be no difficulty at all, but unfortunately there is a rugged section along the shores of Lake Superior, which hardly admits of wheat being commercially carried through. That is the difficulty. How that is to be overcome is a problem of great magnitude, which I am not prepared to solve at present. No doubt new lines of transportation must be found to bring the wheat down to the seaboard every month in the year. That problem, I am afraid, is not capable of immediate realization, but in the meantime what is to be done ? It has been stated repeatedly that one of the things from which the settlers have suffered most is their unfair treatment by the Canadian Pacific Railway—that there has been a combine which has made it impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway to ignore the demands of the settlers and leave the wheat where it is to-day. Well, that is a difficulty which ought to be capable of being remedied and which must be dealt with. I am not prepared to say whether that be really the case or not, but if there has been a combine, the result of which has been to prevent the storing of wheat in the elevators along the railway line, this is the first intimation of it which has been officially made to the government.

Nothing has been done yet to acquaint the government of Canada with the condition of things which has been revealed to-day

by the discussion. It is therefore for hon. gentleman who have spoken not merely to call attention to this very important condition of things but to suggest a remedy. The great question of grain transportation and of the inspection of grain in the North-west is one which was frequently under discussion in the last parliament. Two years ago an Act was passed, the Manitoba Grain Act, which, I understand, has done a great deal to remove the grievances that existed. And, perhaps, if old conditions had continued, if the crop instead of being phenomenally large, had been an ordinary crop, that Act would have been sufficient to deal with the situation. But, fortunately, Providence has been kind to us; there has been a phenomenal crop. The remedies provided by the Act have been inadequate to meet the circumstances. That being the case, I would ask hon. members from the North-west to suggest a remedy. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) made a speech to-night the tone of which I heartily commend, in which he says that the government should deal with the question. The government is ready to do its share. But the hon. members from the North-west should be ready to admit that, in a matter of this kind, technical knowledge is required, knowledge which they possess, and which we are not supposed to have. At any rate, whatever may be our knowledge it cannot be as complete or as accurate as theirs is. We have, therefore, a right to expect them to point out what the remedy is—whether new elevators should be built, or whether there should be government ownership of railways, or what course should be taken. I have understood also that some complaint has been made as to the working of the Act. I think it was my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) who made the statement that not only the spirit of the Act but the letter of it had been systematically violated by the company. I should imagine that, if that is the case, we ought to be able to find within the terms of the statute itself, a remedy—that is, there ought to be means provided by the statute to compel the company to conform to the law. If the letter and the spirit of the law have been violated, and if that is the only complaint, the remedy is in the hands of the people, because the law provides means of compelling the railway company to comply with its terms.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman will pardon me, I hope, but I understood that there was a combination among the warehouse men themselves, and that is what I was dealing with.

The PRIME MINISTER. That may be, but I am dealing with the statement made by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). He stated that the letter of the law had been violated, and I am sure that the hon. leader of the opposition will agree with me that if that is the only evil to be complained of, the statute itself will afford a sufficient remedy, and it will only be necessary to compel the company to conform to the terms of the statute. But I imagine that the evil is greater and deeper than a simple violation of the letter of the statute. For, as I understand the case, the provisions of the Act would have been sufficient to cope with the condition of things brought about by the enormous crop we have had in the North-west. But while the yield per acre this year may not be as great, the total yield will probably be as large, because there will be a far larger acreage under cultivation this year than there was last year. Therefore, we must expect the same evil—or rather the same good, for 'evil' is not the proper word to apply to abundance—as we had last year. If, therefore, the Act is not adequate, it is only for our friends from the North-west to point out the remedy and the government will be only too glad to give them every possible assistance to make the Act as effective as it can be made.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask permission to ask a question of the right hon. Premier. I think my friends from the North-west will bear me out in making the statement that the letter of the law has been violated by the company by issuing orders to their subordinates to refuse to allow the farmers to load their cars. That is a violation of the spirit and the letter of the Act as we understand it. We make that statement on our responsibility as members of parliament on the floor of this House. We think—perhaps I should say I think—I have discharged my duty by making that statement. I do not think the responsibility rests upon me of taking the part of a detective or officer of the law in such a case.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have only to say that the moment particulars of this kind are given, it will be the duty of the government to have the fact investigated, and to apply to the Department of Justice, if the facts are so, to see what remedy can be applied.

Mr. BOYD. If I may be permitted, I would like to correct a wrong impression which the House would receive from the remarks of the leader of the government in regard to the Canadian Northern Railway. Speaking of that road the Premier said that it did not help to relieve the grain blockade. Now, there has been no blockade on that road during the season. Any blockade that has taken place has been on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Evidence was produced at the Agriculture Committee at the local legislature to prove that, at all times, the Canadian Northern road, throughout their system, had been able to handle their crop this season.

Mr. McCREARY. Perhaps I may be allowed to explain that that grain did not go over the trunk line to a Canadian port, but

to an American port. If the Canadian Pacific Railway were to take to shipping to American ports, they could move a great deal of grain, just as the Canadian Northern has done.

Motion (Mr. Douglas) agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Tracing showing the principal railway lines in operation in New Brunswick, and showing the railway lines, or portions of such lines, over which postal cars are run.—Hon. Mr. Costigan.

List of the names of all permanent and temporary officials of the several branches of the Department of the Interior, date of appointment and their salaries, on the 1st July, 1896 ; also a similar list on the 1st July, 1901.—Mr. Larivière.

List of the names of all permanent and temporary officials employed in the Winnipeg Post Office since the 1st of July, 1896 ; date of appointment, length of service, and salary up to the 1st of January, 1892.—Mr. Larivière.

On motion of the Prime Minister, the House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 11, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the British Columbia and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Riley.

Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Mr. Emmerson.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That Government Orders take precedence on Monday next immediately after Questions.

Motion agreed to.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I had contemplated delivering the Budget speech this week, but after consultation with the leader of the opposition it has been found more mutually convenient to fix it for Monday next, on the understanding that the debate will continue from day to day until terminated. It is only intended to take next Monday as a government day unless the Budget debate should not finish next week, in which case the following Monday will be taken.

SCHOOL TEACHERS FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). If the right hon. the Prime Minister will be good enough, I would like him to give some information regarding the sending of teachers to South Africa. A great many are anxious to go and would like to be informed as to the procedure, the form of application and the qualifications.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry to say that I am not in a position to answer my hon. friend on this subject and will have to refresh my memory.

PENSIONS TO NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Resolution (p. 806) respecting pensions to be granted to the officers of the North-west Mounted Police was read the second time and agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 40) respecting pensions to officers of the North-west Mounted Police.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—OFFICIAL REPORTING OF DEBATES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish, for a few moments to direct attention to the 'Hansard' reporting of the House for the present year. In the past I have always recognized that we have had very accurate work on the part of the 'Hansard' staff; but I regret to say that it is not up to its usual efficiency this session. My attention was drawn, a few days ago to a report in 'Hansard' of February 27th. In Committee of Supply the item for 'rewards for saving lives, including life-savings stations' was under consideration, and

I asked a question with regard to it as to what this money was to be used for. I drew attention to it.

I notice an item for life saving in connection with one of the vessels on the upper lakes.

That is what appears in 'Hansard.' But I did not speak of it in that way, but said that, in connection with this item for life-saving service, I desired to draw the attention of the minister to what had happened in the way of life-saving in connection with one of the vessels on the upper lakes, and I asked if anything had been done to reward the captain of the vessel for his meritorious conduct. I asked the list of those to whom awards had been given for saving life, so as to find if this captain's name appeared among them. The minister read the list, and when he had finished, I drew attention to the fact that the name of the captain in the case I have referred to did not appear. I was not, at that time, able to give the name of the steamship, but said it was captain Geo. McDougall, of the steamship 'Athabaska,' who, on the 29th of June, 1901, saved the lives of twelve out of thirteen of the crew of the American barge 'Preston.' I stated that I mentioned the case so as to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to it; that, in the event of deserving men being rewarded, the highly meritorious services of Captain McDougall might receive due recognition. I also stated, at that time, that there had been given to this captain a very handsome testimonial, in the form of a gold watch, by the President of the United States. Now, there is not a word referring to all that in 'Hansard.' I pass on then to the report of next day. I had, on a previous occasion, asked the minister for information with regard to the hydrographic survey chart of Georgian Bay. The minister, referring to my question stated where these maps could be had. And he referred also to the case of Captain McDougall in these words, according to 'Hansard':

With regard to the question put by the hon. member for North Grey—

That is wrong, for it was not the hon. member for North Grey—this is mixed up in every way, it seems to me.

—as to whether any award has been made to Captain McDougall, who had saved a number of lives from an American barge or steamer, and who had been given a very handsome testimonial for his conduct by the United States, I beg to say that I have looked up the records in the department and cannot find record of any application for an award to Captain McDougall.

That was in answer to what I had said in bringing the case to the notice of the hon. minister, for the purpose of having him take note of it so that Captain McDougall might be suitably awarded, but concerning which there is no mention in 'Hansard.' This kind of reporting is unjust to hon. members of this House. And, as this occurred on Friday evening, and I was not in the city on the following day, the necessary correction could not be made in time, and so it appears in this erroneous form in the revised 'Hansard' as well. I draw attention to this in order that there may be more care taken in the reporting, for, otherwise, 'Hansard' will be of little use.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). Let me say, on behalf of the 'Hansard' reporters, that the difficulty of taking down every word uttered on the floor of the House must be apparent. I have had long experience in that kind of business, and I may say that I do not understand how the reporters can be as accurate as they are, for there is so much noise in the chamber that it is almost impossible for one to hear. I have found errors in 'Hansard,' but, on behalf of a staff which is a meritorious one, I must call the attention of the members of the House to the noise which is going on all the time, which makes it very difficult for any reporters to be accurate.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). On that same subject, I might point out that a number of members have a habit of turning their backs on the 'Hansard' men while speaking, which makes it almost impossible for the reporters to catch what they say.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee.

Rents—Dominion public buildings, Ottawa, $31,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. What is the total amount paid for rents in outside buildings in the city, approximately? I am told to-day it exceeds $43,000. That would pay interest on $2,000,000; and if that is the case, we can get much better value for our money by borrowing that amount of capital cheaply, and putting up proper buildings.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I mistake not the amount paid for rents in Ottawa is about $15,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think it is higher than that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not exactly recollect the amount.

Mr. WILSON. It would be well for the Minister of Public Works to give a list of all the buildings he is renting, and the rent he pays for each.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With pleasure. Does the hon. gentleman

ask for a list of all the public buildings all over the country ?

Mr. WILSON. In Ottawa alone.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Geological Museum, Sussex Street, $600 ; French translators' office, $420. The French translators have been lately moved into the central block here, so that item will disappear. Workshops, Wellington Street, at $140, and taxes at $300 ; Examining Warehouse, Sparks Street, $850 ; Imperial building, Queen Street, $1,800 ; Central Basin, coal shed, Slater Estate, $400 ; Thistle Estate, Wellington Street, Gas Inspection, $500 ; Seybold building, $6,500. The House pronounced last year upon that. New methylated spirits warehouse and laboratory, corner of Queen and Lyon Streets, Department of Inland Revenue, $1,200 ; Marine storehouse, $300 ; Dominion Methodist Church, Queen Street, Militia and Defence, $500. This item will disappear hereafter, as we have a new store building erected. Customs Department, Wellington Street, $1,500 ; Molsons' Bank, Metcalfe Street, for Labour Department, $1,200 ; new building for Surveyor General's staff, corner Metcalfe and Slater Streets, $3,000 ; International Boundary Commission and Astronomical Branch, Interior Department, 26 Wellington Street, $800. That makes an approximate total of $21,000, although two items are to disappear. I do not like that state of affairs. At the same time, it would take a large amount of money to erect all the buildings that would be necessary to give the accommodation for which we now pay rent.

Mr. MACLEAN. But the hon. gentleman belongs to an economical government, and they are charged with the administration of the public affairs to the best interests of the country. If it is wrong, as he confesses it is, to pay this large amount in rents and to have the public affairs administered in this extravagant way, he is guilty of maladministration. He is charged by the people to effect the best possible administration, and if it is necessary, to build new buildings and get better value for our money. We are paying him and we are paying the government for that purpose, and we expect them to conduct the public service in the best possible way for the smallest amount of money. I do not like to hear these confessions that are being repeatedly made by the ministers that they are doing something that is not in the public interest. They should bring forward a proposition that is in the public interest, and they should cease the extravagance under which public affairs are now being administered.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never intimated that we were doing this against the public interest, I said it was a state of affairs that I did not like. On the other hand, the Minister of Finance and the government must take care not to spend too much money. Now we are going to erect a museum, an observatory and a building for the mint, which will take a large amount of money. When the government have to borrow money as we have, it is necessary to be prudent and careful.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then what the minister is practically justifying is paying extravagant rents to their friends here in Ottawa, where a judicious administration would borrow the money necessary to put up the proper buildings, and get much better buildings for a much smaller rate of interest than the rents they are now paying. I ask him now whether he intends to continue that system. It is not in the public interest, it is not on the lines of econmy, and it is not on the lines of the professions that the hon. gentleman made in former days.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken when he says we are renting from our friends. The former government were paying a good many of these rentals when we took office.

Mr. CLARKE. It would be good policy on the part of the government to buy this whole block on Wellington Street fronting the parliament buildings which would give us in future the additional accommodation that will have to be provided, before land increases any more in value in this part of the city.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Property is becoming scarcer in Ottawa. I would like very much to have some expression of opinion from the House on this proposition of my hon. friend, because it is a very important question indeed. On the other hand, the House must not forget that it will cost money to erect public buildings.

Mr. MACLEAN. As to buying very expensive property for public buildings, I do not quite approve of that. I would rather go in for the system that obtains in Washington where they scatter their public buildings over the city. If you attempt to expropriate this property in front of us on Wellington Street, you will have to pay $1,000 a foot. There are a number of properties that could be got in other portions of the city half a mile from here where you can probably get land for 50 or 75 dollars a foot frontage. But it is the duty of the government to come forward with some plan, and take the responsibility. The House should not find a plan for them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already been trying to buy property, and have looked over a number of properties, but I find land very dear.

Mr. MACLEAN. Go over in Hull.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the government own Nepean Point now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend would not like to see that whole point occupied, I am inclined to think, with public buildings. Something can be said for keeping a portion of it free. It is proposed to erect the mint in that vicinity close by the Printing Bureau, but even that has been objected to by the military authorities. Speaking for myself, my sympathies run strongly in the direction of having more public buildings where we can accommodate the business of all the departments in buildings belonging to the government. But I am not prepared to admit that these rents are extravagant, as the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) contends. It is quite possible these rents may represent a reasonable return to the capitalists, and not an extravagant return. We have undertaken the erection of buildings in Ottawa, which, in round numbers will reach doubtless $1,000,000. I do not think I am wrong when I say that taking the proposed new museum, which, necessarily will be a large building, the mint and the observatory, you will find that we are undertaking to add to our buildings in Ottawa to the extent of about $1,000,000, which, I think, is a liberal allowance, and I think it would not be too much to wait a year or two before we add to our obligations for other buildings in Ottawa, although I quite admit it is better to have a number of good public buildings, even if they may be scattered somewhat through the city, than to be compelled to rent a lot of third floors and places of that kind.

Rents, repairs, fuel, lighting water service, janitors, watchmen, charwomen, &c.,—Yukon public buildings, $76,500.

Mr. SPROULE. This is in connection with the Yukon Territory ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the government if they have received any complaints about the Treadgold concession and what they purpose doing about it. Perhaps the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) would be the proper minister to answer that question. If he is absent through illness, we have nothing but sympathy for him. There is a strong feeling against the government to-day in that country if we can place any reliance upon the information that comes from that distant quarter of the country, and the government do not seem to be doing anything to improve the situation unless they erect more buildings there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Treadgold business has nothing to do with rents, repairs, fuel, lighting and water service in the Yukon. The Minister of the Interior is not here but when he is in his seat no doubt the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) will ask him for an explanation and I have no doubt that his explanation will satisfy the hon. gentleman. In the meantime, I am asking for $76,500 for rents, repairs, fuel, lighting, water service, &c., in the Yukon.

Mr. SPROULE. According to that I take it that the government have not sufficient accommodation for the transaction of public business and are obliged to rent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I have a complete list of the buildings that we are obliged to rent, to repair, to heat and so on.

Mr. SPROULE. What buildings were erected last year for the use of the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The buildings we erected last year and the year before are the post office, court-house, administration building and governor's house.

Mr. SPROULE. What did they cost in the aggregate ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The post office cost $50,246, court-house, $55,299, administration building, which is a large building, $134,244. Government house, the governor's residence, $41,534.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) speaks of $14,000 for the governor's house, he means the cost of construction ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But this item does not include any of the cost of construction ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. My hon friend (Mr. Sproule) asks me the cost of construction and I give it to him.

Mr. SPROULE. That will be the gold commissioner's office ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is the governor's house.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you have a quasi kind of government there. What I wish to draw attention to is this ; I notice by an item in a Dawson paper that the council use the gold commissioner's office for a court-house ; to which I do not see any reasonable objection, but it means that this country appears to be providing accommodation for the municipal corporation there as well as for the government's requirements, and therefore, it may be that we are spending more money than we otherwise would, so as to be able to provide a build-

ing suitable for the accommodation of both. I take it that the municipal corporation pays no rent for the use of this building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think we are doing that. We are simply providing for the federal administration.

Mr. SPROULE. I merely draw attention to the fact that they are using it and I have in my hand a Dawson paper which says so. I only referred to the fact that I might ask, if, on account of this, we were committing ourselves to a larger expenditure than we otherwise would.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no.

Mr. MACLEAN. Here is an item of $76,500 for the maintenance of public buildings in the Yukon, a comparatively small place and therefore small administration, and five or six items down we find that the total cost of the maintenance of the Ottawa public buildings is $67,000. This is an extraordinary comparison. We pay $76,500 in the Yukon and $67,000 down in Ottawa. I think we should have a little more detail.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say that the amount which I am asking for here does not represent the whole amount. These estimates were prepared before Governor Ross came down here and if the committee will give me two minutes of its time it will find that there is no extravagance. I was thunderstruck, so to speak, the first time that these estimates were placed before me. I do not understand why things were so high in the Yukon. Mr. Ross is a prudent man, and I have some officers there who are very able and prudent men. I consulted business men from Dawson city and I have come to the conclusion that there is no extravagance. If my hon. friend will listen to me, I will give him a few details. The expenditure is divided under the following heads : Fuel, lighting, rents, water, scavenging, janitor, nightwatchman, charwomen, repairs to public buildings and furniture. The committee will not ask me to give every detail——

Mr. WILSON. I think the hon. minister might give each item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am just going to give the amounts now. Fuel, administration building, 350 cords of fire-wood at $20 per cord.

Mr. CLARKE. Only $20 a cord.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it cannot be got for less. We buy the wood for the government buildings not only in Dawson but all over that country. I have the details here. In all there was $35,000 for fuel. It is a big sum but I cannot help it. It has to be paid.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the fuel purchased by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They ask for prices.

Mr. CLARKE. By public tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand they ask for quotations on lists because there are only a few people who can supply wood there. I may say at once that when Mr. Ross went up I gave him to a very large extent—I will not say carte blanche—but supervision over all my officers. I told him you will have to keep your two eyes open, and if something is going on that you do not approve, wire me.

Mr. CLARKE. Has he wired you ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He has never wired me because things go on all right.

Mr. CLARKE. From whom was the wood purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know. The vouchers are all before the Public Accounts committee. The lighting cost $33,235 for the buildings all over the country and the rents $6,240. We do not pay much rent now. The water service costs $2,580 ; scavanging, $1,000 ; janitors, night watchmen and charwomen, $21,600.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BELL. Is there no reduction in the wages in the Yukon ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Wages are going down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would like if they would go down. I have consulted business men who have come here and they tell me you cannot get a charwoman for less than $5 a day. I cannot be accused of making jobs there. I do not know what is going on and so I cannot do anything wrong. The money has to be paid.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to read the following statement to show that these buildings are being used as I have said a moment ago. I have here the Dawson 'Daily News' of February 14, and it says :

Arrangements have been made for the city council to hold its first session, March 3, in the gold commissioner's court room. Other sessions of the council likely will also be held there indefinitely.

The city clerk and the mayor's offices, according to an intimation given by Governor Ross some time ago, likely will be in the quarters at present occupied by tax collector E. Ward Smith. It is a large room and easily will accommodate all.

The gold commissioner's court room will be well adapted for the council. The judge's bench will do for the mayor, the court clerk's desk for the city clerk, and the barristers' long table

for the six councilmen. All are close together, and on the sides will be ample room for the press reporters tables and the rear will accommodate the public.

It has been deemed much better for the city to accept quarters in the administration building at the outset than to endeavour to provide a building for itself. The expense attendant on getting the young municipality on its feet is the prime cause for accepting the courtesies extended by the Dominion government, and through the efforts of Governor Ross the way was first paved.

I have another issue of the same paper and it refers to a question which I wish to bring to the attention of the minister and to ask him if there is any truth in it. It says:

C. M. Woodworth, the barrister, arrived on the White Pass stage at noon. Mr. Woodworth has been absent several months, and for a portion of the time was in Ottawa. While there he was twice the guest of the Governor General and was entertained by two of the cabinet ministers, and met many of the other ministers and officials.

According to Mr. Woodworth, the Yukon will be granted parliamentary representation the present session of parliament, and may be allowed two members.

I would like to ask the minister if that is in contemplation. If so, we have had no information of it so far.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, well, I do not know anything about that. It is asking me too much. I cannot say about that.

Mr. MACLEAN. The minister was giving us other information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The two other items are repairs to public buildings $15,000 and furniture $5,000. My deputy minister tells me that that makes $93,000 which is more than I am asking in this vote.

Mr. KEMP. I am afraid that the officers of the department have very extravagant ideas in connection with these Yukon supplies, and certain items in the Auditor General's Report at page V—48 seem to bear that idea out. We have an account for two wine decanters, $10; whisky set, $5; mirror, $25; and there are other supplies of ale, and wine and whisky charged for at page V—47 of the Auditor General's Report. There is also a charge for 12 feet of extra table, $45. I suppose that is an ordinary table. Sheets are charged for at $3 a pair, I am not prepared to say what is the price in this part of the country, but I am informed that they are worth about $1 a pair. I do not wish to be picayune in criticising these things, but if these extravagant prices are paid in the Yukon it is no wonder that the appropriations are so large.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sure if I had the pleasure of going into my hon. friend's house, I would find more expensive furniture than any that Mr. Ross has bought for himself. I do not believe that my hon. friend can buy decent sheets for a dollar apiece; nor do I think that $25 is an extraordinary price to pay for a mirror. I see gentlemen around me who have more expensive furniture in their houses.

Mr. COCHRANE. They pay for it themselves. They do not pay for it with my money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a very small argument. The governor of the Yukon is not bound to pay for his furniture himself. I may say that I placed $5,000 at his disposal to enable him to buy his own furniture. I thought it was only fair to allow him that freedom. I am sure Mr. Ross has acted prudently.

Mr. MACLEAN. I gather, from what I have read in the newspapers, that prices in the Yukon have come down to hard-pan, but I see no evidence of that in the government accounts. The profits of miners, the rates of wages, and I believe the prices of supplies have come down; the government also, I understand, have cut down the rates of transportation; and I think a little care exercised by them would secure hard-pan prices for the government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think my hon. friend is familiar with the conditions in the Yukon, or he would not say that prices have come down to hard-pan, which I suppose means the same prices that prevail in other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, I mean hard-pan for the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I may say that quite recently I had an opportunity to consult judges who reside in the Yukon and others entirely independent of the administration, who have come from there, and, to illustrate the conditions prevailing in that part of the country, I am told that an ordinary maid servant will not hire for less than $100 a month, and you cannot rent the meanest sort of residence for less than $150 a month. If these are the prevailing prices in the country, it is of course impossible to complain of the rates paid by my hon. friend in connection with the Public Works Department.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the Minister of Justice if he has read recently an interview in one of the newspapers with Mr. Justice Craig, of the Yukon district, who stated in that interview that all sorts of irregularities were being carried on by officers of the government, and that the charges made by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) from his place in the House a few sessions ago, were not a bit overstated. In view of these statements made by Mr. Justice Craig, does the Minis-

ter of Justice propose to have an investigation ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have not had the advantage of reading the interview to which my hon. friend refers; but I have had the advantage of several personal conferences with Mr. Justice Craig, some of them in the presence of the Auditor General, within the last few weeks, and he never suggested anything of the character mentioned by my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT. I can only say that it is remarkable that although this statement has been spread broadcast throughout the press, Mr. Justice Craig has not taken any opportunity of contradicting it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As this interview came to the knowledge of my hon. friend, and as Mr. Justice Craig was here until a few days ago, I think it would have been better to have had him called before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not suppose every member of the House has time to keep himself instructed as to the movements of Mr. Justice Craig. I would suppose that the Minister of Justice himself, under the circumstances, would have brought him to the Public Accounts Committee, instead of expecting gentlemen on this side of the House to do so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I never heard of the statement before.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Every one who pays much attention to the public press must have seen it. I saw it myself.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In that case the hon. gentleman should have brought it to the attention of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I took it for granted that the government were alive. My hon. friend does not deny that it was published in the public press. However, I would like the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Public Works to explain to the House on what principle it is that the officials of the Yukon are now paid on a different basis from other officials. Judges or other officials in other parts of the country do not for the most part receive living allowances apart from their salaries. I am willing to concede that in the Yukon the salaries must be higher ; but what I do not understand is, why our officers there are not paid one lump salary, and left to provide their own living allowances. I think that is a more satisfactory mode of dealing with such matters than the mode that still prevails.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that in a day or two there will be only one officer of my department remaining in the Yukon district. We are giving him an allowance of $75 a month. All the others will be recalled. The telegraph line and all our other public works there for the time being are completed.

Mr. WARD. There is an item on page V—57 of the Auditor General's Report, of which I would ask an explanation from the Minister of Public Works. It is 50 head of cattle, 44,000 lbs., at 30 cents, and $100 paid to a man for killing these cattle.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That item has reference to the construction of the telegraph line. It has no connection with this item at all.

Mr. BENNETT. From the Dawson 'Weekly News' of February 14th, I find it stated that a Mr. Woodworth, a barrister of Dawson City, had been east; and, when he returned to Dawson, in an interview with a newspaper man, he said :

> Mr. Sifton, Mr. Woodworth says, keeps in complete touch with the Yukon, and has clippings of all affairs touching his Yukon administration sent to him personally.

Perhaps in the Department of the Interior might be found a clipping containing the statements of Mr. Justice Craig. If the item stood over and the Department of the Interior were communicated with, we might get something in reference to those statements.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Will my hon. friend give me the date of the paper in which that interview was published? I probably will be able to reach Mr. Justice Craig by telegraph in the next day or two.

Mr. BENNETT. I regret that I have mislaid the paper, but I think that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has a copy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have a copy and will give it to the hon. minister.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. minister say he never saw the clipping ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I never saw or heard of it.

Mr. SPROULE. What control have we over the wood lands ? Are they still in the hands of the parties who tried to get control a few years ago ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not found any coal there, and I can only answer for the wood supplied me. The Minister of Interior has charge of the land, and there will be ample opportunity to discuss the whole situation in the Yukon. I can only answer for my department.

> Furniture Dominion public buildings, $12,000.
> Dominion immigration buildings—repairs, furniture, &c., $4,000.

Mr. BROCK. What accommodation have we in the shape of immigrant buildings in this country to receive immigrants when they arrive ? We are spending a very large amount to bring them here, and if the accommodation is very poor when they

arrive, we lose a good deal of the advantages we would otherwise get from them. I have heard that immigrants who arrived in Winnipeg in the early spring were so badly accommodated that many became discontented with the country and went back to the United States. I would like to ask what accommodation we are providing in this country for those immigrants we are bringing in, not only from Europe but from the United States.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have already a number of buildings for immigration purposes—at Halifax, Quebec, Lévis, Calgary, Edmonton, Lethbridge, Prince Albert, Regina, St. John and other places. I quite agree with my hon. friend that we must treat the immigrants as well as possible. We have endeavoured to do so in the past, but if the immigration continues growing we will be obliged to do more.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is this $4,000 to be expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is the ordinary expenditure on repairs in the buildings all over the country.

Mr. POPE. Are we providing accommodation for immigrants who land here and are going to the United States ? To-day in the city of Montreal, there are more than 200 cases of contagious diseases in the hospitals—all people who came into this country bound for the United States.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not from my personal knowledge that there are 200 foreigners in our hospitals in Montreal, but that may be the case. We have no immigration building in Montreal. In Lévis, St. John and Quebec we have divisions in our buildings, dividing the immigrants destined for this country from those going to the United States, and we have different arrangements for each. Last year we completed our arrangements in Quebec and are now completing them in St. John.

Mr. POPE. Do we furnish, at our expense, covering for those people who go to the United States ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are simply sheltering them as we shelter foreign trade. The immigration trade here is a very valuable one. There are lots of goods of all kinds that pass through and for which we have to provide accommodation. We provide for immigrants in just the same way. The inspection is not made at our expense at all.

Mr. CLARKE. You provide accommodation for them, whether they intend remaining here or going to the United States.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Suppose the Allan and Dominion steamship lines and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada Atlantic will carry American immigrants, are we not bound to shelter them ?

Mr. POPE. No, let the railways shelter them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If we did not shelter them, they would not come to our territory and we would lose that trade.

Mr. McCREARY. You have a lot of Canadian immigrants sheltered in New York city, who arrive there and come to Canada, and a great many of them are in the hospitals there.

Mr. INGRAM. When was the building located at St. John ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is now being completed. We discussed the item a few days ago. It was begun last year.

Mr. INGRAM. I find an item here—not very large, it is true—but it strikes me that legal gentlemen come very high in St. John, much higher than in Ontario :

McAlpine, E. H., barrister, professional services locating premises for building, $8 ; preparing deed, $8 ; search at registry office, 1½ days, $40 ; sundry, $1.41.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have employed some legal gentlemen from Ontario, and I find that they know just as well how to make a charge as those from the maritime provinces. I may add that all the fees are prepared in the Department of Justice, and I have nothing to do with them. The land was given to us.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask about this item of furniture. Is it purchased by public tender, and are the local merchants and dealers given an opportunity to tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That item of $12,000 covers expenditure for furniture for all the public buildings. If I remember well, we have 185 public buildings under our care, and this small sum is to cover requisitions that may be made upon us by caretakers and others. It is simply to cover petty items of expenditure for furniture.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is it purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is purchased locally. With only $12,000 scattered all over the country, we could not adopt any system of purchase and at any central point.

Mr. CLARKE. Is any of it purchased in Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is under another item altogether.

Mr. POPE. I still take objection to our expending Canadian public money for a class of people the whole benefit of whose

appearance in Canada goes to the transportation companies. I know of no reason why the railway companies and shipowners should not furnish that accommodation, just as they furnish accommodation for baggage, freight or any other item from which they benefit, and the benefit to the country is only indirect. In this matter of immigration, I am afraid that we are subject not only to great cost, but to great danger because we allow all sorts of people to land in this country. The United States keep an army of officers to inspect the immigration into their country. From such information as I get from the Bureau at Washington, I am inclined to think that a very large percentage—even a very large majority—of the immigrants landing in this country are destined for the United States and that we, under such items as this we are discussing, are furnishing cover for people who intend to become American citizens. If even the large majority of the people, landing on our shores had points in Canada for their destination, that would alter the case. But the statistics of the Washington Bureau are against that belief, and our statistics are not well kept in comparison with theirs. These immigrants are all counted by United States officers as they pass on the trains, and reports sent into the Bureau. Those statistics show that we are furnishing cover to people who do not intend to become Canadian citizens, and that is not just to the tax payer of this country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would, perhaps agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Pope) to a certain extent if we had erected or were asking parliament for money to erect buildings intended exclusively for foreign immigration. But that is not the case.

Mr. CLARKE. But you do not discriminate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Here is what we have done and what we are doing. We are putting up an immigration building at St. John. That is our winter port; all our own immigration comes from that port, and we must provide for it. My department has been asked to provide a corner, if I may so say it, in the immigration building. And the same is true of Quebec. I was asked to provide rooms for American officers to inspect American immigration.

Mr. CLARKE. Why should we provide accommodation for American officers ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I take issue with my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke). Though in these matters, I am only a builder, and it is not for me to defend this part of the policy, yet, I take issue with the hon. gentleman. The immigration trade is good trade for us to have. Our navigation companies and railway companies benefit by it and our traders benefit by it also. Why should we not encourage it ? I cannot understand the hon. gentleman's reasons for objecting.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I am sorry that Halifax is ignored altogether as a port for the arrival of immigrants. We have an immigration agent and we have immigration sheds, women to attend to them, and all the facilities for receiving immigrants. These people are carried to the port of Halifax by ships subsidized by the Dominion government. We have a road from Halifax extending to Montreal and running through our own country. I maintain that the immigrants that come in our own ships to our own port should go by our own railway into the centre of this Dominion. That would prevent them going to the United States. As for those who go to the United States, they are divided at Halifax, because they are on the manifest of the ship which shows so many immigrants going to this port or that port. Those coming to Canada should enter at the first port where the steamer arrives in the Dominion, particularly as that port has all the facilities to handle them; and they should certainly go by our own road into our own country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may be allowed to remind my hon. friend that St. John is the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has western connections. Unfortunately, the Intercolonial Railway has not those connections. When an immigrant lands in Canada, he is anxious to get aboard a car that will take him to his destination. That is the reason why St. John has been favoured in connection with that immigration in the past.

Mr. CLARKE. But would it not be a reasonable proposition that the railway companies that bring these immigrants through Canada into the United States and the steamship companies that bring them across the Atlantic should provide the accommodation necessary for these people ? There is no objection to treating them as they ought to be treated, but the question is who ought to bear the expense. For my part I say we ought to imitate the example of our friends of the other side—we should collect from the transportation companies for the inspection and temporary housing of immigrants who are not destined for points in Canada.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not pay a dollar for the inspecting. What we have done is simply to allow American officers the use of two or three rooms for the inspection of these immigrants.

Mr. CLARKE. But we should compel the steamship companies or somebody else

to provide the accommodation necessary for the inspection, and for housing the immigrants who are merely passing through Canada and whose destination is a foreign country. Surely that is not unreasonable.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not say that it is.

Mr. CLARKE. We have the statement made that, in view of the quality of the immigration coming to Canada, it was found necessary by the United States government, first to send a medical officer to Liverpool to inspect immigrants going to points in the United States through Canada. But that was not found effective, so they had to despatch officers to our own ports. They are inspecting immigrants coming to Canada and determining which shall be allowed to go to the United States. Ought there not to be some provision, not only with these people so that they could be treated rightly, but that, if they are not fit to land, they shall be taken back by the steamship company. Is it not reasonable to ask that the Canadian public should not have the expense placed on its shoulders, an expense which properly belongs to the steamship companies, to the railway companies or to the United States authorities ? I protest against expenditure for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We must not fall into exaggeration. Of course, I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) does not mean to exaggerate. There are two immigration sheds used for foreign immigration purposes. One at St. John and one at Quebec.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) And Halifax.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Halifax, from what the hon. gentleman says, does not receive much immigration.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). We have ample accommodation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The accommodation is all right. But there are only two places where foreign immigrants are landed. I make bold to say it does not cost the country $500 a year for that object, because we would be obliged to make provision for our own immigration, and we have made provision for it in point of fact. Foreign immigration is only an incident, if I may say so ; it does not cost anything worth speaking of.

Mr. WILSON. It has been stated in this House that the United States house immigrants at New York coming through that port into Canada. Now, is there any arrangement whereby they are to house our immigrants and we are to house theirs ? That would be reciprocity, and I see no good reason why, if they do that for us, we should not do something in return.

Mr. CLARKE.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not the head of that branch, and cannot say. But I do not share the doubts that are expressed now. My policy would be to give cheap transportation to all kinds of trade, to make provision by land and water for cheap transportation through the country, both of trade and of human beings, provided of course that we do not fall into excess in the way of expenditure.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question, whether there is an arrangement made between Canada and the United States that they should house our immigrants and we should house theirs?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am obliged to answer that it is not in my branch, and I do not know anything about it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I may say, as one having had fourteen years experience with immigration in the port of Halifax, that immigrants are not housed, because the moment they arrive they are inspected by doctors, and the cars are all ready for them to take their passage. Those for the United States take passage for the United States, and those for Canada are carried into the interior. What have we the Intercolonial railway for unless it is to carry our immigrants from the port of their arrival in Canada ?

Dominion quarantine stations—maintenance, &c., $4,000.

Mr. SPROULE. We want some information in connection with this item. In the event of immigrants coming to the country, who land and may be found diseased, do they go into these quarantine stations, and are they kept there and fed, and their expenses paid until they are fit to go on to the United States, and do we bear all that expense ? I think whoever has charge of this quarantine station, whether the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of the Interior, ought to be able to tell us that. If the United States does the same thing the service would be mutual. But we want to know whether such an arrangement has been made. There ought to be some minister able to give us the information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Minister of Agriculture in whose department——

Mr. MACLEAN. He is in the garden of Eden. He will be back in a little while.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, he should stay there for some time. As soon as he is done, he will give us the information.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to point out an item in the Auditor General's Report, I do not profess to be an authority on the Auditor General's Report. I regret to say

I have very little time to study it. But my study thus far has convinced me that the Department of Public Works is being imposed upon, I do not know to what extent. There is a tendency sometimes for individuals to charge the government two prices for things. If the tender system were adopted, that might be avoided to some extent. Once in a while an item will catch one's eye, and I find on page V—68 in the Auditor General's Report an item of $1,293.61, including a certain article which I know something about, and that is a galvanized iron boiler. It is 120 gallon galvanized iron boiler, and it is charged here at $84, while the value of that article is only $37. I do not know what system prevails in the department of checking prices, I do not know how often that kind of thing occurs. But we are paying out here hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money, in fact, millions of dollars ; and it is possible we are voting away hundreds of thousands of dollars more than we ought to. Certainly we are doing so, if that kind of thing occurs very often.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend states we have paid $84 for an article that he knows is worth $37. Is he sure of that ?

Mr. KEMP. I have no doubt about it, I know the value of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Having no doubt and being sure, are two different things. There are boilers and boilers. I cannot believe my officers would make a mistake like that. Of course a minister cannot be expected to check all these accounts. But if my officers are guilty of such mistakes they are no good.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I say if they are no good they never have been good, because I inherited nearly all of them. But they are good, and they have not made that mistake.

Mr. KEMP. I may explain to the minister that this is an article carried by all first-class plumbers in stock, and he can inquire the value of it himself.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It depends. I have seen a lot of boilers in my time, and have not seen two that were quite alike. This is not the first time I have been on the floor of the House, and I have heard statements like that on many occasions. But I will look into this immediately. At six o'clock I will wire to the man who paid for it, and if he is incapable enough to be imposed upon, he does not deserve to be in my employ. I am thankful to my hon. friend for drawing my attention to it.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would say to the Minister of Public Works that we have heard that statement for a great many years. It is hoary with age, if not with respectability. I think he knows away down deep in his heart that that job is being perpetrated every day. We have had brought out in the public accounts just such transactions as that. I think his official does it under his instructions, that is my impression in the matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not one word to say in answer to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BELL. This item occurs in connection with the expenditure at Grosse Isle. I think if the minister will look into the matter he will find that some very extraordinary prices are paid for things at Grosse Isle. I have been looking over some of the accounts, and I think that establishment is paying nearly 100 per cent more for everything it buys than the regular market price. One item that caught my eye in the Auditor General's Report is eight cents a pound for putty. They are paying over forty cents a gallon for kerosene oil. I assure the Minister of Public Works that he will be well employed if he will make an excursion into these accounts in connection with the quarantine station at Grosse Isle.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is nothing I would like better than to have these accounts brought up before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BELL. Some of them are now before the committee.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am anxious now that the hon. member for Pictou and the hon. member for Toronto have taken up some of these items, to have them brought before the Public Accounts Committee. I shall be delighted.

Mr. BELL. Some of them are before the committee.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No objection at all ; very far from it. Here is the way these accounts are paid ; they are certified first by the clerk of the works on the spot. They are then sent to Ottawa and certified again by the chief architect. I have nothing to do with them. Of course it is not to be expected that a minister could check all of these accounts. He must necessarily trust his chief officers. If he cannot do so, what other course is open to him. I am anxious that all these accounts should be brought up and my hon. friends will find that they are altogether mistaken. I do not pretend to say that a great department cannot be imposed upon as any other business man is. There is not a business man in this parliament who has never been imposed upon, and the department is imposed upon at times. I will be very glad to have all these items investigated.

Mr. BELL. Does the hon. minister wish the House to understand that in passing an

account for a galvanized iron boiler his final court of appeal is his chief architect ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. BELL. His architect is supposed to be an authority on galvanized iron boilers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What am I going to do if the chief architect of a great department is not able to certify as to the purchasing of a boiler ; if he is not able to do that he is unable to do anything.

Mr. BROCK. This is one of the great troubles of this day labour government. It is quite possible to get over the difficulty and the hon. minister knows it. All he has to do is to ask for tenders. He can easily get tenders for boilers. There is not a plumber in Ottawa, or out of Ottawa, who is not willing to tender. As the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) says, these boilers are kept in stock by all first-class plumbers and there is no difficulty in getting them to tender. I think if the hon. minister would adopt business methods and mix less politics in the business of his department he would get better value.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) referred to some items in an account that he saw. The hon. Minister of Public Works said in reply that these accounts are certified to by certain officials. Here is an account for $811 paid to Mr. A. Laberge, Montmagny. It is certified right and signed by Mr. Langlois and Mr. Lapointe. Mr. Lapointe signs it by making his mark. It is certified still further by another gentleman named Martineau. First it is approved by Mr. Jarvis for $848 and Mr. Martineau signs the certificate saying :

I hereby certify that the above account is correct, &c., and that the prices named are fair and just.

It is the standard certificate. These three officers, and I intend to have some of them examined, say that at the city of Quebec, 163 pounds of putty are worth 8 cents a pound and that the price is fair and just and correct. If one of these gentlemen can only make his mark, I do not think he can purchase goods and know the value of them. There is not a man in this House that cannot go down town and buy putty for 2 or 3 cents a pound. There are several barrels of coal oil in this account at 32 cents a gallon and 2 pounds of white lead, Elephant brand, at $2.10 per pound, or $4.50. Surely the hon. minister will know that there is a rake off on goods purchased at these prices. Among the items for the quarantine station at Grosse Isle are two pairs of snow shoes at $3 a pair. Why do these gentlemen want snow shoes furnished by this government at $3 a pair ? So, I might go on. Perhaps, before the session is over, I will read this account in detail showing every item of that $811. There is hardly an item amongst them that will bear a fair comparison——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) kindly let me have that paper ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly. I have another one certified to in the same way commencing on the 7th July, 1900. Here is a bottle of Hennesy's brandy, and there are eight or nine of them through the account. On the 9th of July there was purchased a ton of chestnut coal for $8.50, eggs 15 and 16 cents a dozen during July when they were worth from 6 to 10 cents at the outside.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct. In July and August you can buy eggs at 10 cents a dozen. There is a barrel of granulated sugar, 306 pounds, at 6½ cents a pound. Everybody knows the price of sugar. Then, there are 7 barrels of coal oil at 32 cents a gallon for the oil and $1.25 for the barrel besides. This, in my opnion, accounts for the great increase in the public expenditure during the last four or five years. The hon. Minister of Public Works is asking for these items and he assures us that they represent the usual votes, but the fact is that where he is asking for $125,000 to-day, in 1895 and 1896 $90,000 would have been asked for the same services. I find the whole item, No. 163, amounts to $608,500, but if the hon. gentleman will turn to the estimates for 1896, the same item which was numbered 148 then, he will find that while he asks for $608,000, the same services were performed more efficiently in the former year for $436,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All the services provided for now were not there then.

Mr. TAYLOR. Deduct the Yukon and there is an increase of $95,200. The whole thing is accounted for by these excessive prices as in the case to which my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) referred in which three prices were paid for a galvanized boiler. The hon. Minister of Public Works says there are boilers and boilers. There are not two kinds of galvanized iron boilers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are more than two kinds.

Mr. TAYLOR. Every one knows what a galvanized boiler is. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) manufactures them, and he knows the price. It is by paying two or three prices to political friends that our money is wasted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, now, see how a man can be unwillingly unfair. Why, I have nothing to do

with that at all. That is a matter which belongs to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is the government all the same.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) says that I did this and I did that, and I am not responsible for this at all, because he will see on the face of it that the account is certified by Mr. Jarvis, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) charges me with having bought snowshoes and sugar. It is not a crime to buy snowshoes or sugar, but I have not bought the sugar and have not used the snowshoes. I am not guilty on this occasion, because I have done nothing at all.

Mr. POPE. The Minister of Public Works should not endeavour to get out of the responsibility at the expense of his colleague (Hon. Mr. Fisher). I can quite understand that even the Minister of Public Works would not like to assume responsibility for the Minister of Agriculture. I have no doubt that at this very moment the Minister of Public Works feels somewhat uncomfortable in finding himself on the floor of the House battling for the government while the Minister of Agriculture sits up aloft enjoying these pleasantries that can only be found in the gallery above. The Minister of Public Works undertook the responsibility of crossing the floor of the House to the gentlemen opposite, when he perhaps could have remained on this side in respectable company. But having crossed the floor he must take responsibility for his actions. Now there is a very serious matter connected with this vote. It is for quarantine stations, and it seems to me that we are spending all this money for the purpose of taking care of diseased and rotten immigrants from Europe.

Some hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. POPE. Yes, they are rotten with disease and unfit to associate with the citizens of Canada, and they are shut out of the United States. Here we are spending money trying to cure these miserable specimens of humanity, and when they are cured at our expense they cross over to the United States. Even if they remained in this country, it is a bad policy that we should advertise to the world that any one would be allowed to settle in Canada except a people who are morally and physically healthy. I believe that to a large extent this quarantine expenditure is for the purpose of taking care of these undesirable immigrants who come to Canada trying to find their way to the United States. It behooves the government to see to it that none but desirable immigrants should come here, immigrants who are fit to associate with us and to take their rank as good citizens. We should not advertise that Canada is a rendezvous for the outcasts of Europe.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That question is certainly worthy of consideration, and it can be properly discussed when the immigration vote is before the House.

Ottawa—public buildings—telephone service, $7,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Minister of Justice told us the other day that my telephone Bill did not cover the ground and that his did. If his Bill is going to be of any use in decreasing the cost of telephones, why are you taking an extra vote for telephones here ? What rate do you pay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have a special rate of $35 each instrument.

Mr. MACLEAN. But we have an increase in the vote for telephones here, and that does not carry out the promise that the Minister of Justice made when he told us that his Bill would reduce the cost of telephones to the public.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no increase in the price, but we are obliged to have an increased number of telephones because we have more public buildings than formerly.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does not the Minister of Justice intend to get a reduction of rentals under his Bill ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Minister of Justice has charge of that Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. I know he has, and the Minister of Justice should be here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is not far away, and when the Bill comes up it will be time to discuss it.

Mr. MACLEAN. If the Bill has the effect which the Minister of Justice promised that it would have, this vote should be decreased rather than increased.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the Bill has that effect we will not spend so much money as we do now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. While we are speaking of telephones, I may say that for the last week the telephone in the House of Commons has been out of order.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that when a member from room 6 wants to use the telephone he has to come around the building and then he is likely to find the messengers and pages using it. I should like to

have a telephone in room 6, or somewhere near there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We should have a telephone in room 6. Is there a telephone in room 16 ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, then, we must have the same thing in room 16.

Mr. BELL. How many additional telephones have you this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Seventeen or eighteen.

Ottawa public buildings—grounds, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am asking a little more this year. The appropriation my deputy minister informs me, used to be $9,000. If I remember rightly, it was only $5,000 when we took office. The great demonstrations which have been held here have injured the grounds very much, and I am asking $3,000 more this year, because I want to improve the grounds. I hope that next year I shall be able to decrease the amount.

Salaries of engineers, firemen, caretakers,&c. —Dominion public buildings, $88,500.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister define the duties of a caretaker of a public building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The duty of a caretaker of a public building is to take charge of it, to keep it clean and in a state of repair, and to give us notice if anything is wrong.

Mr. INGRAM. Who inspects the public buildings ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect and other officers. They do not inspect every building every year, however.

Mr. INGRAM. Some of the caretakers have a holy horror of water. It must be against their principles to use any water.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In what province ?

Mr. INGRAM. In the province of Ontario. If the inspectors were asked to have a little more water used in some of our public buildings, they might be kept a little cleaner.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman tell me what buildings are not kept clean ?

Mr. INGRAM. I would not like to single them out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend will write me a private letter about them, I shall be thankful to him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman explain this increase ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is due to the fact that we have a larger number of public buildings to look after.

Mr. WILSON. I understand that the caretakers do not take care of the different offices. I think there are some post offices where the postmasters are allowed a percentage of the box rents for keeping the office clean, while the caretaker is only expected to keep the lobbies and the outside parts of the building clean.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the hon. gentleman is now alluding to buildings which do not belong to us.

Mr. WILSON. No. Take, for instance, the public building in the town of Napanee. If I am correctly informed, it is not the duty of the caretaker to keep the inside of the post office clean, but it is the duty of the postmaster, who for that reason gets half the rent of the boxes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers tell me that my hon. friend is wrong—that Mr. Webster's duty is to take care of the public building and keep it clean, for which he gets $400, and if he has not done his duty we have not been notified of the fact.

Mr. WILSON. I think that the minister will find that there are printed instructions to the caretakers, and, if I am correctly informed, they are not obliged to do that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes, they are.

Mr. WILSON. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what the postmaster gets half the rent of the boxes for ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmaster looks after the collection of the rents, and in all post offices where the postmaster himself owns the building he gets all the rentals of the boxes ; but in the case of a building owned by the government, the postmaster gets an allowance for the trouble of collecting the rents.

Mr. WILSON. It is not a great deal of trouble for the postmaster to collect the rents if they all do it as the postmaster of Napanee does. A printed notice is put in each box that if the rent is not paid within a certain time, the box will be given to some one else. I understand that the postmaster is allowed half the rent ; and, although the building belongs to the country, I know that the postmaster has to clean the inside of it.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before we leave this vote for public buildings, I would like the Minister of Public Works to make an explanation in regard to telephones. The hon. minister says the price in Ottawa is $35.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is there a uniform price charged the government in all other cities ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have made a special arrangement in Ottawa, under which, instead of being charged two prices—one for private residences and the other for business telephones—we are charged the uniform price of $35 per telephone. Does my hon. friend want to know how much we pay elsewhere ?

Mr. MACLEAN. When we are obtaining a uniform price for Ottawa, why not have a uniform charge for the public service throughout the Dominion ? I hope that when we come to regulate the rentals of these telephone companies, as they will be regulated by the Bill going through the House, the public will secure the best possible rate in the same way. If you get a telephone service in Ottawa at $35, the country should not pay much more.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have very few telephones outside of Ottawa. We have discouraged their use as much as possible in our public buildings elsewhere. We have not more than ten or twelve outside of Ottawa, and in Ottawa we have made a special arrangement.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the company not make enormous charges elsewhere ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They charge a great deal, and I am not here to defend them.

Mr. MACLEAN. If the jurisdiction over the telephone companies should fall into the hands of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, I hope that the hon. minister will be assiduous in trying to get the public rates reduced. If the government gets a cheap rate of $35 in Ottawa, the public should get a similar rate all over the country.

Arnold's Breakwater, Nova Scotia, $1,700.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to some matters in connection with public works in Nova Scotia. There is no doubt at all that the harbour and river service in Nova Scotia requires a considerable amount of appropriation, and I am not finding fault with the general principle that our harbours and rivers should be assisted, but from information in my possession, some of the money expended during the past few years has been little better than absolutely wasted. Of course, I have no personal knowledge, but the information given me comes from an entirely unprejudiced source—from political friends of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Finance, in whose constituency—I refer to the Minister of Finance—a good deal of this expenditure has been made. Take the xpenditure for the purpose of cutting a canal between a lake at Black Point in the county of Shelburne or Queen's—I do not know which—and tidal water. The information given me by a gentleman, who has personal knowledge, is that the project was to cut a canal between tide-water and the lake for the purpose of affording shelter to fishermen. The project had been reported on years ago adversely by the engineer in charge, Mr. Dodwell. That is the information given, not by Mr. Dodwell, but by this gentleman to whom I refer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no Black Point in our books. Is there any other name by which the place is known ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The harbour at Black Point near Lockeport. It seems that afterwards a gentleman by the name of Locke, a civil engineer, who was placed in charge of a portion of the south shore, reported favourably on the construction of this canal. Mr. Dodwell had said it was no use undertaking the work because the bottom of the lake was higher than tide-water, and the construction of the work could not possibly result in any advantage to the fishermen; but under Mr. Locke's report, the canal was cut at considerable expense, and it was found that the bottom of the lake was above tide-water, so that the water simply ran out of the lake and the expenditure was absolutely thrown away. This is worse than waste of public money, and the Minister of Public Works should inform the House whether or not the statement I have made is correct.

I am informed also that the breakwater at Port Latour, on which some $10,000 has been expended, is not of the least service to those it was intended to benefit. The hon. Minister of Finance may have some personal knowledge with regard to these matters. These statements are very widely spread throughout Nova Scotia, particularly along the south shore, and do not tend to increase confidence in the minister of public affairs at Ottawa.

I am also informed that the breakwater near Port Mouton, west of Liverpool, which costs some $20,000, was nearly all washed up on the beach the first winter, and is of no practical service.

Then there is the work at Clark's harbour, in reference to which a very strong supporter of the Minister of Finance broke out into song in a paper called the 'Coast Guard.' I do not know whether his verses have ever been brought to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I had the pleasure of reading them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sure my hon. friend must have been favourably impressed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend might give them to us again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not undertake to give the whole of the song, but only a couple of stanzas :

Coast Guard.

Wot's that up thar in Skote P'int Creek,
That good half mile o' stone an' stick ?—
Dear Christian friends pray tell me quick !
Wae that, by golly,
Is wot we call a spes'men brick
O' Fieldin's folly.
* * * * *
The only trade o' any note
That sich a structer can permote
Is catchin' all the ice afloat
W'en tides is swift
An' holdin' every cranky vote
From goin' adrift.

This gentleman, who is said to be a political friend of the Minister of Public Works, seems to have very strong impressions as to the purpose for which this structure was erected.

The wharf at Gunning Cove, which cost upwards of $3,000, is regarded as of such little importance by the people in that vicinity that they have not even taken the trouble to open a road to it from the public highway, and practically do not use it at all. These five public works are works with regard to the expenditure on which there is considerable feeling along the southern coast of Nova Scotia. The opinion is generally held that the money has been wasted to a great extent and that the works have not proved of the slightest public utility.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is very gratifying to me, Mr. Chairman, to find my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), taking such a warm interest in the affairs of Shelburne and Queen's counties. But it would be more gratifying if he would give us the source of his information. He tells us that he has no knowledge himself of these matters—a very proper observation—and then proceeds to give a statement of what somebody else says. But we are not favoured with the name of that somebody else, and we do not know whether his information is any more than that of the hon. gentleman which, he himself says, is nothing. If the leader of the opposition intends to impugn the propriety of these expenditures on the authority of a witness, he is bound to show the credibility of that witness, to let us know that he proceeds upon something more than mere hearsay statement of some one who is jealous because he did not get a job. We know that that sort of thing may occur in the case of any public work. The first public work that the hon. gentleman mentioned is not shown by that name in the accounts, and therefore I cannot deal with it. As to the work at Port la Tour, I desire to inform the hon. member that Port la Tour is one of the largest and most prosperous fishing settlements in the maritime provinces, and contributes more largely to the statistics of the Fisheries Department than any other settlement, except one, in the lower provinces. The people there wanted a breakwater for the protection of their harbour, and the government entered upon the consideration of the question of providing it. Of course, the breakwater could not be finished at once. The breakwater has not served its full purpose, because it is not completed. Where we can get an opportunity at once to complete the work, the amount is spent and the work completed. But I have been very modest in my demands upon my colleagues for public works in the district I have the honour to represent, and in many of these works we have to be content to construct them piecemeal, doing what we can one year and waiting for a further appropriation. It is, therefore, absurd to speak of a work not being sufficiently useful until the work itself is completed. Another work referred to by the hon. gentleman was that at Clark's Harbour. If there is a settlement that is distinctly a fishing settlement, it is that of Clarke's Harbour on Cape Sable Island. It ranks with Port la Tour as one of the most prosperous in the country. Of course no public work was ever constructed where there was not a difference of opinion as to the location, the engineering arrangements and the people employed on the work. The people in that section sent in a petition asking for the construction of a breakwater. After several years—for this matter was not decided upon in a moment—and after several small appropriations were made and found insufficient, the work was undertaken and carried out by a competent engineer. It is, I believe, a very useful public work, and it can be made more useful still by being extended further. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has spoken of an expenditure of $10,000. I am speaking from memory and subject to correction, but I do not think that $10,000 has been spent on any one public work in my constituency since I entered the government. There have been a number of small appropriations but none so large as this. The hon. gentleman referred to a Mr. Locke. It happens that 'a Mr. Locke' is a very intelligent and capable civil engineer who is in the employ of the Public Works Department. I know him very well. He belongs to one of the best known and the most highly respected families of Nova Scotia, the Locke family of the western part of the province. He was trained in the office of the department of the provincial engineer of Nova Scotia when I was Prime Minister of the province. I know that he is an intelligent and capable young man. He is employed as an assistant engineer in Nova Scotia. I have never heard a question raised throughout the province of Nova Scotia as to the way in which he discharged his duties. That he would

permit a dollar to be wasted on any public work under his control, I do not for a moment believe. I must decline to accept my hon. friend's statement. And, in justice to Mr. Locke, I protest against the idea that because some unknown correspondent raises the question whether money is wasted or not, we are to assume that there has been anything of that kind. I challenge the fullest investigation before the Public Accounts Committee as to the expenditure on all these works. In several instances it may be said that the works are not useful, but that is because the works have not been completed as it is intended to be. Every work has been designed to meet the wishes of the people, has been constructed in response to petition sent in, and after proper inquiry by an engineer representing the department. And I state in the fullest and most fearless manner that an investigation, if necessary, will prove that these statements are correct.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I venture to say that the question whether Mr. Locke is a good engineer or not has not much to do with the question before the committee. I was not making an attack on Mr. Locke's capability in respect to other matters. But I say that I have information from two sources—not from sources such as the hon. minister suggests, but from people who have no interest in public works——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Give the names.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They are not interested in public contracts at all, and one of them is a gentleman who is a political friend and supporter of the hon. minister. I have the authority of that gentleman for saying that the statements I have made are correct. I have given the hon. gentleman the information exactly as it was given to me by him. It does not make the slightest difference what the name of this gentleman may be—the question is whether the statements are true or not. That is it, the point we want to come to. But my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) desires to shunt this discussion to the question whether or not I am to give the name. I am not going to give the name, because it was given to me in confidence. But I am going to ask the Minister of Public Works to give information before this estimate goes through. And I will not wait for the Public Accounts Committee, as I want the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) to understand. I want information as to the harbour at Black Point, and I want to know whether it is true that the bottom of the lake proved to be above tide water and whether or not the expenditure of a large sum of public money proved to be a mere humbug.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What money ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The money expended to cut a canal from the lake to tide water.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How much ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is what I want to know. I do not carry the public accounts in my head. But we have ministers who are here to give us the information, and we will see that they give it. I wish information also concerning the expenditure at Gunning wharf. I wish to know how much that work has cost and also whether it is true, as I have been informed, that this work was of so little use that no public road has been opened to it from the highway near by. Then I desire information concerning the work at Port Mouton—how much that work has cost, and also whether a considerable portion of the work was washed up on the beach the first winter. Then I wish to know how much was expended on Clarke's Harbour. The hon. gentleman says there was no sum of $10,000 expended.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On any one work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to know how much has been expended on Clarke's Harbour, how much will be needed to complete it and of what public use it is at the present time. I wish the same information with regard to a harbour I did not mention, Wood's harbour. There is also the breakwater at Port la Tour. If the hon. Minister of Public Works will give us the facts in regard to these various expenditures, it will assist us in judging whether the statements which are freely made in the province of Nova Scotia with regard to these expenditures are correct or not. If they are correct, it is right that we should have the opportunity of criticising them. If they are not correct, it is right that public opinion should be assured on these points. Therefore, I trust that the Minister of Public Works will not find it inconvenient or burdensome, in putting through his estimates, to look into these matters which I have thought it my duty to bring to the attention of the House and to give us the information, so that we may know whether the statements made to me, made in good faith, I am convinced and by a man whose reputation in the province of Nova Scotia is as good as that of any member of this House, bar none, are true or not. If they are not true, I want to know in what particular they are inaccurate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers are taking note of every place that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has referred to and the information concerning these points will be brought down with pleasure. My hon. friend is mistaken in one point, at any rate, when

he says that $10,000 have been spent at Clarke's Harbour. That is a large fishing place. I undersand that the fishing industry in 1900 was worth in the vicinity of $450,000. We have spent to improve the harbour in that place the very moderate amount of $6,788, certainly there can be no great waste of public money there. As to that famous Black Point work, my officers do not know anything about it, it must be some other name, as it is certainly not in the estimates. But we will find it somewhere. Let me remind my hon. friend that the coast of Nova Scotia is, so to speak, a fishing coast. I have taken a deep interest in that coast, because I have been around it and have seen the fishermen at their arduous and interesting work. I say it is the duty of any government to take good care of those fishermen, they are one of the most important elements of the country. I invite my hon. friend not to listen to the jealous complaints of people who may not always be pleased with the public works that are being done. I know well how these complaints arise. Suppose you have in the estimates $2,000 for a harbour at Black Point. Well, there are people who live in the eastern portion of Black Point and others who live in the western portion. The eastern people would like to have the work there, and the western people would like to have it on their end, and the consequence is that somebody must be disappointed and displeased. I am free to admit that the works carried on in the maritime provinces are of a most difficult nature. We are working on the Atlantic ocean where the waves are very powerful, more powerful than any minister that I know. Works that are designed with the greatest care are destroyed. It may happen that one of these works has been damaged; it happens every day. I can assure my hon. friend that my staff of engineers in Nova Scotia is one of the best in my employ. Mr. Dodwell is a good, careful man, a capable, painstaking engineer. He has under him as one of the staff, Mr. Locke, who is also a very careful and capable man. While he may have made mistakes, it has not come to my knowledge that he has made any. Any how, I will be glad to bring down any information asked by my hon. friend. My hon. friend is perfectly within his rights in asking for that information, and my officers have taken note of every place in regard to which he wishes to be informed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The leader of the opposition is entitled to every possible information, though it may be a question whether this is the proper form of getting it, when it refers to works that are not under consideration, and for which no appropriation is asked. But we will not stand on that. I do not agree with my hon. friend that it is of no consequence who writes a letter. He says it is of no consequence who writes this letter, that it is only the statements with which we have to do. Well, testimony of every kind is to be considered with some regard to the person who testifies, and if the hon. gentleman brings forward statements here that works have been mismanaged and constructed where they have no value, works some of which are washed away by the first storm, it is of immense importance to know who makes this statement if we are asked to pass judgment upon it before we get any information. My hon. friend properly says he has no knowledge, and therefore he makes no statement on his own responsibility, and he does not give us any information. I say that until the information is obtained, until somebody is in a position to make a statement, it is not fair for my hon. friend to pass judgment on this matter and to say that a wrong has been done. He wants to know among other things whether some of the works have been washed away. I have no doubt it may be found that some parts of these works have been washed away. It happens that upon the Atlantic coast every great storm does some damage to our public works. I am constantly receiving letters from my constituents telling me that a certain work is damaged by the storm, and they hope repairs will be made. Does that prove that the work is useless, or that the engineer was incapable ? Nothing of the sort. I remember one case in the city of Halifax where a structure built by the late government was washed away because they failed to keep trains on it to steady it; an expensive bridge across the narrows was washed away in the storm. In every great storm we have on the Atlantic coast some damage is done to some public work. But the fact that damage has been done does not prove that the work was useless. It doest not even prove that the engineer failed in his duty in constructing the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works suggested that I should have consideration for fishermen on the coast. It is because I have consideration for these fishermen, and regard for them, that I do not want to see public money upon that coast expended in such a manner that it is of no use to them. These men along the coast can only expect a certain amount of public money to be expended for their relief, and if the large sums of money which are voted for that purpose are expended in such a way as to be of no use to them, the fishermen are the very persons who have a right to complain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If they do complain. Let us know who complains.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Therefore, I submit we are entitled for that reason to have the exact information which I have asked for from the Minister of Public Works. As to what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has said with regard to quoting names,

I still adhere to the opinion that if the information is given to me by a person in whose credibility I have a right to rely, that entirely justifies me in giving it to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, when the proper item is up for discussion, and to ask for information as to whether the statement made to me is correct. That is all I have done to-day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may add that we have received no complaint from those Black Point people. We will find where that place is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is said to be near Lockeport.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only complaint I have heard with reference to public works done in that region, was in the case of one piece of work, though I cannot exactly mention the locality. But I remember in one case where work was done on a sandy beach, and it did not stand a storm that came along. But no one said it could have been done in a different way. It was a small expenditure, a few hundred dollars. With that exception I never heard a complaint of that character in the whole two counties during the five or six years I have represented them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that that item be changed to read as follows : 'Little Harbour breakwater, opposite Arnold's Point.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) says it is near Lockeport. I think he is mistaken. This is a place between Shelburne and Lockeport, a fishing settlement of thirty or forty families. The engineer has found it more correct to say opposite Arnold's Point.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Arnold's Point is situated on the south-east extremity of Black Point, about 8 miles to the east of Brockport.

Item as amended, agreed to.

Boularderie Centre—wharf, $2,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much will this cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount of the contract is $4,850.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the necessity for this expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been asked for by the people of the county of Victoria in the fishing interests. Boularderie is in Victoria county, on the northern side of Boularderie Island, about 8 miles west of the Atlantic and 10 miles to the east of the entrance of Little Bras d'Or lake.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the total expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $4,850. It is under contract now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) has some personal knowledge in regard to this. It does not seem a sufficient reason that the people simply petition for it. If there is any commercial reason on account of which this wharf should be built we would like to have it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) That work is under contract, and will be finished about the end of June. There is a steamer running up and down tri-weekly through the Bras d'Or lakes, and this is a central place to bring the produce of the people to be shipped by the steamer to the markets in Sydney. This wharf is, therefore, for the accommodation of the farming community.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On Boularderie Island ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) In the central part of Boularderie Island.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work was applied for in 1899 by Mr. Murray, the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, and a petition was received numerously signed representing that there were pretty large commercial interests at stake. The government authorized me to go on with the work last year. The vote I am applying for this year is only to supplement the vote made by parliament formerly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have you a report from any of the officers of your department as to the necessity of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, before going on with work of this kind, we always have a survey made.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not a survey, but a report as to the cost of the work, or a report as to whether the work is necessary or not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a question of policy. The question of necessity is not a question to be decided upon by any public officer. The government are responsible as to the policy of carrying out public works. As to the cost we have in every case a survey made and a report.

Mr. KAULBACH. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether this wharf is completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is not completed yet.

Mr. KAULBACH. And there is no revenue from it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be completed June 30th.

Mr. KAULBACH. Is it intended that tolls shall be collected from the parties who are using the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As soon as the wharf is completed I transfer it to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and then the law is applied.

Mr. KAULBACH. I know of a number of works that are not giving any revenue at all to the country, and I merely asked the question in order that I might ascertain as to whether a work of this kind, which appears to be important, will give a revenue to the country or not.

Burlington—wharf, $3,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the explanation as to this vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Burlington, Hants county is, according to the note which I have placed in my hand, a prosperous farming settlement of 500 people, situated on the River Avon, about half way between Windsor on the south and Summerville on the north. That work was authorized to go on last year. I am asking this year for a revote of $2,000 and a new vote of $1,500 to complete the work. There have been petitions, of course, asking for this vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. minister not have any system or principle to go upon in building these wharfs ? I can name him twenty-five places in my own county where they would be very glad to have a wharf built, if there was any money available for the purpose, but I do not know that I would like to press, myself, for this expenditure in these places, because it might not perhaps be in the public interest that the money should be so expended. Is there any principle or system upon which the hon. gentleman goes in making these appropriations and building these wharfs ? Does he build a wharf at any place where a majority of the people send in a petition asking that a wharf shall be built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then what is the principle upon which he does go ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A Minister of Public Works receives a great many petitions and if he were willing to grant every one of them, he would have a great deal more trouble than he has now in putting his estimates through. But, my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), when he has been a minister—it will come some of these days—will know all about it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am anxious to know all about it now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am just going on to say that to him also. We receive petitions, bundles of them, and they are discussed before council. In every government the different provinces are represented by ministers, men who have the confidence of the people for the time being. The works that are deemed worthy of being granted are granted ; that is all. We discuss the position, we have the information and I supply reports. My duty is to supply reports on surveys, and so on. When I have supplied all the information to my colleagues as to the cost of different public works we grant those works that seem to be the most meritorious. It is a good principle. I do not see what else we could do.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A very broad and general principle.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, we are men of broad principle. I do not deny that at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. minister might do better by giving the reason that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) has given. It is for the purpose of remedying injustices which have been perpetrated on these constituencies by former governments.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have done that at times, and at other times, we have simply administered justice.

Cheticamp Point—wharf, $11,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That work is going to be given by contract and it is a very important work.

Cow Bay (Port Morien)—Repairs to breakwater, $10,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount expended upon that work. It must be very large.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $221,000 has been spent in the past on that breakwater. Of course it was mostly expended by the former government. When we took office this work was destroyed to a large extent and we are rebuilding it. I am glad to say that there is a revival of the coal industry there and we are carrying on this work to help the trade at that port.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the volume of trade carried on there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was a coal mine there which was closed and it is being opened up again by a powerful company. When I was there every house was closed up, but I am glad to say that there is a large trade in view now.

Mr. KAULBACH. What amount, is it expected, will be required to complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It depends on the part of the work we will rebuild, and on the trade that will develop. This year we will not spend of course

more than we are asking for. I have visited the work myself and it can be attended to day by day.

Mr. KENDALL. This breakwater is being built in order to afford necessary protection to the colliery works, and it will certainly require an expenditure of from $50,000 to $75,000 to finish it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the new company ?

Mr. KENDALL. It is an English company, the Newcastle Coal Company.

Mr. KAULBACH. How much does the coal company contribute to the construction of this work. We are told that it is for their benefit and I think they should contribute a large proportion of the cost.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) The breakwater belongs to the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would be the first time companies would be asked to build wharfs.

Mr. MACLEAN. We build our own wharfs in the west.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does the hon. gentleman say that they build all their own breakwaters in Ontario?

Mr. MACLEAN. The minister spoke of wharfs, not breakwaters.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, we will come to the Ontario items soon, and you will see some large sums voted for that province.

Mr. KENDALL. I may say that this breakwater in Port Morien affords the only place of shelter for vessels all the way from Louisburg to Sydney, a distance of fifty miles, and there is a very large coasting trade in that locality.

Drumhead Breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is Drumhead ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Drumhead is in the thriving county of Guysborough so ably represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser).

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will be the whole expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is estimated at $7,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the particular purpose of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to help the fishermen in their trade. These fishermen are carrying out a very useful and very difficult trade. I did not know much about that trade until I went there, and when I saw twenty boats in a storm not having a harbour, I thought that a few thousand dollars from the government was well invested in protecting the lives and the property and the trade of these men.

Friar's Head boat harbour, $600.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is Friar's Head ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Inverness. The total cost is estimated at $2,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What do you mean by boat harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is just precisely a boat harbour to protect the boats of the fishermen.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I might explain something with regard to this locality. This is a small harbour formed by a long ledge of rock jutting out in the sea, and at a certain angle with the coast, there is a gap in this ledge which lets the action of the sea in on this small harbour. It is to fill in this gap with cement and stone that this small sum of money is required and the work is being carried on successfully.

Herring Cove Breakwater, $1,500.

Mr. KAULBACH. Where is Herring Cove ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in the county of Halifax, represented by the hon. leader of the opposition and by another gentleman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad that we have reached Halifax county at last.

Iona wharf, $6,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the commercial purpose to be served by this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract price is $7,840, and the contract is expected to expire on the 30th of June, 1902.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there a steamer service ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Yes. When the draw on the Grand Narrows cannot be opened, this work is required so that the mails can be conveyed daily. At present the steamer has sometimes to return to Baddeck, because it is impossible to open the draw bridge.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—Larry's river—breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. In all these items there is evidence of a practice which has grown

up of voting a sum of money year after year without it being spent. I have said before, and I repeat, that I do not think it is a proper practice to continue voting money without a serious intention of spending it. If it is needed and we vote it, it ought to be spent. If it is not needed, this House should not be called on to vote it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On several occasions votes have been placed in the estimates without the department having full information as to the cost of the work to be carried out ; and I must say that that is so in this case.

Mr. SPROULE. Why should it be so ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a little difficult to say why, to be frank. Petitions are put in asking for works, and then a certain amount is placed in the estimates. Any man who has passed through the Department of Public Works knows that we have so many works that it is quite impossible to have surveys in every case, and I do not like to start a work without having full information with regard to it.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister's explanation is the very strongest argument for my contention. This House should not be asked to vote money, nor should the government put an item in the estimates unless it is done upon intelligent grounds, that is, with a comprehensive knowledge of the locality and its needs, and what expenditure is requisite to give the people the convenience or the accommodation they require. That should always be available before the government asks the House to vote money. Another feature of the case which I have in view is this, that it seems to be too much the custom of the government to put items in the estimates for works in places where no work has been done, and for no better reason, so far as we can learn, than the fact that an application has been made by the member or by the people in the locality ; and then the minister states as a reason why the money is not spent, that he has not adequate knowledge of the locality to justify the expenditure, and he is withholding it until sufficient knowledge is obtained by means of preliminary surveys. I maintain that these preliminary surveys should be made before the money is voted, and then the minister could give the House the information which would justify the voting of the money. When that information is not available, it is a bad practice to put the items in the estimates year after year, because they are too often used as corrupting agencies in the hands of the government when elections are being carried on. I do not apprehend there is any likelihood of that taking place in this case ; but when we see the large number of items of this kind that come down year after year, we are reminded of what use has been made of them in the past, and may be made of them in the future.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. FRASER. A word of explanation may be necessary. The engineer went down to this place last year and made certain investigations. Last fall there came a very heavy storm, and the engineer has not been able to make the additional survey that may be necessary ; but I saw him before I left home, and he said that by the spring that investigation might be made. The people are in very great need, and when this investigation is made, it may be necessary to spend the money.

Lingan, N.S.—Beach protection, $600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the work.

Little Bras D'Or, N.S.—wharf, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is under contract.

Livingstone's Cove, N.S.—to complete wharf, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Antigonish and under contract.

Lower Cove, N.S.—breakwater, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Cumberland county, on the Bay of Fundy side.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of the breakwater ?

Mr. LOGAN. The Atlantic Stone company is developing a big quarry there, and this breakwater is intended to protect the schooners while loading stone.

Minudie, N.S.—wharf, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Cumberland county.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the necessity of a wharf here ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To provide the accommodation required by a large population engaged in farming and fishing. They have to drive five miles to market, and this is intended to shorten the distance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They will carry their farm produce by water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly, there are boats and a ferry.

Neil's Harbour—breakwater, $14,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Victoria county and under contract.

New Harbour breakwater—repairs, protection slopes, &c., $6,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Last year there was an expenditure of $17,470 on this breakwater, according to the Public Works Report, and the government is now asking for $6,000 more. Two years ago, so unimportant was

this harbour that its location was entirely unknown, either to the Minister of Public Works or the hon. member representing the county, and it seems to me very strange that such a large amount should be expended on a place entirely unknown to those who live in that section of the country I think I am not mistaken when I say that up to the 30th June last there was expended, either on the harbour or the breakwater, $17,470. That seems a lot of money to spend at a place which was entirely unknown two years ago, or so little known that we could not get any information as to what part of the country it was in.

Mr. FRASER. I do not believe that the hon. gentleman would wilfully state what is not correct, namely, that the member representing the county did not know where that breakwater was.

Mr. HENDERSON. He could not tell us and he was in his place.

Mr. FRASER. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the 'Hansard,' he will find that when the discussion began I was not in, but that I came in afterwards and explained where the place was. When the vote was first asked for, there was not in the department as much information as I have, but that is easily explained. It was a place where the fishermen had to go ten miles on the one side and seven on the other, with their boats, before they could find shelter if there was a storm, and the work would not have cost so much only for a violent storm which interfered with the top part—the most severe storm, with one exception we have had in Nova Scotia within my recollection. This work has been of great benefit to the fishermen, not only at New Harbour, but on both sides, and when completed will enable them to carry on their fishing industry as they never could do it before. As to the knowledge of the locality, one can very well understand that there might not be much information in the department about a fishing village on the coast of Nova Scotia. But the place is well known in our part of the county as one of the best sections in the county.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for his correction, but I think that perhaps my recollection of the matter is quite as clear as his, and I think it will be in the recollection of the Minister of Public Works that when I drew his attention to this harbour a year ago, the minister rose in his place and exclaimed: We have found it. Now, if it had not been lost, there would have been no occasion for the minister to inform us that he had found it. He well remembered the difficulty he had in trying to locate the harbour the previous year and was glad to announce that he had succeeded in finding it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We had some little doubt about this place a couple of years ago. I must admit that it was difficult for us that night to put our finger on the very point where New Harbour was located. The coast of Nova Scotia is very wide and long and my colleague and myself had some trouble before we could lay our finger on that spot, but we found it easily after the money was voted and spent.

Parker's Cove, N.S.—extension of pier, $4,700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Annapolis county.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you want the pier extended?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because the people complained that they had not sufficient accommodation and insisted on having more.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What part of the county is it in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. INGRAM. In the items respecting different breakwaters I find a charge for the wages of a 'conductor' and immediately following for a 'foreman.' What are the duties of a conductor engaged on these works?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Generally we have only one man employed, except where the work is large or there are two kinds of work calling for the services of different men. In some cases the foreman must remain to actually supervise the work, while it was necessary to have another man outside to buy the material. Whether they are called conductors or foremen makes no difference.

Mr. INGRAM. The men who are entered as conductors appeared to have received larger wages than the foremen. Here are conductors whose wages are $3.50 or $2.50 a day, while the foremen are paid $2.50 a day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To what works does the hon. member (Mr. Ingram) refer?

Mr. INGRAM. Porter's lake, Nova Scotia, dredging and breakwater, referred to at page V—160 of the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer explains to me that on that work there was cribbing to be carried on and also hand dredging—two different works altogether. That explains the employment of two men.

Mr. CLARKE. Are wages paid to these foremen fixed by the fair wages officer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. CLARKE. He does not go down that far ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, he has been in that region.

Mr. CLARKE. But he does not fix the wages scale ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On small works that has not been done yet. But there would be no objection.

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—Port George —breakwater, $2,300.

Mr. KAULBACH. I observe quite a number of estimates for different counties in Nova Scotia. Annapolis appears not to have been overlooked. Neither have Richmond, Guysboro, Victoria, Inverness, and other counties. The two counties west and adjoining Lunenburg, not excepted, or in other words all are included on the roll for benefits. But I am afraid that the Minister of Public Works has forgotten the most important part of the entire coast. He says he is very desirous of forwarding the interests of the fishermen. I wish to inform him that there is a county west of Halifax that is greatly in need of protection ; and, as he is a protectionist in other counties I hope he will be a protectionist in this one also. I refer to the county I have the honour to represent, Lunenburg. I wish my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to be informed on this subject, and I will take the trouble to give him any information possible. I may tell him that there is a long stretch of coast in St. Margaret's Bay where, for twelve or fifteen miles, there is almost a continuous town, house almost against house for that entire distance, with an immense population. I have been asking for a number of years for a breakwater for Mill Cove, St. Margaret's Bay. The property of the fishermen there is in jeopardy every time there is a storm. They have to fish in large boats ; smaller boats would not do because they are exposed to the open ocean. The breakwater would not only afford protection to the fishermen and their products, but it would also be a protection to larger boats coming there for a harbour of safety. I referred this afternoon to Cow Bay. As that is a place that has a large coal interest, and as that interest would be served very considerably, it should contribute to a structure of the kind that was referred to this afternoon. True, it is a harbour of safety for fishermen as well, that is, for fishing vessels. But there are very few that frequent that harbour or use that breakwater or that public wharf, as it may be called, except for the shipment of coal. For that reason, I think it is well worthy the government to ascertain for themselves whether it would not be advisable to call upon the coal interests there or those who have capital in the mines to contribute to that public work. Or, I would not object if the government went further and allowed every vessel going there and getting a cargo of coal to contribute to the revenue by the collection of a certain fee as a port charge. In that way, the exchequer would not be called upon for a very large amount of money. At all events, the fees would pay for keeping up the repairs and other incidental charges that might be occasioned, and thereby relieve the exchequer considerably of a large expenditure. Now, I would ask the minister if he will not take into consideration this important county of Lunenburg and contribute from the exchequer an amount sufficient to put a breakwater at Mill Cove. It is a structure that is much needed. If the hon. gentleman will make inquiries he will find that there is no structure on the coast from Cape North to Cape Sable that is more necessary than this that I refer to. As I have said, it is not only necessary to the safety of the poor fishermen and their property, but also to the safety of vessels going into that bay when, from stress of weather they are prevented from going farther.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think the department has received any petition from Mill Cove so far. I think it is the first time my attention has been drawn to the matter. But I will look into it.

Mr. KAULBACH. Does the hon. minister mean to say that I never made a request for this work to the Department of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember having received any petition.

Mr. KAULBACH. Petition. They have too much confidence in me to think of sending in a petition.

Mr. TOLMIE. And you forgot.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. minister forgets that I am the medium through which all these deals should be made, and it was made by me of his department on repeated occasions.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is not a bad medium, at the same time, if his constituents feel as keenly as he seems to do about it, I would advise him to get them to send a petition, and it will be carefully considered.

Mr. KAULBACH. If the minister will look through the archives of his department he will see a very long petition signed by nearly every fisherman of the place.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When was that petition signed ?

Mr. KAULBACH. I would not like to say.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would like to know.

Mr. KAULBACH. I would not like to name the particular time I made the appeals of his department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it was about ten years ago. I would like to know just now when it was sent.

Mr. KAULBACH. According to the hon. gentleman's own words, there is all the more need for his work being performed now. During the time I represented the county when the other government was in power, I got a very fair proportion of benefits for that country. But this proposed 'Mill Cove' breakwater is greatly needed, and was promised to me before the old government went out of power. Now, I think those works should be carried on according to a certain principle, and I would not like to be too severe upon the hon. gentleman and say that he is making an exception against me in this particular instance. but I will express the hope the hon. gentleman will recognize my appeal in the early future and grant my request.

Washabuck Centre--wharf, $5,500.

Mr. BELL. As this is the last item under the head of harbours and rivers, I would like to call the attention of the minister to the necessity for some work on the wharfs at Pictou island, in Pictou county. During last session I called the attention of the minister to this matter on two occasions, and I understood from him at that time that the matter had been also brought to his attention by other persons. During the recess I wrote him twice, the last time in the fall, and he then promised me that out of the general vote for the lower provinces the necessary work would be done, and that he would send down an engineer and examine it. As I am informed, the wharfs there, which have cost some thousands of dollars, are in such a position that a severe storm would completely destroy them, which would involve an expenditure by the department over which the hon. gentleman presides of some thousands of dollars to replace them, as they must be provided. The wharf in question is situated on an island with a population of about 100 people, who have no other means of communication with the mainland than by their boats, and they must have a wharf in order to enable them to land. I would like the minister to make a note of this matter, and take care to preserve the works from destruction.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that I have authorized an expenditure, if my officers remember right, of $800 for the work to which my hon. friend refers. Mr. Millidge, our engineer, has been authorized to go on with that work. The chief engineer informs me that instructions have been issued to him to procure all the materials that are required, and the work will be done before the 1st of July.

P. E. I.—harbours and rivers—Canoe Cove, breakwater, $1,500.

Mr. KEMP. Last session when the estimates were under consideration for Prince Edward Island, the matter was brought to the attention of the House concerning a tax levied by Prince Edward Island on persons from other provinces who desired to do business there. The matter was very earnestly considered, and I have only to refer to the remarks which fell from some hon. members opposite to show the importance they attached to it. The member for Victoria said :

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I entirely endorse the remarks of the last speaker (Mr. Kemp). I believe that there should be no restriction of any kind on trade between one part of the Dominion and another. We who profess to lean towards free trade ought to feel ashamed that there should be a province in the Dominion which would levy a mean tax of this kind. It is not to the credit of Prince Edward Island, that dear little island, that such a tax should exist. I believe that if a proper appeal were made to the proper legislature, they would take steps to have it repealed, because it is a tax that should never have existed and the sooner it is wiped out of existence the better.

The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) said :

Hon. members have spoken of the tax on commercial travellers in Prince Edward Island. I am as much opposed to that tax as any hon. gentleman present. I think it is about as small a piece of legislation as one can imagine, and I am ashamed that a province, which lies next to my own, should pass such a measure. Perhaps the fact that the province of Prince Edward Island did not get what it was entitled to from this parliament created the necessity for this legislation, but that is the only defence that can be set up for it.

Then the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said :

I am not in a position to pronounce any judgment now one way or the other, but the matter is engaging the close attention of the hon. Minister of Justice.

Now I understand that this tax, although illegal and unconstitutional, still exists, though it is within the power of this government to render it ineffective. Suppose the province of Ontario should undertake to enforce a tax of that kind upon those of other provinces, which, according to the amount of business to be done would amount to about $500, it would be almost impossible to enforce it without a regiment of soldiers. Yet this illegal tax has been allowed to exist, the government have not taken the necessary steps to cancel it. It is looked upon by commercial bodies throughout this country as a very obnoxious tax, and I would like to have the views of the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) upon it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not asked, I suppose, to give my views as

to the legislation in question, because I have not had occasion to look into it either at the time the legislation was passed or recently. All I can say about it is that in the ordinary course this legislation, after it was passed, came under the notice of the Governor in Council, and it was examined, as is customary, by officials of the Department of Justice and a report was made by the minister. After that report, the Council thought fit to allow the law to go into operation. But I think my hon. friend should bear in mind that while the law has been allowed to go into operation, it is still open to those interested to bring the matter before the courts. Of course, if the law is ultra vires, the powers of the provincial legislature has not gained anything by the lapse of a year in force or in strength and if the law is ultra vires the courts will pronounce upon that point and declare it to be so.

Mr. KEMP. I may say to the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) that the right hon. Prime Minister expressed himself thus in regard to bringing this before the courts :

> I will tell my hon. friend this contract is between the province of Prince Edward Island and the Dominion, and we can certainly interpret the contract ourselves and make an agreement upon it. There is no third party concerned. If there were a third party whose interests were affected we could not do it and we would have to go to the courts.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. Mr. Chairman, I know something of the Act referred to, and while perhaps it is not as popular as some other Acts, the legislature of Prince Edward Island thought proper to pass it some years ago. No tax is popular. They have collected that tax for a great many years. I take it that it must be constitutional of else some of the commercial men who are proclaiming against it from time to time would have wiped it out of existence long ago. However, it does not seriously affect the commercial men coming to Charlottetown or to other points in Prince Edward Island. I notice that we have about four hundred a year coming over there and paying in about $20 each, or about $8,000 in all. It may be we should raise the money in some other way, but we have not thought proper to do so, and the tax still remains, and so far as I can see, is likely to remain. I do not know that I can say anything further. The hon. Minister of Justice has spoken and it is open to those who object to say whether or not it is unconstitutional, and if it be so to have it wiped off the statute-book later on.

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say in connection with this matter, that I think the imposition of this tax on commercial travellers is a disgrace to the province of Prince Edward Island. We desire to trade with the other provinces. We were satisfied when we entered into confederation that we could sell our products in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec or Ontario, without having any tax imposed upon us, and I therefore say that it is extremely wrong that because these commercial travellers come down from the upper provinces to sell their goods in Prince Edward Island they should be taxed for the purpose of raising a revenue for that province. I say it is entirely wrong and from the beginning, although the hon. gentleman (Mr. Farquharson) who has just spoken, is responsible in a large degree for the imposition of this tax, I have believed that it was unconstitutional. I do not think we can place a bar between provinces, one trading with the other. I think it is wrong and unconstitutional and I hope that the hon. Minister of Justice will, in the decision he is about to bring down, show that this tax on commercial travellers is an unconstitutional and wrong tax.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the statement that the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) so emphatically made that this Act is illegal is probably too strong. The propriety of the Act is one thing, its legality is another thing, and this is just one of those questions upon which prominent lawyers have entertained differences of opinion. Whether the tax comes within the section of the British North America Act respecting taxation, or whether it is an interference with trade and commerce, is just one of those questions on which you might get a very distinguished lawyer from Toronto or Montreal to give you an opinion on either side, and one would have just as much chance of being right as the other. I am not justifying the tax upon its merits, but very distinguished members of the legal profession have held that the Act is entirely legal. That will ultimately have to be determined by the courts. I merely state that there are these two divergent opinions in regard to it.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the Justice Department here given any opinion ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Act has been allowed to go into operation. It has been deemed inexpedient to disallow it. Similar Acts I think have been in force in other provinces.

Mr. HACKETT. Is the work going on at Canoe Cove ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is going on now, and it will be completed in a short time. The vote for which we are now asking will complete the work.

Mr. HACKETT. Is it being done by contract or day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Tenders were asked and we received only

one, but it was so high that we could not accept it and we went on by day labour, doing the work at a much cheaper rate. The work will be completed out of the vote that we are applying for now.

Mr. HACKETT. In how many papers did the hon. Minister of Public Works publish an advertisement calling for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say offhand, but we advertised in the usual way, in the papers we usually advertise in in the maritime provinces. I will give my hon. friend later on, if he wishes it, the names of the papers.

Mr. HACKETT. It is a most unusual thing in the province of Prince Edward Island, when you call for tenders for a public work, that you can only receive one tender, and I think that the hon. minister ought to be able to state how many papers he placed the advertisement in and during what time the notice was inserted in these papers. I see by looking in the Auditor General's Report that it cost $100 for this advertising, and I am confident that if the hon. gentleman had advertised in Prince Edward Island and made it known that this work was in contemplation, he would have received more than one tender. Under these circumstances the hon. gentleman ought to state all the facts in connection with this advertising.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no doubt that we advertised in the usual way.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. I can justify the hon. Minister of Public Works in regard to the Canoe Cove Breakwater. He advertised twice and I saw the only tender that came in. It was unreasonably high. The work is being done by day's labour, and it is being done with great care. I think the work is necessary and that later on it will prove to be useful. I am sorry that the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Hackett) is rather opposed to it.

Mr. HACKETT. I fully agree with the last suggestion in connection with the necessity of the work. It is a very necessary work. I know the locality very well, and I know the work is a very necessary one, but what I complain of is that the contractors of Prince Edward Island did not have a fair opportunity of tendering for this work. When the election was pending and when the hon. gentleman who formerly represented West Queen's, was about to be elevated to the Supreme Court bench, it was known that a vacancy would occur and the hon. gentleman who now represents that riding (Mr. Farquharson) has been using that work for the purpose of gaining support and carrying his election.

Cascumpec Harbour—closing opening through beach, $2,000.

Mr. HACKETT. What progress has been made in regard to this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is located in the riding of my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett).

Mr. FRASER. That is throwing money away.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no; only that the work, I am very much afraid, will involve a large expenditure of money. We have spent a pretty large amount of money there. The total expenditure to December last was $17,561.19. Now the total estimated cost of the proposed work is $3,500. We want $1,500 more to complete the work. Instructions have been given to Mr. Egan to go on with the work, but as on some other occasions, he has not been able to do so. The work will be carried on in the ordinary way.

Mr. HACKETT. The minister has stated that $17,500 had been expended on Cascumpec harbour, but that is altogether apart from the present work. About three years ago, owing to freshets and high tides the sea broke through the sand hill separating Cascumpec bay from the gulf and allowed a great deal of water that should pass through the main channel to go through this inlet. It was necessary that the whole body of water should be concentrated on the main channel because the more water there is concentrated on a sand bar the better will become the channel. It was proposed three years ago in the estimates to take a vote to close up that inlet. That money has never been expended. At election time you will hear the Liberals standing on the platforms and saying that the government is spending a large sum of money for public works, but the people are humbugged. For three years this $2,000 have appeared in the estimates and not a dollar has been spent yet. Recently the Ottawa correspondent of the 'Charlottetown Patriot,' the government organ, telegraphed that $22,000 had been placed in the estimates for improving Cascumpec harbour. How is it that we have only $2,000 here now ? The Ottawa correspondent multiplied the vote by ten, and then added the $2,000 of the actual vote of last year, and so it was an easy thing for him to figure out the $22,000. What is the use of putting appropriations in the estimates unless you expend them. Do not endeavour to mislead the people like that. I trust that the minister will see that the $2,000 is now expended, and expended either under the supervision of a good foreman or let by open tender.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find myself at times in very embarrassing positions. When I spend money my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) reproaches me with spending too much, and when I do not spend money he is mad at me. I have always endeavoured to be prudent. When the vote was first placed in the estimates I admit that I had not all the information that was required, but I have the information now,

and I can assure my hon. friend that the money will be judiciously expended. Does he object to the expenditure of that money ?

Mr. HACKETT. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If 'not at all' then let the vote pass. I want the vote to go through in order to spend the money in the hon. gentleman's county. I cannot be accused of being a partisan because I am spending the money in the county of my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) and he is not a strong partisan of ours. I am doing the right thing by him and I hope he will do the right thing by me and not ask any more questions.

Mr. HACKETT. I do not find fault with the minister for expending this money because it is very necessary, but what I do complain of is that it should be put in the estimates and not expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, this time it will be expended.

Mr. HACKETT. All right.

Creosoted timber for general repairs to wharfs piers and breakwaters, $2,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is this creosote timber prepared ; I do not think it can be procured in this country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry that we are obliged to import this timber. We have contemplated for some time establishing a creosoting plant, but we have not done so. We may have been wrong in not doing so, but I would like to have an expression of opinion of the House on the subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What would it cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would cost between $35,000 and $40,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The reason I am making the inquiry is that there has been a resolution passed recently by the Halifax Board of Trade suggesting that some encouragement might be given to the establishment of a plant for that purpose in one of the maritime provinces. I have not had an opportunity to investigate the subject at all, and I do not know if it would be practicable, but it is the opinion of some of these gentlemen who have considered the subject, that the government should see whether or not it would be in the interest of the country to give encouragement to such an establishment in Canada. Of course, I suppose it would depend very much on the cost of the plant which the minister says would be $35,000 or $40,000. These gentlemen seem to think they have facilities to do the work there, and it is a matter that should have the attention of the government. I know there is a great deal of this timber used in public works around the province of Nova Scotia. It is rendered necessary as I understand by the presence of worms in some of the harbours which destroy in a very few years timber that is not treated in this way ; whereas creosoted timber is impervious to the attacks of worms for a very considerable period. Could the hon. gentleman give us an idea of how much of this timber is used in the public works of Canada in the course of the year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) says. The question has been discussed several times since I have been in office here. Timber of this kind to the value of about $70,000 is used in the Public Works Department. If we had a plant, more than timber would be used. For instance, creosoted railway ties last longer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax. Is that quantity used by the Public Works Department alone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is some used in the construction of piles for railway bridges and possibly there is some used in the other departments of the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the minister could tell us how much of this timber is used altogether in the public service of Canada, it might be useful information to those gentlemen who propose to engage in this business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say how much is used altogether. Speaking for myself, I think we should have an establishment of that kind. There is a large work at Cape Tormentine that has been destroyed because it has been built with timber that was not creosoted. It is a question of money again, but since the leader of the opposition has called my attention to the question, perhaps I will ask my colleagues to look more carefully into the matter when the supplementary estimates are discussed. It is a very important question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What these gentlemen had apparently in mind was the establishment of some such plant by private enterprise. What the minister seems to have in mind is the establishment of a plant under a department of the government. The advantage of doing it by way of private enterprise of course would be that a supply in that case would be available for private operations throughout the country. I suppose that more or less of this timber is used outside of the requirements of the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think so.

Mr. KENDALL. There is a considerable quantity used.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suppose that people who construct wharfs and works of that kind in the maritime provinces would require some of it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall would know as to this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If such a plant be established by private enterprise I would make it my duty to buy in Canada every piece of creosoted timber that we would want. I would only be too glad to do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear,

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) There is not a wharf or breakwater that has been built but that a large quantity of this timber is used. Perhaps the largest wharf in the Dominion is now being built at Sydney by the Nova Scotia Steel Company, and they have imported a whole steamer load of this timber, but it will not be sufficient for them. The only place that this pine can be prepared successfully in the Dominion of Canada, would be, I think, around Quebec, because I do not think that we have the quality and quantity of pine in Nova Scotia that would be sufficiently large for the requirements of timber prepared in this manner. I think the subject is well worthy of the consideration of the Minister of Public Works and the other members of the government as to whether we shall not prepare this timber in our own country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) It would not only be used by the government but by other people who are building wharfs and other works in connection with shipping.

Souris, Knight's Point—strengthening of breakwater, &c., $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Under contract.

Summerside Harbour—breakwater, $35,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Under contract ; the work going on.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what progress is being made with this breakwater. I understood that it was to be completed last year, and I further understand that the plans are not workable, and that in consequence the contractors are having a great deal of difficulty in the construction of the breakwater. I would like to know what is being done, and when the breakwater is likely to be completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans are all right and workable. The contractors, Messrs. McDonald & Moffat, of Sydney, have not, however, made the progress we hoped they would make. They may be a little slow, but still I feel that they could carry on the work with more activity than they have displayed. We have notified them that they must go on with their work.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Have you any idea when this breakwater will be completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer tells me that if the contractors apply the energy they should apply, the work can be completed in one year. Now, these gentlemen must go on with their work. If they do not do so, we might have to have recourse to urgency measures. We might have to take the work from them.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have in my hand a copy of a memorial, the original of which I understand has been sent to the Department of Public Works ; and copies, I believe, have also been sent to the other Prince Edward Island members. This memorial reads as follows :

To His Excellency the Governor General in Council :

The memorial of the undersigned committee, appointed at a meeting held at Cape Traverse, Prince Edward Island, on January 6th, 1902,

Respectfully showeth, that the meeting above mentioned was largely attended by influential and representative men of Prince and Queen's counties, and after full discussion unanimously adopted the following resolutions :

Moved by Dr. Dougherty, seconded by Major Clark, and resolved, that this meeting do hereby memorialize the Federal government to put a sufficient sum in the estimates of this coming session of parliament for the construction of a pier at some suitable place on the Cape Traverse side of the Straits of Northumberland so that terminal facilities may be had here for the navigation across the straits winter and summer.

Moved by Mr. H. Crockett, seconded by Capt. Thomas Howatt and resolved that parliament be petitioned at once to make provision for the construction of such extra pier work as will thoroughly equip and protect the Tormentine pier for all the purposes of winter and summer navigation.

Your memorialists were instructed by the meeting at which they were appointed to bring to your notice that Prince Edward Island has long suffered greatly from the want of daily steam communication with the mainland to which the island is entitled by the terms of union with Canada :

That the winter routes of communication between the island and mainland, from Georgetown to Pictou where the ss. 'Minto' is now plying, and from Summerside to Cape Tormentine where the 'Stanley' is now at work, have been frequently interrupted, sometimes for a week or more at a time, causing great inconvenience because of the detention of passengers, mails and freight ;

That hence it is especially desirable that another route for one of the winter steamers be tried, and your memorialists, and those for whom they speak, believe that the route from Cape Traverse, Prince Edward Island, to Cape

Tormentine, N. B., being but eight miles in length, and because at or near this place the floating ice separates at the turn of the tides, affords not only the shortest but the most convenient and practicable route for winter navigation between the island and the mainland ;

That because of the want of terminal facilities on the island side this route has never been tried by the government steamers in winter, and has been also left unused in summer, notwithstanding the large outlay made by the Dominion in constructing and improving the pier at Cape Tormentine, and in constructing the Cape Traverse Branch Railway, which important public works in no way fulfil the objects for which they were constructed ;

That, therefore, your memorialists urge upon your Excellency and your honourable council that a sufficient sum be granted to provide the required pier and terminal accommodation on the Cape Traverse side of the straits and for such further improvements at Cape Tormentine as will enable navigation to be opened and continued by this route winter and summer, and as a highway for interprovincial communication.

And as in duty bound your memorialists will ever pray.

EPHRAIM BELL,
DONALD MATHESON.
F. SCHOEFER,
Committee.
W. W. DOUGHERTY,
Secretary.

This document, I believe, was accompanied by a largely signed petition—some 800 signatures, including the names of some of the most influential men in Queen's and Prince counties. The petitioners state that as the Cape Traverse branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway runs through a populous country and serves a prosperous people, the purposes of the railway are to a great extent nullified by the fact that there are no terminal facilities. It is true, a wharf was built at Cape Traverse at considerable expense ; but unfortunately it was put at the wrong place, and for the last few years practically no work has been done on it, except for a week or so before the last election, and the work was stopped a day after the election. However, the best authorities there are of opinion that a suitable place for the construction of a wharf can be had near Cape Traverse, along by Carleton Point, and this petition asks that the minister place a sufficient sum in the supplementary estimates to guarantee this work going on. I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries understands that this is the most natural route for steamers in both winter and summer, because they have not the difficulties to overcome that are encountered in going to Georgetown. The distance across the channel to Cape Tormentine is only 8 miles ; but from the nature of the ice on the New Brunswick side, it is almost impossible for a steamer to land, especially in the condition in which the pier is now. The idea of the petitioners is that a suitable wharf should be built at Cape Traverse, for both summer and winter navigation, and that a fery should be established there. A great deal of produce has to be brought down the line to Charlottetown or Summerside to be shipped across, and if the facilities were provided which were contemplated when the Cape Traverse branch was built, there would be a vast improvement in the trade of that section. The minister has no doubt received and considered this memorial, and I would like to have some word from him as to what he intends to do about granting the prayer of this petition by placing a vote in the supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is asking me, if I understand him correctly, to place in the supplementary estimates an amount of money to provide accommodation at Cape Traverse, I remember receiving a petition to that effect. My hon. friend has spoken of elections. It is very seldom that we do not hear that word elections in connection with any work on Prince Edward Island. What are the facts ? Under the late administration there was about $275,000 spent at Cape Tormentine. That is a large amount of money. The work was built with improper materials, and with timber which was not creosoted. Twelve months after the work was completed it was destroyed. I suppose it was not an election work ; it was not a very good work, at any rate. At Cape Traverse there was another work built under the late regime. I do not recriminate ; I simply state the facts. There has been about $40,000 spent at Cape Traverse on a wharf which my hon. friend has just said was badly located. Now he wants me to put in the supplementary estimates an amount of money to provide accommodation elsewhere. I would like very much to have his views as to the location of the works in the maritime provinces.

I am informed that the steamer 'Stanley' has been trying to do the service during the whole winter of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, but has not worked very well. This very work at Summerside, on which we have embarked, is intended to provide accommodation for that winter service. We are doing our best, and cannot experiment in two or three places at the same time. We cannot carry out experimental work right and left in that way. I would be very glad to do all I can for that interesting island, but we have to spend a pretty large amount on that winter service, and must know exactly where we are before incuring further expenditure.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Two wrongs do not make a right, and the fact that mistakes have been made——

Mr. FARQUHARSON. Hon. members perhaps do not quite understand how the island is situated with regard to this matter. We are separated from the Nova Scotia shore by about eight miles of water. On the Cape Tormentine side a large amount of

money has been spent, and it will be necessary to spend more money to complete the work there. On the Cape Traverse side little or nothing has been done. There is no ferry at this crossing but railways on either side and at either terminus. To go to the capital by water from Pictou over the route now followed, or from Cape Tormentine, is a distance of forty or forty-five miles, and the hon. minister will understand how willing we are to have that reduced to eight miles. Many people, especially tourists, do not want to cross so much water, as the crossing is very rough particularly in the fall, and we are anxious to have distance reduced. I am in sympathy with what the hon. member (Mr. Hackett) has said. I believe that in the near future our government must see its way clear to place an amount in the estimates in order to provide for summer and winter ferry at that point. That is absolutely necessary, and when other provinces are receiving benefits which are denied our little province, we have a right to insist on that being done and to combine in forcing our claim on the government, no matter how we may differ in local matters. I am satisfied that in a few years there will be a ferry traversing that eight miles, and thus save the forty miles travel which at present has to be undertaken. Why should we go forty miles when we can shorten the distance to eight, and when there is railway accommodation on either side. We are asking for a wharf at Cape Traverse. Perhaps the hon. minister may not see his way clear to give it to us this session, but it will have to come in the near future no matter what government is in power.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very thankful for the information given me and will give more attention than ever to this important question. If it be true, as I hope it is, that communication between the island and the mainland can be shortened to eight miles, there is no government which can refuse to undertake that work, but there must be some obstacle in the way or it would have been done long ago. However, we are in a century of progress, and I will give my best attention to the statements just made. I will have my officers go again into that important question, and if it can be done, I will pledge myself to do it.

Mr. HACKETT. I am very much pleased indeed to hear the statement of the hon. minister because I know that when he makes a promise of that kind he means to keep it. I believe it will not be very long before government works are constructed at Carleton Point, Prince county, for the purpose of maintaining winter and summer communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I do not want to minimize what the hon. gentleman has done with regard to public works in the island, but to impress upon him the necessity of completing the work he has begun.

We may disagree, and we may say things that are pretty sharp sometimes. But I want to say that when the hon. gentleman tells us that he will do a thing, he will do it. Yesterday, in the discussions in this House we had a gale blowing from the prairies of the North-west; this evening we have a breeze from the east, from the province of Prince Edward Island. I am pleased indeed to find that the hon. minister is paying so much attention to our remarks. We are a small province, but we claim that we are as intelligent and as bright as any people in the Dominion of Canada. We are only asking for our rights as guaranteed us by the terms of confederation. Now, you have two steamships running to keep up communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. They run at times for forty or fifty miles in floating ice. If the government will construct a pier at Carleton Point, it would make it possible to keep up that communication. I trust the hon. minister, if he can not see his way clear at the present time to construct this pier, will keep it in view as his ultimate object. By this means the service will be kept up from Cape Tormentine to Cape Traverse, running to Carleton Point, winter and summer. In that way, you will solve the problem of winter communication and satisfy the people of Prince Edward Island. I am glad that the hon. member for West Queen's (Mr. Farquharson) has, in almost his maiden effort, in this House raised his voice in favour of this route. We call upon him to continue to support us in this matter.

Public Works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—New Brunswick—Bay du Vin—to complete reconstruction of wharf, $4,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the contract for this work been let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the contract was let, on the 27th of May, 1901, to Mr. Charles Ransborough.

Mr. FOWLER. I find certain charges respecting this work noted at page V-172 of the Auditor General's Report. Have these charges been incurred since the contract was given ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that certain repairs were done outside of the contract, and it may be to these that my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) refers.

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

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount is $7,745.

Mr. GANONG. Referring to page V-172, of the Auditor General's Report, I see that the last items referred in this Bay du

Vin work are $31.31 for the King's Printer and $146.84 for advertising, making a total of $178.15. What do these two items of King's Printer and advertising refer to ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that they refer to the printing and advertising the specifications.

Black Brook (Logieville)—wharf, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is under contract.

Cape Tormentine—repairs to breakwater, &c., $15,000.

Mr. WILSON. There should be some explanation of so large an item as this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already said—perhaps my hon. friend was not in the House—that this work has cost a large amount of money. Unfortunately, material was used in the construction of this wharf, years ago, that should not have been used. Creosoted timber was not employed as it should have been. Now, we have to rebuild the work using rip rap to keep it from falling to pieces. We seek in this way to save a large work which has cost a great deal of money and which we hope will be used as one of the piers in connection with the winter service between New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. WILSON. Could not the hon. gentleman give us some idea what portion of this vote is for material and what portion is for labour ? There should be some explanation beyond the mere statement the hon. minister has given.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Superintendence will cost about $1,500. The balance will be spent in buying material. We are simply buying big stone and ripraping the whole work.

Mr. HACKETT. I am not going to criticise this vote, as I know how necessary the work proposed is. But I would like to call the attention of the hon. minister to the need for dredging along the outside of the pier in order that the winter boats may come up alongside the wharf. Is it the hon. minister's intention to do that work also ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have tried in vain to get a dredge for this and other works. Unfortunately, in the maritime provinces, we are short of dredges. We should have some dredging done there in order to allow the steamer to come alongside the pier. I understand every word the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) has said.

Caraquet—wharf, $20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. We would like some explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That work is practically under contract now. We have asked for tenders, and have accepted the tender of Simmons & Burpee as the lowest. That work is of great importance. I may say that since it became known that we were going to do this work at that point, several lumber industries have been established there.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the land on which this wharf is to be erected the property of the government or of private individuals ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer informs me we have not bought any land yet, but the work is on land belonging to the government.

Mr. FOWLER. Who owns the land at the inland end of the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am thankful for the suggestion of my hon. friend. I have given most positive instructions to all my officers not to begin any work without having made arrangements with the owners of the land. There is an understanding about the land, but not in writing. I will say that before doing anything further I will see that we get a deed of the land, because we have trouble every time unless that is done. In this case, however, I do not think there is going to be any trouble.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the site located yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the work is located, but there will not be any trouble about the land, because the work is just on the shore.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister says there have been some verbal negotiations going on; what is the price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand the price is about $20 for the right of landing there. I suppose the insignificance of the price is the reason why a written deed has not been made.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps the price will be raised now that the site is taken.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Before the contract is awarded I will see that the deed is in my hands. A tender has been accepted, but the contract has not been signed.

Mr. GANONG. Who is the owner of the land ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. James Blackhall.

Chance harbour—breakwater, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that that item be struck out.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that $190 have been expended on that for advertising. Why advertise if it was not intended to build ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have since found out that the work was too expensive to do this year.

Mr. FOWLER. Then the $190 is lost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not lost, because it has given us information that will be useful later on.

Mr. FOWLER. Could not that same information have been obtained without the expense of advertising ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps so. But it is better to have that item struck out, that work would cost about $40,000.

Motion agreed to.

Dipper harbour—breakwater, $3,250.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that that item be struck out.

Mr. GANONG. We find another advertising bill here for $224.44 in connection with this. In looking over these advertising accounts it seems to me that they run a little irregularly. The other night the Minister of Public Works said that he had advertised for building that breakwater down near Wilson's Beach. I am not surprised when I look over this list that he did not get any tenders. I regret that the Grit papers in our county were not better paid for advertising. I see in this Wilson's Beach matter, which will be a work costing from $25,000 to $35,000, he only paid $64.76 for advertising. Now, both these items are struck out after advertising for tenders. We also find some that run higher than that. It is evident the minister was not very anxious to have Wilson's Beach breakwater let by tender, or he would have put it in the hands of other newspapers so that it would have been more thoroughly advertised.

Motion agreed to.

Grande Anse—extension and repairs to breakwater, $9,000.

Mr. FOWLER. There was a lot of expenditure in connection with Grande Anse last year. Is this the same breakwater ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is the same breakwater. This year we are only taking a revote to complete the work.

Mr. FOWLER. But this work is evidently done by day's work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There have been some repairs, I am informed, to the old breakwater; but the work mentioned in this vote is under contract. It is an extension of the breakwater 250 feet long and 12½ feet wide.

Motion agreed to.

Point Wolfe—breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Who has charge there ? Who located it ? As I understand it at Point Wolfe there has been considerable money expended and parties who live in the vicinity say that some of it has not been very well expended. They claim that the fault lies with the engineer in not knowing exactly what he was about. I suppose the money is being expended under the direction of Mr. Shewen, who is the engineer of the department in that locality ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. I should like to know whether the hon. minister has ascertained the views of the people in that neighbourhood who are well acquainted with the tides and the movements of the currents there and who know just where this breakwater should be located.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not now remember that we have received any complaints as to the manner in which the work has been carried out. It was carried out under Mr. Shewen's supervision. I would be very glad to receive any information at the hands of my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) if he thinks something was done that should not have been done.

Mr. FOWLER. There have been complaints as to the Point Wolfe and Alma expenditure, more particularly in regard to the Alma expenditure.

Richibucto—reconstruction of north pier and groynes, &c., $20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like some information as to this Richibucto matter. This seems a very large vote. I notice the hon. member for Kent (Mr. LeBlanc) in his place and perhaps he may have some information upon the subject.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is an old work that has cost a large amount of money, and it was in a very bad state of repair. I visited the place a couple of years ago. The work was simply in the worst possible state. We started repairing the work by day's labour. We had a good deal of trouble and I finally made up my mind that the best way of ending my worry was to ask for tenders. We have done so. The tenders are in, but I have not had time as yet to pronounce upon them. The work will be given to the lowest tenderer if there is nothing to prevent me from doing so.

Mr. FOWLER. I see that you spent nearly $17,000 last year. Is this vote in addition to that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. That will be about $37,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work has cost a large amount of money. The original work that we are repairing to-day cost about $150,000. My hon. friend knows the amount of work there is to do. It is a long pier that forms the entrance to the bay. It is a necessary work.

Mr. FOWLER. While we are at these estimates, I would like to call the attention

of the hon. minister to the fact that there is a great variation in the prices of lumber supplied at these different works. I notice here, page V-173, Auditor General's Report, in connection with the repairs to the breakwater at Campobello (Wilson's Beach) that in some cases hemlock is charged for at $11 a thousand which would be a fair price. This is one of our cheapest woods, but I find that in another place another contractor charged for hemlock $19.50 a thousand.

An hon. MEMBER. The same work?

Mr. FOWLER. It is the same work but not the same man.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not on the same day and not from the same place either.

Mr. FOWLER. There has never been in the history of the lumber business, as far as I am acquainted with it, and I think I know something about it, such a variation in the price as that during the same season, or in fact any season—a difference of $8.50 a thousand. I see that Messrs. John Dewar & Sons supplied hemlock at $11 a thousand and that for the same work Mr. F. E. Sayre supplied hemlock at $19.50 a thousand, and birch hewn timber at $17.50 a thousand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know my hon. friend does not want to be unfair, but he has only to look at the statement and he will see that it is not the same kind of timber at all. There is sawn timber, log timber and hewn timber, and these are not the same classes of timber at all. It may be hemlock, but it is hemlock prepared in a different way. I may say that my officers have received and are receiving the most positive instructions to buy material at the lowest possible prices in the market, and I do not think that any member of parliament will be able to prove before the Public Accounts Committee that I have done anything other than that. My officers are always instructed to buy material at the lowest possible prices, and on this occasion the hon. gentleman will find that this is not the same material at all.

Mr. FOWLER. No, it should be cheaper in the one case than in the other. The smaller the size a log is cut into and the more sawing you do the higher the price will be. But here, this timber is simply squared. Hewn hemlock was charged for at the rate of $17.50 a thousand by Mr. Sayre and the other at $19.50 a thousand while the other man sells his timber at $11 a thousand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is round timber.

Mr. FOWLER. Supposing that is the case, it is altogether too high a price. Seven dollars would be a good price for hemlock round. It is only a question of towage. Suppose you towed it from the mouth of the St. John river it would not cost more than $1.25 a thousand, and here is a charge besides for towage in Mr. Sayre's bill.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that the timber came from the county of Albert.

Mr. FOWLER. No, that timber came from up the River St. John. That is where Mr. Sayre's timber lands are located. He is a merchant living in the city of St. John. This timber would come down the St. John river, either from Mr. Sayre's own lands on the Salmon river, a tributary of the St. John, or from the lands on the upper waters of the St. John river. If it were squared timber, it certainly should not cost as much as boards, and the very highest price of hemlock boards is $9 a thousand. Here we have a charge of $17.50 a thousand. That is from $6 to $7 a thousand out of the way.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend is right, my officers are wrong, and on the other hand, if my officers are right my hon. friend is wrong. It is all very well to state on the floor of parliament that the price of this and that article is too high. Conditions are not always the same. In New Brunswick I have had at times some little trouble here and there, but I have never found that any extraordinary charge has been made. However, my chief engineer will take a note of what my hon. friend says and inquire as to the reason why there is that difference. I understand that the timber is long timber, specially long, 45 feet long. It is pretty difficult to judge of these matters on the floor of the House. It is easier to speak than to buy cheaply.

Mr. FOWLER. Hemlock grows very tall in our country, and it is the cheapest lumber we have in our country. Therefore, it is no excuse or argument to say that it is long timber, because long timber would be nearly as cheap as short timber. It sells by the thousand feet and there is no argument in that. I may say, no matter how much confidence the hon. minister may have in his officers, that they are clearly wrong in this instance. This man has received from $6 to $7 a thousand too much for his lumber, and I am giving you the benefit of the doubts.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be very sorry to find out that my hon. friend is right. I will find out tomorrow whether he is right or wrong. I have discovered no information that has come to me on that point. I will find out the reason for the price he paid. If my hon. friend is wrong, I will ask him to say that he is wrong.

Mr. FOWLER. I will be very glad to do so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I will make that bargain with him.

Mr. FOWLER. I am quite agreeable, but I shall expect that my hon. friend will be reciprocal and will acknowledge it if he is wrong.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief engineer is instructed to wire to Mr. Shewen to know why he has paid that price, because his hands have always been free. He, like all my other officers, are ordered to buy at the lowest market price. I challenge any member of parliament on either side to say that I have given any other order than that. Mr. Shewen will be wired immediately and I will communicate the answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler). That is fair, I suppose.

Mr. FOWLER. Not exactly fair and for this reason: That you are wiring to get your information from the same man who made the mistake, which I do not think is fair at all. It is not necessary for the minister to get heated over the matter because I am not imputing the slightest blame directly to him. I only say that his officers have deceived him in this matter, as his friend deceived him the other day about the appointment of a clerk of works at the Sussex armoury. I do say that there are gentlemen supporting the minister on the other side of the House who know something about the price of lumber in the province from which we come, and if they state what they know to be the fact, they will state that this is an excessive price for any hemlock lumber; and not only for hemlock, but he has charged $17.50 a thousand for birch, which is a very high price. The ordinary rough pine and not clear pine would be used for the purpose of a breakwater. If this were clear pine the price would not be excessive, but for the class of pine that would go into a breakwater it is an excessive price—that pine is worth $7 or $8 a thousand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If Mr. Shewen paid too much I would be surprised because he is one of the hardest men I have met in my life.

Mr. FOWLER. Then get your information from another source than Mr. Shewen and you will be surprised.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will ask my officer why he paid that much and from whom he asked quotations, because I am sure he did ask for quotations. If my hon. friend gives me any other source of information I am prepared to accept it. I do not desire to shield any one of my officers. I cannot be held responsible directly if too high prices are paid, but I am always anxious to get information.

Mr. FOWLER. If the minister will communicate with his officer and get the reasons that his officer gives for these high prices, then if these reasons do not appear satisfactory to me I will give him the names of persons with whom he can communicate, and who are experts in the lumber business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be very glad to receive the information.

River St. John, including tributaries, $16,000.

Mr. WILMOT. How does the minister propose to spend that appropriation of $16,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not yet decided on the work to be done. Last year we spent very little of that appropriation. There are works of several kinds to be carried out there. We have works at Oromocto, at Tobique, at St. Francis, at Bear Island and at Topaz. This vote is for clearing the river generally. It is a very changeable river as the hon. gentleman knows and it contains snags and sandbars of all kinds, so that it is very difficult to name the particular places at which the work will be caried on.

Mr. WILMOT. I am very well acquainted with the river and I know where the works have been carried out. I would urge on the attention of the minister the importance of making an effort to clear that channel. Last year, under the direction of Mr. Shewen, the resident engineer, dredging was commenced where the water was sufficiently deep, and quite unnecessary work was carried on for some time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At what place?

Mr. WILMOT. At Oromocto. There was a good deal of criticism on the work, and it was said that the engineer was not going about it properly. He should have commenced directly on the shoal. At a period when the water was at a proper depth the work could have been carried on properly. At all events they had to discontinue the work which they commenced. I would urge upon the minister the necessity of directing his attention to that particular point on the river, namely the Oromocto shoals.

River St. John—wharf at Oromocto, $1,500.

Mr. WILMOT. Does the minister propose to make any other appropriation for that wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was represented to me that the work would cost a large amount of money and then I paused. Later on we had another estimate based on a new survey and we found the work would cost $6,000. We are now preparing plans and asking for tenders for that work.

Mr. WILMOT. The work will be gone on with ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

St. John harbour—Negro Point breakwater, $20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is being done there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That work has cost a large amount of money, but the waves are so big there that every year we are obliged to make repairs. This vote is to lay down large blocks of concrete to complete the work.

Upper Salmon river (Alma Pier), $5,700.

Mr. FOWLER. Will this work be let by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we have asked for tenders but the contract has not yet been awarded.

Grande Vallee—pier, $25,000.

Mr. GANONG. I would like to know something about that $25,000 for a pier at Grande Vallee. What business is there, to warrant this expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are large lumber operations carried on in that part of the country, and it was to help that trade that the money was voted last year. The contract for the work has been awarded and I am simply asking parliament to give me the money to pay for that contract which was commenced on the vote of last year.

Mr. GANONG. That is just the understanding I have in regard to this matter—that the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) owns large timber properties in that section of the country, and that this wharf is virtually being built in the interest of a lumber company in which that hon. gentleman is largely interested—that it is wholly an electioneering matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has not been elected there ; he has been elected elsewhere, where he will be elected again. So this is not an electioneering work. The money for this work was voted last year, and it is being voted again this year, and it is rather late for the hon. gentleman to object to that work now.

Mr. GANONG. I have had information that that is the sole purpose of this pier—to make the lumber property of the hon. member for Stanstead valuable. What is the population of the locality ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just stated that the work has been undertaken in view of large lumbering operations—not because there is a town there ; and I may add that there is no other harbour on the north shore. So that the wharf will be used for lumbering operations, for trade purposes, and for shelter for the fishermen.

Mr. GANONG. It is a most excellent advertisement for any man who has a good lumber property. All he has to do, if he votes right, is to come to this government and ask for an appropriation to increase the value of his lumber property. Will the hon. minister tell us whether the site for this pier has been purchased and paid for, and if so, from whom ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has not. The fact that the hon. gentleman who represents Stanstead may have property there is no reason why the government should not make any improvements. My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) has large properties in his riding, and I am carrying out improvements there. My hon. friend will not be accused of serving his own interests when he is insisting on money being spent in his riding. This is no argument.

Mr. GANONG. Not if the money is spent for general purposes ; but when it is spent for the special purpose of increasing the value of a lumber property, I claim it is wrong.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no doubt that any public works improve the value of property, and if a member of parliament happens to have property in a place where these works are going on, so much the better for him. It does not injure the county.

Mr. GANONG. Will the hon. minister be kind enough to tell us from whom the site was purchased and the price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been no land purchased. The wharf is built on the shore.

Mr. GANONG. It must front on some one's land.

Mr. BENNETT. This seems to be an extraordinary proposition. From what has dropped, it would appear that there is a saw-mill situated at this place, and unfortunately there is no proper dock for a large lumbering business. The minister asks the House to vote this large sum for the construction of this dock, and he cannot tell whether a site has been purchased, or if so what the price of the site is. Before the item goes through, I think the minister should state the population of the place, whether the municipality is giving the land lot and the water lot adjoining, and whether there is any contribution by the municipality towards the construction of the dock.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The municipality has not given any contribution—not more than the municipality of Midland will give us, I suppose, for works

which we will build there. This dock is being built in the province of Quebec under the ordinary rules which are applied in all the provinces. No site has been purchased, because it was not necessary to purchase a site. An amount was voted in the estimates last year for this work ; I have been notified to go on with it, and it is rather late now for hon. gentlemen to complain that we are going on because my hon. friend has property there, hon. gentlemen opposite begrudge the expenditure of the money. I do not think it is fair. The work is being built on a rocky point that does not belong to anybody.

Mr. FOWLER. It must belong to somebody. It is Crown land ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose it is Crown lands.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the work commenced ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes. I am simply asking for a vote to supplement the vote of last year. The contract is let, and the work is going on.

Mr. FOWLER. How much was voted last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year I had a vote of $15,000. I have been fully authorized to go on with the work.

Mr. FOWLER. If this work was going to cost $40,000, how is it you had only an estimate of $15,000 last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My department asks each year for the amount we expect will be spent during the year, and afterwards we ask what is necessary to supplement the vote.

Mr. FOWLER. What was your engineer's estimate of the whole cost of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount of the contract is $53,000.

Mr. FOWLER. And this work is begun without your having any title to the land on which it is built.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because it is not necessary to have one. The work is built in the water.

Mr. FOWLER. It must be built on land.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is built on a rocky point which belongs to the Crown.

Mr. FOWLER. It does not matter whether it is a rock or not. It must belong to a private party or to the Crown. If it belongs to the Crown, it belongs, I suppose, to the province of Quebec. The minister, it seems to me, has placed himself in a very peculiar position. He is spending $53,000 on property to which he has no title whatever. What sort of an arrangement can you make if this property really belongs to a private individual ? If it belongs to the gentleman who owns these vast lumber lands in that district, you should have got a deed from him before you began the improvements.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this case it was not necessary to buy the site because the work is built on a point which does not seem to belong to anybody unless to the Crown.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it all wilderness there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a good deal of wilderness there.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there not a village or town or any inhabitants ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a small village.

Mr. FOWLER. About what is the population ? It has a very elaborate name.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. According to the last reports, the population was 370.

Mr. FOWLER. What are the industries ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Lumber and fishing.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there a saw-mill there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. How many hands does it employ ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who looks after the census, can tell ?

Mr. BENNETT. The strength of the Minister of Public Works is certainly shown in the vote now being taken. He presumes so much on his followers that he lets a contract for $53,000 for the construction of a dock, for which he only asked an appropriation of $15,000, and relies on his followers to support him in making the balance of the grant good.

Mr. FOWLER. And they will.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the position ? The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) owns a saw-mill at this point, and taking advantage of his position as a supporter of the government, applied to the Minister of Public Works to have a dock constructed there for the purpose of carrying on his own business. This is on all fours with the vote last year of $75,000 for the construction of a dock at Depot Harbour for the sole benefit of Mr. Booth. The hon. minister last year made a present of $75,000 worth of dockage to Mr. Booth, which that gentleman is today about to dispose of to another corporation. In other words, we increased the value of Mr. Booth's assets to the tune of

$75,000, and the minister did this, knowing that his followers would blindly vote it through. Surely there must be some hon. gentlemen on that side, who, if they feel no moral responsibility themselves, must feel that they are responsible to the people who sent them here. Will they not protest against expenditures of this kind ? I submit that the hon. minister had no right to enter into a contract for $53,000 until he had got the assent of the House. I do not recall last year's vote on this particular question, but I believe that a reference to 'Hansard' will not prove that the hon. minister stated then that there would be an expenditure of $53,000. If the rule is to be laid down that any hon. gentleman who has the requisite political leverage can have his own private property improved at the expense of the country, it would be well that the country should know it at once. I must congratulate the Minister of Public Works on this fact, that he has not the slightest fear that his followers will not vote through any appropriation he chooses to bring down. This is another tribute to the strong position he holds in the cabinet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let me say to my hon. friend that I am not alone in this government and that no contract of this kind can be carried out unless it is approved by my colleagues. I stand here responsible for what I have done just as I am for what they do, and just as they are for what both they and I have done. I am very much surprised that some of my friends in the other provinces, where much larger works have been carried out, find so much fault with a work of this kind carried on elsewhere. I gave the House the figures the other day to show that in Ontario there has been a large amount of money expended. In Southampton, for instance, there has been spent a quarter of a million dollars, and I make bold to say that in a few years there will be as much trade in this Grand Vallee as there is in Southampton. I admit that it is a pretty large amount to expend but I did not deceive the House. Last year, if my hon. friend had asked me how much the work would cost, I would have told him. The House granted me $15,000 to build the work and it is now under contract. Do hon. gentlemen want me to repudiate my obligations ? I have never entered into any contract without their consent. I have not deceived anybody. My colleagues know perfectly well what I have done. I can sign no contract, and have no desire to do so, without going before my colleagues. But because the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) has mills in that vicinity, my hon. friend raises a row. I cannot help that. The work has to be paid for because the contract is signed, and no doubt it will prove a very useful work.

Mr. BENNETT. The point I make is this, that the vote is not for a work of public utility, but solely in favour of a private interest, namely, a saw-mill owned by the hon. member for Stanstead. Let the expenditure be large or small, the question for us is whether it is for the public utility or simply for the benefit of one private individual. The hon. minister referred to grants in Ontario. Well, in the riding I have the honour to represent I was pleased to see that he has made grants. But under what circumstances ? At the town of Midland there are large industries and a good harbour, and if by the receding of the water, the elevators cannot be approached, is it not the bounden duty of the government to step in and do the necessary dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And we did it.

Mr. BENNETT. But if the hon. minister were asked to make a grant for the benefit of any saw-mill owner in East Simcoe—as he has done in this matter—I should object to that expenditure, whether it were in my riding or not. I have objected to expenditures made by the hon. gentleman in my riding. I objected notably to the construction of a dock at a village called Hawkestone. I do not hold the minister accountable for all these expenditures, because his colleagues are equally culpable; and in the case of the dock at Hawkestone, the recommendation came from the Postmaster General. But I can tell the hon. minister that I look with pleasure on expenditures such as are made at Hawkestone, for this reason, that they show the people how the public money is being frittered away in the attempt to make some petty political capital. But this expenditure recoils on the hon. gentleman. The whole thing was a political job. The man in charge of the work was a hotel-keeper, who lived a mile or so away, and was charging three dollars a day for superintending the work. The question is not whether the expenditure is large or small, but whether it is simply aiding the promotion of a private enterprise, and the private enterprise of a gentleman who happens to hold a seat in this House, supporting hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MONK. How much was spent on that work last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not given any estimate yet, but——

Mr. MONK. There is only a couple hundred dollars, according to the Auditor General's Report—$233.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since the close of that report, the work has been going on.

Mr. MONK. Who is the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Messrs. Heney & Smith, Ottawa.

Mr. MONK. How much has been spent since the 30th of June, the time to which the Auditor General's Report carries us ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not given an estimate, but I am sure there must be a pretty large amount They are wealthy men, and they are going on with the work.

Mr. MONK. I find the information given with regard to this work very scanty. We do not know how much has been spent. We only know that we are called upon to spend about $50,000 at a place, that in itself does not appear to be very important—its population being about 350. And we have the statement made and repeated that this work is undertaken to satisfy the political urgings of a gentleman who sits in this House and who is largely interested in lumbering operations in that distant part of the province. We have the statement of the Minister of Public Works that he has not purchased any site for this wharf. But we have no statement as to the representations that have been made to the department of the need for this work. Have the steamboat companies asked for this wharf ? Have the inhabitants joined together to send in a petition for it? Has anything been shown to the government to make it appear that there is any necessity for it outside the private necessity that has been mentioned two or three times this evening ? It is not fair for the Minister of Public Works to say that he has executed large works elsewhere and that members who happen to come from other provinces, but who take part in the work that it is the duty of us all to perform, that of criticising the government, shall not be allowed to ask such simple questions as those that I have asked. I can say for my own part, that I think the hon. minister appreciates what I say that it is a pity, if it be true that we are spending such amounts as are provided in this resolution largely, as appears so far in this short discussion, for the private benefit of individuals of some people engaged in lumbering operations when, at present, as a matter of fact, we have the proof before us since last year at the beginning of the session, that that part of the St. Lawrence navigation which interests the people of the province of Quebec so deeply, is absolutely neglected—neglected at least to this extent, that as the Minister of Public Works knows better than anybody else, there is not a sufficient amount spent on that navigation of the St. Lawrence to remove the objections put before the government last year in reference to the dangers of that navigation, in reference to the cost of freights, in reference to cost of insurance. And we have the statement made here tonight, unrebuked, uncontradicted, not disproved by the department, that this large amount of money is being spent to forward the interest of one individual or one company in which a member of this House is largely interested. And we have no statement on the other hand from the Minister of Public Works, or from other quarters that facts have been brought forward to show need of this wharf or to show that the people of the place demanded it. I know that, in the province of Quebec as elsewhere great pressure is brought to bear upon the government to carry on local works. They are of some use to somebody—nobody will deny that. But can we afford to spend large amounts of money on local works when the general scheme of the improvement of the navigation of the St. Lawrence from Montreal to the sea is not being done justice to ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The improvement of the St. Lawrence is one thing and the erection of the wharf at Grande Vallee is another thing. We are attending to the improvement of the St. Lawrence better than it has ever been done in the past. It is of no use to make so much fuss—for it is fuss that is being made now and nothing else. The hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Lemieux) is not in his seat at the moment. He is one of those who came to the government and represented to us that, if there was a wharf built there large lumbering interests would be fostered and developed. We considered the case and came to the conclusion that it was a meritorious work. Now it is not fair and it is not good policy to say that improvements must always be made at places where there is a large population. If by the erection of this work, you help population to settle there, that will be a good thing. Why, we are spending half a million dollars a year to bring population over from the other side.

Mr. MONK. And wasting a lot of it too.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because this government has thought proper, has thought it was good policy to foster a large industry in that part of the country—a very interesting part of the province and which has vast resources—we are denounced. I say it again, I know the reason ; it is because the hon. member for Stanstead happens to have property there. If that hon. gentleman had not happened to have property there, nothing would have been heard of the matter. But, because an hon. member for this House has lumbering property in that locality, I have done wrong. But whether I have done wrong or right—I am sure I have done right as usual—the faith of the country is pledged, the contract is signed and I must pay ; there is no escape now. And permit me to add that there have been a good many cases worse than this. This is not a bad case. Let my hon. friends await the developments of the trade there—they are too impatient. We must give time for the trade to develop which this work is intended to promote.

Mr. MONK. It is the Minister of Public Works who is making the fuss. I am

not aware that anybody denounced this undertaking or said that it would not foster trade. But the Minister of Public Works has admitted that he has spent this sum of $50,000——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, $53,000.

Mr. MONK. Oh, I have no doubt it will be $60,000 before the hon. gentleman gets through. He is spending this money to develop trade. Now, does he not think, when this vast work is being executed purely for the future, that it would be better to erect there a wharf at a cost of $10,000 or of $15,000 and spend the balance to do justice to what seems to me the extremely fair representation made last year by Major Bond, speaking on behalf of the underwriters of Montreal with respect to such general improvements to the navigation of the St. Lawrence either through the Marine Department or through the Public Works Department as to remove from the shoulders of the merchants and exporters of Montreal the heavy burden of the extra premiums they have to pay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The little money we are spending for the benefit of the trade and of the fishermen in Gaspe will not prevent this country from carrying out the necessary improvements in the St. Lawrence. My hon. friend the leader of a party understands that. The expenditure of $20,000 or $25,000 in Gaspe will not prevent us from carrying out the necessary works in the St. Lawrence. We are attending to the St. Lawrence, and at the same time we are endeavouring to attend to the requirements of the trade and of the population of Gaspe. This is a very interesting part of the country, and great developments are expected by those who are acquainted with it. Now, if we do not show a spirit of progress, if we do not occasionally move in advance of the times, if we do not force progress, we will be accused of being slow. I do not like to be accused of being slow.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was not present, unfortunately when my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) made his speech against Grande Vallee.

Mr. MONK. I did not make a speech against Grande Vallee at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may say to my hon. friend that the work at Grande Vallee is a most important one. As a result of this work an improvement is already manifest in that locality. In 1896 when I ran for the first time in that county and visited Grande Vallee, I found that fifty electors resided there. Yesterday I was consulting the census returns, and I found that as a result of this work, the population has increased to 352 souls.

Mr. MONK. But we only spent up to the 30th of June last, $233 there, according to the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, but the prospective expenditure has already brought to that place a great enterprise. The name of the Messrs. Lovell has been mentioned. They have there perhaps the most extensive lumber mills in the lower portion of the St. Lawrence. The name of the county of Gaspe is frequently mentioned in the estimates. It is true that the government has spent many thousands in that county during the last few years. But we must not forget that there are no railways in the county of Gaspe, that no subsidies have been paid there, and these are the only improvements that have yet been made so far as breakwaters and wharfs are concerned. Now my learned friend speaks of navigation, and the improvements which should be made in the lower portion of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Prior to 1896 there was no steam communication between Quebec and Montreal, and the different ports and harbours on the coast of Gaspe. As a result of these works at Cape Chat, at Grande Vallee, at Gaspe Basin, at Percé, at Fox river, at Anse à Beaufils, giving facilities and accommodations to the travelling public, a line of steamers has been established between the large centres and the coast. Previous to that period, no steamer would have gone to that coast. But to-day we have several harbours and safe shelters, and as a result, a regular steamship's service. The fishermen of that coast have been treated like slaves for the last century. I have met fishermen on the coast of Gaspe who had not seen a red cent during their whole life. They used to sell their fish to the merchants on the coast and were paid in trade. Since the establishment of that line, and as a result of the improvements which were made by the Department of Public Works, to-day the fishermen of Gaspe are trading with Montreal and Quebec, and even with the province of Ontario, as Mr. Flavelle, one of the most important merchants and manufacturers of Lindsay, told me a fortnight ago. Therefore, I think my learned friend should not criticise these small amounts, because this is the first time since the county of Gaspe has been represented in this House that any grants have been made to it by parliament. The county of Gaspe is the oldest county in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the hon. gentleman talking about other works than this one, or is he confining his remarks to the vote we are now discussing ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am speaking of the works which have been constructed at Grande Vallee, at Cape Chat, at Fox river,

at Percé, at Anse à Beaufils, and at Newport.

Mr. MONK. What work favourable to steam navigation did my hon. friend refer to as having been executed at Anse à Beaufils? I thought that was specially for fishermen and not for steamers.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is for fishermen. At Fox river, for instance, a work was constructed last year and the year previous.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Amherst.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I did not speak of the Magdalen Islands, that is another question. But on the coast of Gaspe, whenever a steamer was caught by a storm, she had to cross the St. Lawrence on the north coast to get shelter. To-day, owing to the works done at Grande Vallee, at Cape Chat and at Fox river, this is avoided. They are most useful works, and nobody would criticise them, on the coast of Gaspe.

Mr. AVERY. Since the hon. gentleman is so well acquainted with that place where there are 350 souls, can he not tell us who owns the land that this dock is to be built on?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Grande Vallee is in a seigniory, and it belongs to the firm of the Messrs. Lovell.

Mr. MONK. Then this is built on the Lovells' property?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, it is built for the general advantage of the people there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Even if it was.

Mr. MONK. Well, we would like to own it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, so would I.

Mr. FOWLER. I would ask the minister whether, in view of all the information he has with respect to the ownership of this property, he intends to get a deed of the land that will be occupied by this wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, although I do not believe it is necessary. I have just reproved my chief engineer for having gone on with that work without a deed, but he tells me it is on a rocky point that is not supposed to belong to anybody.

Mr. FOWLER. But the hon. member for Gaspe says it belongs to the Messrs. Lovell.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, the seigniory. This is a shore.

Mr. FOWLER. But the less must be included in the greater. Certainly this property belongs to the Lovells. If the minister was building a house for his own use, he would scarcely build it upon another man's property. He would find there would be some question raised about the title if he wanted to sell the property. Now, I understand this wharf has been built by parliament, therefore it belongs to the country. But we find now it belongs to a company, and the government have been building upon their land. Surely it is the intention of the minister to see that the Messrs. Lovell give a deed. They should make it a free gift to the department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not expect that there will be any trouble as to the ownership but even if there were any trouble we can always expropriate.

Mr. MONK. There is nothing before us but what has been told us by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), that we are expending $60,000 upon a wharf that is being built on the property of Mr. Lovell.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In tidal waters.

Mr. MONK. If he is the owner of the seigniory he is the owner of the foreshore, If it is on Mr. Lovell's property we would be justified in making this vote conditional upon the government being entitled to a deed of the property.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be no trouble as to the ownership of the land.

Mr. FOWLER. This is the second instance that has come to our notice to-night in which the title has not been obtained to a property where wharfs are to be erected. I think that the hon. minister should bring his officers up with a pretty sharp turn in connection with this matter, and instruct them that in all cases they shall see that no public money is expended on property without obtaining a title to that property.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have given written instructions which I will bring before the House, to every one of my officers to do in each case, that which has been alluded to here to-night. In the Caraquet case it is a question of $20, and it has been verbally arranged. The deed has not been executed. It has been overlooked. All the same I agree that it should have been arranged because I have had trouble over little things like that. There are certain properties to which we did not obtain titles in the past. I quite agree that we should have titles in every case, and my officers have received positive instructions on that point. They are within hearing of my voice and they know that I have given them the most positive and severe instructions.

Mr. FOWLER. That very fact might tend to shake the confidence of the minister in his officers obeying his instructions in other matters.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman said that he had given instructions in respect to the purchase of supplies to these officers and that he had absolute confidence that these gentlemen had not exceeded his instructions. In this case he has given just as positive and severe instructions and they have not obeyed his instructions. In this case two new wharfs have been built and in neither case have the title deeds been obtained. I think the hon. gentleman will find that they have neglected his directions in other matters as well as this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a case in which there is much ado about nothing. In one case there is $20 involved, and you cannot hang a man for $20.

Mr. FOWLER. It is not the amount of money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Where is the big firm in which similar transactions will not happen ? I grant it should have been done.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is the big firm that would build on property without getting the title to it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are not many big firms in this country possessing the rights which are conferred upon the hon. Minister of Public Works by the Act respecting the Expropriation of Lands, Chapter 39 of the Revised Statutes, which permits the minister to enter upon and take possession of property for the purpose of constructing public works. All that is necessary for him to do is to deposit his plan, and that plan being deposited, he may proceed with the expropriation. He can do it now, and if he can do it now what is all the row about ?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, but he will have to pay a great deal more for that land if he puts a work upon it before he gets the title.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is a remarkable statement to say that the Minister of Public Works, after he has entered upon a property to make improvements, as he is authorized by law to do, will be obliged to take into consideration these improvements in the expropriation.

Mr. FOWLER. But you will find that a jury will award a much larger amount.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The jury has nothing to do with it at all. It is the arbitrators who will settle it.

Mr. FOWLER. It is the same thing.

Mr. INGRAM. When the statement is made that the hon. Minister of Public Works is expending $53,000 in building a pier facing the water front, that the country has no deed for, I will tell the hon. Minister of Justice where all the fuss will come in. In Ontario and in other provinces throughout the Dominion, there are municipalities and private individuals who own wharfs facing water fronts and I venture to say that these corporations and persons have come to the hon. Minister of Public Works and asked for assistance towards the maintenance of these wharfs, and that the minister has refused to grant them money. What position is the minister in ? He has told us that he has granted this money without any deed or any claim on the property facing the water front, and he has refused the request that deputations have brought before him, on the ground that the government did not own these properties I say it is a very improper course and it is a course which was not pursued years ago by the government of this country. Heretofore, the government, before they undertook to expend any money on works of that kind, insisted first on the private owners transferring their harbour to the government. This has been the practise in the past, and a proper practise I think. If that practise had been followed out it would not be necessary to impress upon the Minister of Public Works the necessity of building public harbours or piers at these points. To-night we have not had a single bit of information as to what will be done at this harbour other than in the general statements made by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), and these statements have reference to five other harbours in addition to this one. If the hon. gentleman had confined his remarks to the subject under discussion the committee could have discussed this matter more intelligently. He should be in a position to tell us the exact condition of affairs at this harbour. He has not given us that information, and therefore we should not pass this item until we do get it.

Mr. AVERY. How much money has already been spent on this wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is going on. We have not yet given any estimate. The two contractors are carrying out their work. Now, while I am on my feet, I may say that in a fortnight I will lay on the Table of the House deeds for these two properties. There is not much in it, but I grant that the property should have been secured by deed beforehand. My officers, I say in their presence, should have done it. It has been overlooked, not because they meant to do wrong, but because they thought it was not necessary. The hon. Minister of Justice tells me that it is better to have the deed and we will have it. At Caraquet it is a matter of $20 and a verbal arrangement. We will have it in writing.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that there is something of a disagreement between the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Minister of Public Works. The hon. Minister of Justice informed us a few minutes ago that everything was all right, and if so, he

asked, what is all this row about. All that the Minister of Public Works had to do was to expropriate. Let us look at this for a moment. The Minister of Public Works says he can obtain the deed of the Caraquet property for $20. He goes on with the work without getting that deed, and suppose the property changes its owner in the meantime and the new owner refuses to give him the deed, then we take expropriation proceedings, and I would like to ask the Minister of Justice what under the circumstances, the total cost of that land would bear to the $20 that it now can be obtained for ? The Minister of Justice knows that the cost would be more than ten times; yes, more than twenty-five times the amount.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If Caraquet costs more than $20 then I will pay it.

Mr. FOWLER. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman does not propose to follow the suggestion of the Minister of Justice, and that he intends to get the title of that property.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the member for Gaspe say what is the nearest harbour to Grande Vallee ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is about forty miles.

Mr. INGRAM. Surely the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) must have given some good reasons in the first instance as to why this money should be expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He has given me the best reasons possible.

Mr. INGRAM. What are they ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman was not in the House, as he should have been, or he would have heard what I said.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, I was in the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will repeat the useful information I gave before. There are large lumbering operations in sight.

Mr. MONK. Oh, we heard that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was a large increase of population in sight also. If that population increased on the mere hopes of building the wharf what must we expect when the wharf is built ?

Mr. INGRAM. It is a very funny matter to spend this $53,000. I can tell the Minister of Public Works that I have been in the House during the whole discussion, and I can say that if all his appropriations are based on the enlightened information he has given to the House in this case, then God help the country. As to the increased population, the member for Gaspe said there were fifty electors in 1896, and that the population had increased to 350 souls. Will the hon. gentleman multiply the families of the electors in 1896 by the usual rule——

An hon. MEMBER. The French rule.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, and I venture to say that he will get 350 souls in 1896. He counted the electors in the one case and the souls in the other. Will he tell us how many souls there were in 1896 ?

Mr. MONK. Did I understand the minister to say that there was a contract for $53,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, signed and sealed.

Mr. MONK. Who is the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Messrs. Heney & Smith, from Ottawa.

Hudson wharf, $1,000.

Mr. MONK. Have any representations been made to the department as to that wharf not being located where it would be of most use ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief engineer tells me that we have not received any such representations.

Isle au Coudre—addition to wharf, $6,000.

Mr. MORIN. Is that wharf built at Isle au Coudre for steam boats or sail boats ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for steamboats and for sail boats also. I am in hopes that Isle au Coudre will become a summer resort of great importance as all the other places on the St. Lawrence are becoming year after year.

Mr. MORIN. The minister says he has hopes, but I do not think it pays the government or anybody else to build wharfs on hopes. If there was any public interest to be served I would like to see a wharf built there, but no steamers go to that place and there is no traffic there at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. Steamers stop there. That wharf has been built twenty-five years and we are only adding to it. There is a population on Isle au Coudre of 1,500, and it is increasing rapidly. The climate is fine there. There is a larger number of summer tourists visiting this place than formerly, and there is large fishing and farming interests. Isle au Coudre is one of the most fertile parts of the province of Quebec.

Mr. MORIN. The minister speaks very highly of the island, and I do myself, too. That island has been inhabited for about 250 years and it has a population of about 1,100. If it is such a nice place and such a good place it must have been since last month, because for 250 years it has been growing to a population of 1,100.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are doing much better now.

Mr. MORIN. Where will the steamer start from and where will she go to Isle au Coudre ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend knows very well that there are steamers starting from Montreal and Quebec, and visiting all these places. This is one of the most thriving parishes of the lower part of the St. Lawrence, and this work is just for the purpose of helping the trade. Two steamers stop there.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Twice a week all summer.

Mr. MORIN. I have been on the boats up and down, and they have never stopped there.

Isle aux Grues—repairs to wharf, $3,500.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works again what is the use of a wharf at that island ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That island is populated by good loyal citizens who want to have communication with other parts of the world, and for that purpose they must have a wharf. They have no railway ; this is an island, and steamers and sailing boats stop at that port. If my hon. friend were located there he would like to have some communication with us.

Mr. MORIN. I believe the Minister of Public Works does not understand exactly the meaning of steamers and steamboats. There never was and there never will be a steamer to stop there; but steamboats may. I never knew more than one steamboat, and a small one at that, to leave Quebec in the fall of the year and go there. Many sailboats come from there, but no line of sailboats or steamboats stop there at all.

Lake Temiscamingue—improvements, $10,000.

Mr. MONK. What are these improvements?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We intend starting the construction of a dredge with the amount of money for which we are applying. We have hesitated a good deal as to what we should do. As my hon. friend knows, there is a large current of immigration towards that part of the country, and we have been considering whether we should raise the level of the lake by building a dam or whether we should dredge. After careful investigation, we have come to the conclusion that it is better to have a small dredge for the purpose of dredging the mouth of the river.

Lower St. Lawrence—removal of rocks, &c., $3,000.

Mr. MONK. Where is this removal to take place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is intended to help the fishermen to land their boats. If my hon. friend has visited the coast of Gaspé and Bonaventure, he knows that there are rocks carried by the waves and storms, which often prevent the fishermen landing their boats when seeking shelter; and part of this vote will be used to remove the rocks to help the fishermen to land their boats and prevent them being drowned.

Mr. MONK. I think that is very good, but where are these rocks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is a general one, just as we might ask for $10,000 for repairs. Our engineers will report to us that there are rocks to be removed at one place or another. A similar vote is taken every year for the same purpose.

Mr. MONK. I think the minister himself will see that, small as this sum is, it is a pity that we have not something to show us where the rocks are that are to be removed. Not one of the employees of the department can tell us where there is a demand for the removal of rocks.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is altogether wrong. We could bring more demands than we have money to comply with. When we apply for a general vote for repairs, we cannot say in advance at what points it will be spent. This vote is similar. We know that we have a large fishing trade on the coast, and that every year we are obliged to remove rocks, and they are removed at such places as are pointed out to us. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him not to begrudge the vote of a small amount of money for the benefit of the fishermen ?

Mr. MONK. I am not opposing it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I know that. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in asking for information. I just call his attention to the great importance of protecting these poor fishermen in the gulf. When a storm arises, if they cannot find shelter and land their boats easily, they will not only at times lose their boats, but also lose their lives. At page 100 of my report my hon. friend will find full information as to the places where rocks were removed last year.

Mr. MONK. I do not like the minister to be under the impression that I am opposed to any assistance being given to the fishermen—far from it; but I think that on votes of this kind we should have satisfactory information as to where the money is to be spent. For my own part, I do not pretend to know the Gaspé peninsula perfectly, but I made a trip there and went

along the coast from Dalhousie to Gaspé basin and back, and met a great many people connected with the district, and although the building of wharfs is of great use, I am bound to say frankly that from the people of the district and the people on the boat I heard that in many instances these expenditures on public works were used to oblige political friends, and that you could spend the money to much greater advantage in the interior, improving its agricultural condition and giving roads and railway communication, because once you leave the coast and go to the interior of the peninsula you find room for an immense population and a country comparatively deserted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The government cannot build roads.

Mr. MONK. It can build railways.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That would cost a large amount of money. That is a horse of another colour. We are now discussing a small vote for the removal of rocks, and I have given all the information I can. If the hon. gentleman will look at my report, page 100, he will get further particulars.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This grant is voted but not expended every year. Its expenditure depends on the petitions sent to the department, and in some years a greater amount is required than in others. For instance, two or three years ago about 200 or 250 boats were lost on the coast, and it became necessary to take means to prevent a recurrence of such loss. My learned friend has not visited the worst part of the coast of Gaspe. The portion between Dalhousie and Gaspe Basin, which he visited, does not require such an expenditure, but from Grand Greve, at the head of Gaspe Bay, down to St. Anne Des Monts, a good deal of expenditure is necessary because that part of the coast is not protected against the ocean; and in fact is known by travellers and sailors as the graveyard of the Atlantic. This amount of money is generally spent, as the hon. minister has explained, in removing rocks and boulders from the small harbours where the fishermen get shelter. At Cape Rosier, which is the most dangerous place in the gulf, sometimes $200 and $300 have to be expended. This vote is a most useful one, and I should be very sorry to have the item struck out. It really affords the only protection these people have. In some of the harbours $25 is spent; in others $200. In some places there are no rocks one year, and the next year the harbour will be full of rocks. This money is also spent not only in the county of Gaspe, but in Rimouski, and a small portion of it in Bonaventure.

My hon. friend has told us that more useful expenditure could be made by providing railways. Well, I may say that ever since I have been elected, I have been continually struggling to get better railway accommodation, but have been hampered by the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company of Armstrong fame. It has been the misfortune of the peninsula of Gaspe to have had Mr. Armstrong as the promoter of railway accommodation in that part of the country. He did build a railway from Metapedia to New Carlisle, but the work has stopped there, and to-day the rest of the peninsula is deprived of railway communications. Two years ago, I presented to this House a Bill to incorporate a railway company, composed of the best railway men in the Dominion, among whom were Messrs. Macrae & Ross, the gentlemen who built the Great Northern from Quebec to Hawkesbury. They were ready to take up the construction of a railway, but the Bill, after passing this House, was defeated in the Senate through the Armstrong influence. These men were prepared to build a railway from Gaspé Basin to New Carlisle, and even into the interior, striking a point somewhere near Causapscal, in the county of Rimouski.

At my request, the government put into the estimates in 1898 a subsidy amounting to about a quarter of a million dollars to build that line, but no company would undertake the project on account of the opposition of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. The subsidy is still in the estimates, and I hope, the day is not far distant when a new railway line will be built as far as Gaspe Basin.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend must not think that because we ask for some explanation we desire to have the item struck. When we have such a desire, we will make a move in that direction. But we are entitled to some explanation. What my hon. friend says about Mr. Armstrong I would not like to let go entirely unchallenged. He is more familiar with the facts than I, but there are two sides to every story, and possibly there is another version besides the one he has given the House. If Mr. Armstrong has the powerful influence which my hon. friend says he has—sufficient to prevent the peninsula of Gaspe from having the benefit of railway accommodation—he has much greater influence than I have credited him with.

My hon. friend will bear me out when I say that outside the wharfs down there, the cry is for railway communication, and when we come to spend money in that peninsula we ought to see that it is spent for the greatest benefit of the people. I would ask my hon. friend whether there are any works projected this year from Percé, around the extremity of the peninsula, into the estuary of the St. Lawrence, which is the most dangerous part ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. A wharf was built at Cape Chat three or four years ago, and there is now the Grande Vallee pier, which we are providing for. The works at Fox river

are going on and a few days ago tenders have been advertised for in the newspapers to build a breakwater at Point St. Peter, between Percé and the Bay of Gaspe. At Point St. Peter there was two years ago a loss of sixty boats, and I think the expenditure there, is a very wise one. That is the only new work I know of this year.

Murray Bay—increasing height of wharf and extending same, $6,000.

Mr. MONK. Was there not work done there last year to a considerable amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and this is to complete the raising and enlarging of the wharf.

Mr. MORIN. I do not see why the government should not compel the Richelieu Company to build their own wharfs, at Murray Bay or anywhere else, which is touched by their line of steamers. It is ridiculous for the government to build wharfs for a company like the Richelieu Navigation Company. Why cannot this company build their own wharfs ? The hon. Minister of Public Works may think that I am rising just to find fault, but that is not the case. I am not in the habit of getting up very often, but I have the right to see what becomes of the people's money. That money goes and is not divided equally. Now, there is the St. Lawrence river. The people that live along that stream have all the facilities people could ask for. They have the waterway, they have the railway, and the wharfs to assist them to use the waterway are built for them. But the people who live in the back counties, such as the one I represent, cannot get help to the extent of one cent. I have heard members of parliament from the west complain about having to haul their grain fifteen miles to market. I have heard them say : We have been living in the west fifteen or sixteen years, and do you think we are going to haul our grain fifteen miles to market ? It is ridiculous ; we must have a railroad. Just think—the county of Dorchester was opened by my grandfather in 1797 ; and I would like to see the man in this House or out of it who could show where the government has ever spent one cent in that county. Now, I will give you time to reply to that. Some three or four years ago there was a bridge carried away, the fourth bridge at that place. I came here and asked the Minister of Public Works to have a donation of $200 towards a new bridge. I did not get it, but I suppose I was to blame. If I had asked the hon. gentleman for $20,000 I might have got $1,000. But I was reasonable, and asked for only $200—and did not get one cent.

An hon. MEMBER. That was a local work.

Mr. MORIN. Why, if you will look at these estimates, you will see where this parliament is asked to vote money to build bridges right here in Ottawa. Has not a bridge been built across the canal ? Is that a local work or not ? But this is the way we are treated. Because we live back from the St. Lawrence, away from civilization, as you say, we must get along without encouragement and without help. There was a bridge across the Etchemin river——

Mr. LEMIEUX. That was the Quebec government.

Mr. MORIN. Quebec or Ontario, it was a bridge, just the same. An hon. gentleman this evening quoted some of the prices paid by the Minister of Public Works for timber. The Minister of Public Works does not understand prices and qualities and quantities of timber. I must say I understand these matters very well. The Minister had some doubts about the prices paid. I can say to the hon. gentleman that I have no doubts at all. I can give him a case. I do not speak from hearsay, but what I say—it is so. There was a man near Quebec—I do not propose to mention his name in this House, he was a strong Tory. Remember that. As he was a strong man, the Grit party bought him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MORIN. Yes, Sir. And after they had bought him, they had to feed him, or he would slip away from them. And what did that gentleman do ? Some three years ago, he came to me and said : I have the contract to furnish the government with some timber, round timber and hewn timber. He asked me if I would help him to get it. I said : 'No, I am out of that business.' 'Well,' he said, 'will you help me by telling me where I can get it ?' I said I would. I went home and saw the men who live about me and told them of the matter, and they said they would hew some timber. The gentleman came down, and I took him around, told him this man would get some timber for him, and the other would get him some more, and so on. They made a bargain before me. The price that this man gave to them was 6 cents for round timber. Bear that in mind. The Auditor General's Report shows that the government paid that man 12 cents for that same timber. For another class of timber, he agreed to pay these people 12 cents a foot—the report shows that the government paid 18 cents a foot. Do not you tell me I am mistaken, for it won't do. This gentleman never bought an ax, he never bought a cant hook, he never bought a tree. The people did all the work, and, as the government paid him he paid them. Now, the lumberman has to send his men up to the timber limits, cut the logs, drive them, saw them, put the lumber away for a year and then sell it. He is out of his money for two or three years.

And if he gets two or three or four dollars a thousand profit, he is well satisfied. So, if a gentleman can clear six cents a foot without doing anything and without risk, why should he not be satisfied. This shows just what I say—first you bought him, and then you had to feed him or he would slip away from you. Now that is all.

Riviere St. Maurice—channel between Grandes Piles and La Tuque, $8,000.

Mr. MONK. How is that work being done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have a small dredge of our own, which will do the work.

Mr. MONK. It is not under contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, this is a small dredge we have built ourselves, and we are working it in the usual way.

Riviere St. Maurice—dredging, $6,000.

Mr. MONK. Has that dredging been asked for by the people ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a large trade. No part of the country is developing more rapidly than that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the payment per day for a dredge on work like this ? The reason I ask is that I see figures down here for dredges at the rate of $65 per day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When we reach the item for dredging I will be glad to give all the information available.

St. Alexis—Baie des Ha ! Ha ! $4,000.

Mr. MONK. There was a pier built there last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to complete the same pier; we have not enough money.

Mr. MONK. It was done last year by day work. Does the minister not think he might have gained something by calling for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In that district the work has been nearly all done by day labour with great success.

Sorel—deep water wharf, $170,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister give us an explanation of this most extraordinary item ? I heard a startling statement made a little time ago by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin), although it was not new to me. It was that the government from time to time are constructing along the St. Lawrence river these docks for the accommodation of steamboat companies. Let me tell the Minister of Public Works that the Richelieu and Navigation line, if I am not mistaken, ply into the city of Toronto. The government does not build docks for them in Toronto. They go into the province of Ontario where business is done on business principles, and where the thing would be nothing short of an outrageous scandal were it exposed. Consequently the Richelieu and Navigation Company go to some private individuals who own a dock in the city of Toronto, and make an arrangement by the year for the use of the dock, paying rent therefor. Yet here to-night—I suppose this may be news to some hon. gentlemen opposite. I am astounded that some of those gentlemen from Ontario do not rise up and ask any questions in reference to these matters. I see the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) sitting before me. I will be bound to say that had he attempted to defend any one of these items in the riding of West Durham when he was there a few weeks ago, his friends would have got a worse black eye in the rural districts than they did get there. The whole province of Ontario, the whole Dominion, know that the government down in the St. Lawrence river are taking the money of the people of Canada by thousands and thousands to construct docks for the purpose of affording accommodation to a wealthy company. Now, may I ask the minister this question in connection with this dock at Sorel ? What is the expenditure intended on the construction of this dock, has the contract been let, and is the dock to be constructed on property already acquired by the Crown?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dock is being constructed now on property acquired, a deed of which we have in our possession. Let me tell my hon. friend that the Richelieu Company has nothing at all to do with that work, it will not be used by them. They have their own wharfs in the Richelieu river. This work is at the junction of the Richelieu and the St. Lawrence, and is being built for the accommodation of trade. My hon. friend may happen to know that the New York Central interests have bought lately the South Shore Railway. There are two railway companies at Sorel. The work we are doing there is for the accommodation of trade, for the same purpose for which we have built and are building to-day, wharfs, piers and harbours in every province, Ontario included. It is useless for my hon. friend to say that we are doing that work in Quebec while we are neglecting Ontario. He has only to look at the figures in the estimates to find that Ontario has the lion's share. We have done in the past, all governments have done in the past, large harbour improvements in every province, Ontario included. Meaford, Owen Sound, Collingwood, all these harbours have cost a large amount of money. In Collingwood the government has spent over $400,000. The money is well invested, we do

not complain. Collingwood is not more important than Sorel, Owen Sound is not more important than Sorel.

Mr. KEMP. Are you building a wharf in Collingwood ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are doing dredging operations there.

Mr. KEMP. We are talking about a wharf.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Harbour works are of different kinds. Sometimes they require a dredge. There is a good deal of dredging on that work. My hon. friend will not tell me there have been no works done in Ontario. There are dozens of harbours, wharfs and breakwaters that we have built in the past in Ontario, and we shall continue to build wharfs and breakwaters there in the future. I may say that the harbours of Montreal, Sorel, Three Rivers and Quebec will be largely used for trade purposes, they are being already largely used for that purpose. Trade is increasing every day. If we are going to have that current of trade that we expect, we must provide for it. The works at Sorel, at Three Rivers, at Quebec, at Montreal are just the same kind of works that are being constructed elsewhere.

Mr. BENNETT. I made no complaint on the score that this was a local work, and that it was being done in the province of Quebec. I tell the minister that there are items in Ontario more disgraceful even than some of these that have been mentioned. Three years ago he constructed a dock in the riding I represent that was a disgrace, so far as the expenditure of public money went. It was at a place called Hawkestone, under the direction of the Postmaster General, and the people there reprobated it. It cost three or four thousand dollars, and the people there reprobated it even though they did get a little profit out of it. I had a better majority at that point than I ever had, because the people said, if this is a sample of the dissipation of the public money of this country, then we propose to condemn it. I am prepared to support the principle of constructing harbours at any place where they are required by reason of receding water or by reason of deeper vessels plying there. I believe it is proper to do necessary dredging. So far as the expenditure goes that is a matter for the minister and the government to decide.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Goderich, how much have we spent in the past ? $600,000. Not this government alone, but past governments.

Mr. BENNETT. These are matters for the people of the country to decide, whether or not the government should do as they are doing, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars at places that never have become ports and never will become ports, but simply to meet political exigencies.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman does not mean to say that Sorel is not an important port.

Mr. BENNETT. If the minister will give the House this assurance, that they are going to construct docks at Sorel and charge the steamboats which may use those docks a reasonable sum for such use, and that he has reason to believe the revenue derived will be a fair return for the investment, then there is something to be said in favour of it. But, I have this to say to the hon. minister when he takes that stand, that, if it would pay the government to invest in docks and harbours, why are not private parties justified in going into similar enterprises as they do in Toronto ? Why does not the government go to Toronto and construct docks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Have we not spent $1,000,000 in Toronto ?

Mr. BENNETT. My hon. friend cannot point to where a dollar has been spent in Toronto on docks. True, where private parties have built docks you have spent money in dredging, and you have also expended money in constructing piers and rip-rap works to prevent filling in by sand. As far as Owen Sound goes, I do not think this, or the preceding government, has spent a single dollar on docks.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, on wharfs.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I say it was wrong to spend money there for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway or anywhere else, but if the hon. minister will explain to us what this Sorel dock is, we will understand what is proposed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not hesitate to say that any country that tried to get along on the principle enunciated by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) would not get along very fast. If you wait for private enterprise to provide accommodation for trade, you will have to wait a long time before such a system is carried out, and in a young country where we have an immense quantity of trade in prospect, if we do not provide for it, we will never secure it. I say as a matter of general policy, that it is the duty of any government to provide for the accommodation of trade by building wharfs and elevators. If I have a free hand I would not hesitate to erect elevators——

Mr. MONK. In Montreal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Montreal and elsewhere, because, in this century, governments must move on. But, we are doing a great deal and we cannot do everything we would like to do. As to the erection of works at Sorel, as at God-

erich and elsewhere, we have to do it. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has started his criticism under the wrong impression that these works were created for the benefit of the Richelieu Company. It is nothing of the kind. These are deep water wharfs for the accommodation of the deep draught vessels that will certainly visit that port when these works are completed. As soon as these works are completed by my department they are transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and, as I have stated in connection with some other works, the law then applies and the ordinary dues are charged.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to say to the hon. minister that, as we have been informed, the New York Central Railway Company have bought the Canada Atlantic Railway, and according to what the hon. minister says, they have bought the road from Montreal to Sorel. Before they bought these roads it appears there were wharfs enough at Sorel. At least, we heard no complaint about any scarcity of wharf accommodation. How is it that as soon as these American people come in here and buy our railways we must jump right up and build wharfs for them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These works were given out by contract long before the New York Central bought the South Shore Railway, in fact, a year or two ago. An appropriation was voted by the House before the South Shore passed into the hands of that syndicate.

Mr. MORIN. That may all be, but I was just referring to what the hon. minister said. He said that the New York Central had bought the South Shore Railway and required these wharfs.

Mr. KEMP. As this is a very large item, I think we ought to consider it a little more fully. May I inquire what amount of money it is intended to expend on the wharf at Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For that work ?

Mr. KEMP. Altogether.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the only expenditure of money that has ever been asked by parliament for any works at Sorel.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will that complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the amount of the contract is $255,000.

Mr. KEMP. Do I understand that it is intended to make Sorel an ocean terminal, the same as Montreal and Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. KEMP. Montreal has harbour dues and Montreal does not ask the government to build wharfs. I do not understand on what principle the government are embarking on this enterprise. If they are going to make an ocean terminal of Sorel, this is the first I have heard of the intention to cultivate a trade of that kind at that place. Do I understand that it is the intention of the New York Central to carry grain down the South Shore and transfer it at Sorel to ocean vessels to be carried thence to Europe ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Sorel is a large centre of trade already. There will be a large quantity of products that are shipped perhaps from Montreal now which will be shipped from Sorel. All that large district from St. Hyacinthe on the Richelieu river will certainly ship its produce through Sorel. This is one of the wealthiest parts of the province of Quebec and of the country. My hon. friend has just stated that the government does not vote money directly for the port of Montreal. It is true the trade has paid so far for the works that have been carried on in Montreal. I do not know whether it is the best policy that can be followed, because if we are to compete with American ports, we will be obliged to be progressive, and it may come to pass that public opinion will insist that the government shall do for Montreal what we are doing elsewhere; that is to say, carry out works at the public expense. But, so far the trade of the country that is passing through the port of Montreal is paying the interest on the money that is being expended there. It is about the only port that is supporting itself in that way.

Mr. KEMP. I do not suppose there is much difference between the opinions of my hon. friend and myself in reference to the port of Montreal. Probably if we understood each other we would agree. But, in reference to making Sorel an ocean port, it is a new proposition, and I question very much the practicability of the scheme.

The PRIME MINISTER. This question is not at all a new one. Within a short time this proposal has come before the House. In 1899, I think it was, or, in 1900, when the Minister of Public Works was away, an appropriation of $25,000 was taken. It was rather a tentative appropriation and was found to be insufficient. Nothing was done upon it. Last year, after having had complete surveys made, an appropriation of $100,000 was asked from parliament and then it was stated that these works, which were intended to be constructed at Sorel, would cost anywhere from $150,000 to $175,000. Now, the intention is to make Sorel an ocean port. This seems to surprise the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp). There is really nothing in it that should surprise him. Sorel is at the confluence of the

Richelieu river and the St. Lawrence, and from time immemorial it has been the great artery of communication for the whole interior of the country south of Montreal. But railways are taking the place of waterways, and two railways are now converging at Sorel, the south shore which has been constructed from Montreal to Sorel and beyond Sorel to Nicolet, and will be completed this year probably to Lotbinière. There is the United Counties Railway also which became the Rutland Railway, and which I believe now belongs to the New York Central, and it comes from the New York Central railway system at Lake Champlain to the town of Sorel. The traffic of a very wealthy section of the country, of eight or ten of the most wealthy counties in Quebec—Richelieu, St. Hyacinthe, Yamaska, St. John, Iberville—and others will come to this harbour. It is not possible to doubt that a very large trade will be brought there and this work is contemplated in order to accommodate that trade. I was surprised to hear my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) make some comparison between the expenditure in the province of Quebec and the expenditure in the province of Ontario. It does not matter in what province we make the expenditure, if it is to accommodate the trade of the country at large, which is coming more and more to the valley of the St. Lawrence, and nobody will grudge money spent for that purpose. This is not only for Sorel, but it is a part of the system to equip the harbours of Montreal, Three Rivers and Quebec. I am sure that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) has no doubt whatever that before many years, there will be enough trade coming from Ontario and the west to supply all those harbours, of which Sorel is one.

Mr. KEMP. I am glad to have this information. I was not a member of the House when the vote was first taken in 1899 and I did not hear the discussion. In fact until now I never heard of Sorel as a prospective port for ocean vessels. When we consider how long Quebec has been stagnant and how few of the ocean vessels have called there of recent years—in fact only the Leyland line is coming here this summer after years of waiting—we may reasonably come to the conclusion that Montreal and Quebec will be for years the principal ports of the St. Lawrence. I confess that I do not see how Sorel is to become an ocean port. I quite agree with the Prime Minister that the valley of the Richelieu is very fertile but the agricultural products of that district are not sufficient to afford trade for this large harbour.

So far as the Rutland road is concerned it will bring no traffic to Sorel for export, because its terminal at one end is practically in New York, a sea port, and Sorel would be the other. It will be many years, and Montreal and Quebec will have to develop to an enormous extent, before Sorel will get any trade as an ocean port. My impression is that the wharf at Sorel at present is sufficient for the trade of that fertile valley to which the Prime Minister has referred.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who are the contractors for this work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Messrs. Poupore & Malone.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did the contract call for hemlock or pine.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the specifications at hand, but I will lay them on the Table.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to see them.

Mr. MONK. Will the minister lay on the Table a copy of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With pleasure.

Mr. MONK. Have the works proceeded so far ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes, they will be completed at the end of the season. Poupore and Malone have a splendid equipment, perhaps the best of all the contractors I have.

Mr. MONK. How much was spent last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $86,000.

Mr. MONK. The minister tells us that this extension of trade is expected from the new railway companies that are interested in Sorel. Have any steps been taken by the government to find out if these railway companies would contribute any to this expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was awarded before the present syndicate owned these roads.

Mr. MONK. Of course it presents a very great anomaly, because if you spend such a large amount as that in towns which have a great deal of promise, the fact remains that in the city of Montreal where our harbours are still unimproved, the trade has to bear the charges of the improvements that are being made there. It is a very regrettable fact, as Mr. Reeve stated last year when he visited Montreal harbour with the Harbour Commissioners, that it was not possible immediately to put that harbour on a proper footing without any further delay. I would not begrudge any improvements that are being made at Sorel. Of course Three Rivers has a very important harbour, and Quebec I need not speak of, but you have this great difference that what is being done at these places is being done at the expense of the govern-

ment, and all that is being done in Montreal is done at the expense of the trade. Under these circumstances it is a pity that this expenditure cannot be slightly reduced.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not altogether right to say that all the work that is being carried on at Montreal is carried on at the expense of the trade. Most of the work, nearly the whole of the work is carried on that way, but my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will not forget that the government is carrying on in the eastern portion of the harbour a very large work, the contract for which is over $600,000. The same contractors, Messrs. Poupore & Malone are proceeding with that work actively. I have been fortunate enough to be able to convince my colleagues and parliament two years ago of the necessity of starting works in the eastern portion of the Montreal harbour. One of the results has been that the Canadian Pacific Railway are locating an immense establishment in that part of the harbour.

Mr. MONK. That has nothing to do with it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, the facts are there. The Canadian Pacific Railway knew they would have accommodation. Of course the Harbour Commissioners have already built two low level wharfs, but we are building a magnificent high level wharf that will accommodate the trade. I altogether share the views of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that it is a great pity that the port of Montreal has not been equipped sooner, but we are now making up for lost time. I am bound to say that the works are progressing, though perhaps not as fast as I would like them to progress. I hope and trust that these improvements will be completed in the centre of the harbour, the main works, at the close of the present season. Then the equipment of the wharfs will have to be attended to.

Mr. MONK. I would only ask my hon. friend if it would be possible, in bringing down the contract for the wharf at Sorel, to bring down a copy of the contract for this work at Maisonneuve.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With pleasure.

Valleyfield—dredging channel in Valleyfield Bay, &c., $4,000.

Mr. MONK. Where is that dredging to be done exactly ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the harbour at Valleyfield. We started the work last year. We have done a good deal of it, and we must go on with it. Valleyfield is becoming every day a more important harbour, and we shall have to do a good deal of work there in the future, in order to accommodate the large trade centreing there.

Mr. MONK. Is there any estimate in the department of what it will cost to terminate the work begun last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer tells me that this $4,000 will complete the work in that part of the harbour where it was begun last year ; but there is a channel to be dredged 12 feet at the entrance to the harbour. I have a complete survey of this work to be done, but I cannot state just now what the cost of that additional work will be.

Mr. MONK. Is it the case that a portion of this dredging is to allow a free approach of water to the mills ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to give a greater depth of water to the trade generally. As my hon. friend knows, Valleyfield has a population of 12,000 souls, and I anticipate that in the next few years it will have a much larger population, and we intend improving that harbour, as we do all the harbours where trade is developing.

Mr. MONK. Is any of that dredging to be done in the dam of the mills ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister be good enough to lay on the Table a list of the works to be done by public contract, together with a list of those to be done by day labour, out of this vote of $422,900, at some future time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no objection. I prepared such a list last year, and I will have another prepared this year, and will lay it on the Table with pleasure.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that elevator built at Sorel, which the hon. minister promised last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not promise an elevator last year.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman stated that as a reason why he was spending so much money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no doubt that when that work is completed, there will be an elevator built.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman made the statement last year that that was one of the reasons, and I am simply asking him whether anything more was done with that elevator.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was represented to us last year that an elevator would be built. It is not built yet, because our work is not yet above water.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 12.10 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 12, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that Mr. Carroll's name be added to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, on Railways and Canals and Telegraph Lines, on Miscellaneous Private Bills and on Public Accounts ; that Mr. Stewart's name be added to the Select Standing Committee on Railways and Canals and Telegraph Lines and on Miscellaneous Private Bills, on Standing Orders and on Agriculture and Colonization ; that Mr. Porter's name be added to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the North-west Mounted Police for the year 1901.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS —AMENDMENTS.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I beg to introduce Bill (No. 41) in amendment of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts. The object of this Bill is to constitute the Supreme Court into a mere federal court, having jurisdiction in all civil and criminal matters, in all cases relating to the constitution, to the laws of the Dominion, to admiralty matters and to navigation laws. Further, in all suits to which the Dominion government will be a party ; in all cases between two or more provinces ; between a province and a private individual living in another province ; between private individuals from different provinces ; between private individuals claiming some real estate, in virtue of claims emanating from different provinces ; and between a province and private individuals belonging to another province or private individuals of the same province.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 42) to amend the Railway Act of 1888.—Mr. Scott.

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—COMMISSION ON OUTLAY.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Maclean—asked :

Has the government had any communication with, or from the Colonial Office, or the War Department of the Imperial government with reference to the 3 per cent commission said to be granted to certain Australian colonies on outlay in connection with expenditure for the war in South Africa ? If so, has any conclusion been arrived at in the matter, and if so, what, and will the papers be brought down at an early date ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No such communication has been received from the Colonial Office or from the War Office.

THE CENSUS—COST OF ENUMERATION.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Maclean—asked :

1. What was the cost of the enumeration of the census in 1891 and 1901, respectively ?
2. What was the cost of the work in the county of Grey for 1891 and 1901, respectively ?
3. How were the enumerators paid, whether by the day or for each name or family, also factory ?
4. If by the day, how many hours were to constitute a day, and was overtime paid for at some proportionate rate ?
5. If paid so much per name or family and industrial establishment, what was the rate for each ?
6. How many enumerators were employed for census of 1891 and 1901, respectively ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) to move for a return of the information sought in this question.

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P. E. I.—RANGE LIGHTS AT THE SANDHILLS.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Did the Department of Marine and Fisheries instruct Mr. Lord, the agent at Charlottetown, to remove the range lights at the Sandhills, Cascumpec Harbour, Prince county, Prince Edward Island, on or about the first day of May, 1901 ?
2. If so, were those instructions given because the lights were in a wrong position and dangerous to mariners frequenting the harbour ?
3. On what date was the change made ?
4. Was the department aware that the lights were in a wrong position from the date of the instructions to Mr. Lord until the change was made ?
5. Were the lights in operation from the first of May until the change was made, and was the keeper paid his salary during that time ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Instructions were given to Mr. Lord, on the 19th June, 1901, to remove the range lights from the Sandhills to Sandy Island.

2. These instructions were given because a change in the channel necessitated a removal of the range as explained to the hon. member for West Prince last year. Frequent changes in this range are necessitated by constant changes in the channel over the bar at the mouth of the harbour.

3. 11th July, 1901.

4. The range lights previously maintained on the Sand Heads had been put out in the

autumn of 1900. The change was made in the summer of 1901, as soon as the position of the new channel had been accurately defined.

5. The lights were not in operation from the 1st of May until the change was made. The keeper was paid salary for maintaining the main sea-coast light which was under his charge. His salary was increased $40 per annum from the 1st of December last, in consequence of the extra work involved in maintaining the range lights on Sandy Island.

CHICKEN-FATTENING STATIONS, P.E.I.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Where are the chicken-fattening stations in West Prince, Prince Edward Island, situated ?
2. Who are the persons in charge of same ?
3. What number of chickens was purchased for these stations last year ?
4. What was the price paid ?
5. In what market were the fattened chickens sold, and what were the prices realized ?
6. What was the expense of each station, and the amount paid in wages and expenses to the parties in charge, giving names and amounts for each station, respectively ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. There is one station in West Prince, P.E.I., situated at Alberton.
2. Mr. Henry J. Matthews.
3. 204 chickens.
4. $52.50.
5. Shipped to England, account sales not yet received.
6. Wages to Henry J. Matthews, $50; other labour, $10.20; crates and feed, $49.48

FISHING LICENSES, PRINCE COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. How many fishing licenses were issued by Edmund Matthews, fishery guardian at Alberton, Prince County, Prince Edward Island, in the years 1900 and 1901, respectively ?
2. What are the names of parties to whom licenses were granted, and the kinds of fish for which such licenses were given ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Local guardians do not issue licenses.
2. I would be much pleased to bring down the information. It is a very voluminous document, and if my hon. friend will move for a return, I will see that it is brought down.

COMMISSION ON DISBURSEMENTS FOR IMPERIAL AUTHORITIES.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. Has the government received from the Imperial War Office or Colonial Office, a circular announcing that three (3) per cent commission will be allowed to the Canadian government on disbursements made on behalf of the Imperial authorities ?
2. If not three (3) per cent commission, what commission was named ?
3. Is it the purpose or intention of the government to accept such commission ?
4. Has such commission been charged the Imperial authorities by the Canadian government, or by any agents recommended or appointed by the Canadian government ?
5. What agents or inspectors for Imperial purchases in Canada were recommended directly or indirectly by the Canadian government, or by any member thereof ? What commissions did these receive ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. No communication of that nature has been received, as already stated, from the War Office or from the Colonial Office.
4. No commissions have been charged.
5. Officers of the Inspectors' Department have generally been acting, but without any commission.

CENSUS ENUMERATORS, SOUTH WATERLOO.

Mr. CLARE—by Mr. Lennox—asked :

1. Who were the enumerators for the electoral division of South Waterloo in the taking of the recent census ?
2. What was the amount paid to each for his services ?
3. By whom were the enumerators recommended ?
4. Was there any special enumerator assigned for securing information as to manufacturing interests in the said riding, or in any part thereof ?
5. If so, who was the special enumerator, and what amount was paid to him for his services ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1 and 2. Cost of Census Waterloo South for 1901 :

C. A. McIntosh	$ 35 95
R. C. Fife	81 00
Jno. Noll	85 20
James Goudie	74 30
Edward Weiler	105 95
David Little	62 30
A. R. Good	83 80
H. J. Hindson	78 00
M. E. Wismer	67 85
Andrew Chisholm	82 05
C. T. Groh	95 10
James Taylor	71 15
A. Cressman	102 20
J. A. Manson	75 25
G. L. Baker	71 30
John Taylor, jr	78 20
W. A. Smuck	53 05
W. Clouston	51 20
E. J. Wilkins	54 10
Peter Seip	88 10
Herman Schantz	92 05
J. C. Cressman	91 00
George Rife	75 45
Geo. D. McColl	54 80
Alex. Fraser	62 35
Thomas Barrett	56 65
William Colvin	33 25
J. McTague	45 85
J. McFeiggan	49 50
Joseph Springer	78 55
Robert N. Scott	54 75
A. S. Mann	42 50
S. D. Robertson	30 75
Thos. K. McBean	57 40
Edward Lane	29 75
W. N. Schweitzer	29 30

3. The recommendations are confidential.
4. Yes.
5. Fred R. Shantz. Nothing as yet has been paid to Mr. Shantz.

PROPERTY AND CIVIL RIGHTS.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Hants) moved :

That in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when steps should be taken to carry out the provisions of section 94 of the British North America Act, for securing the uniformity of the laws relating to property and civil rights in Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and in such other provinces as have been brought within the scope of the section since the passing of the British North America Act.

He said : The motion that I desire to commend to the favourable consideration of the House, was placed on the Order paper at the last session of parliament, but no favourable opportunity was presented for its discussion. I regard it as one of the most interesting and important subjects that could be brought to the attention of this Chamber, although I am well aware that it is not in the smallest degree of an exciting or sensational character, and I do not venture to hope that it will make so strong an appeal to the consideration of the general public as many others with which this House is called upon to deal. It relates to a provision of the British North America Act for securing such a degree of uniformity in the laws of the various provinces of the Dominion as may be found acceptable and advantageous to the legislatures and people of those provinces. This provision in substantially similar terms to those appearing in the British North America Act, was embodied in the resolutions of the Quebec Conference on which our Constitutional Act is founded, and I think it may be fairly presented as a compromise between the views of those members of the Conference who favoured a legislative union of the provinces, and those who opposed such a union. Or perhaps I shall speak with greater accuracy if I say that it was adopted as a solution of the difficulty that presented itself to those members of the Conference who, while they leaned towards the project of a legislative union, realized that under the conditions that surrounded them it would be undesirable and in fact impossible for the various provinces to make such a sacrifice of their autonomy as the consummation of a legislative union would involve.

It is well known to those of us who are old enough to recall the proceedings of that historic assembly, or who have had occasion to peruse the debates to which its proceedings gave rise, that some of the most renowned and able political leaders and publicists who took part in the discussions of that period looked with great favour upon the project of a legislative union. Sir John A. Macdonald made no secret of his preference for such a union, assuming that there had been no practical difficulties in the way of the consummation. But there were difficulties which the practical wisdom of the Conference was obliged to frankly recognize. I think it is very widely and generally assumed that such difficulties had reference solely to the peculiar conditions of language, laws and institutions prevailing in what is now the province of Quebec. No doubt the institutions of Lower Canada, guarded and guaranteed by an inviolable treaty, had much to do with the ultimate decision of the Conference, but Quebec did not stand alone in its preference for a federal union. A perusal of the debates that occurred in the legislative assembly of United Canada on the adoption of the resolutions of the Quebec Conference, and still more a knowledge of the discussions that took place throughout New Brunswick and Nova Scotia would, I am sure, convince any impartial man that even if there had been no province of Quebec to be incorporated in the proposed union, had the objections to a legislative union presented by the conditions in Lower Canada been wholly eliminated, it would nevertheless have been impossible to secure the assent of the remaining provinces to a surrender of their provincial autonomy. You will find in those discussions references to the enormous extent of the territory to be administered and the immense variety of subjects with which its legislature, under such a union, would be called upon to deal, you will find arguments against a legislative union drawn from the experience of the parliament of the United Kingdom, where an assembly wielding the sovereignty and dealing with the interests of a world-wide empire is absurdly called upon from time to time to pass laws for the regulation of gas works or a tram service in some obscure town in a remote corner of the island. You will find, moreover, in those discussions evidence of the sensitiveness of some of the smaller provinces to an apprehension lest under a legislative union they would forfeit the right of immediate and direct control over matters that they regarded as of vital importance to their happiness and welfare. These considerations, let me repeat, even apart from any special desire on the part of Lower Canada would have made it impossible to adopt a legislative union. But in addition to all these arguments which in themselves would have been conclusive, the Conference had to take into its account the deep and fond attachment naturally and properly felt by the people of Lower Canada for the laws and institutions inherited from their forefathers and guaranteed to them by treaty which will be forever held sacred, so long as truth and justice and national good faith remain the stable foundations of British sovereignty. We may differ upon many questions of public policy in this House, and we may differ

in our judgments as to many of the great questions that have arisen from time to time during the period that has passed since the Act of Confederation was adopted, but I take it that there are no two opinions in this House as to the wisdom of the conclusion that was arrived at by the Conference at Quebec when the project of a legislative union in so far as it had ever been mooted at all, was definitively set aside as impracticable and the federal principle was frankly and unreservedly adopted as the basis of our union. I should ask for no support and expect no support for this resolution if I supposed that it could be justly objected to as menacing in the faintest degree the fundamental principle of federalism upon which this confederation stands. It contains no such menace. It is open to no such objection.

What is the essence of the federal principle in so far as it relates to the question in hand ? The essence of that principle is that in regard to all matters upon which it may be conceived that the several provinces composing the union may have different views and cherish different ideals as to what is just and expedient in their legislation, the exclusive authority to legislate shall be vested in the provincial legislature. That is one proposition and one that is of the utmost importance to the well-being of the Dominion. But that proposition connotes another which is equally important and equally necessary to the adequate statement of the principle, namely, that in all matters upon which it is for the general good that a uniform system of legislation should prevail throughout the Dominion, the legislative authority should be committed to a central parliament having power to make its edicts binding upon all. It would not be pardonable in me to occupy the time of the House with proofs or illustrations of such an obvious and palpable truism. A comparison of the subjects of legislation assigned to the central parliament and to the provincial legislatures respectively would be simply a pretentious presentation of that with which every hon. gentleman is already familiar. But one single illustration may perhaps be permitted for the reason that it lies so directly in the path that this discussion is bound to follow. The subject of property and civil rights has been assigned to the provincial legislatures. Why ? Because in one at least of the provinces that compose the union and perhaps to a certain degree in more than one province different views prevail from those that find acceptance in other provinces as to what is just and expedient in the laws that govern the ownership, the enjoyment, the transfer and the devolution of property, either real or personal. The law of contract has been held to come within the definition that covers the general subject of property and civil rights, and there were at the time the Confederation Act was adopted variant provisions in the several provinces as to the validity and authentication of contracts and variant provisions as to the evidence by which they should be proved in courts of justice. And yet one most important class of contracts, one most important species of property was committed to the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of this Dominion parliament. Why? Because bills of exchange and promissory notes are of such a cosmopolitan character, they travel so freely and so widely from province to province, drawn in one province, payable in another, indorsed in still another and perhaps in others more than one, that it was above all things desirable that the rights arising out of their creation or resulting from their dishonour, should be determined by a uniform body of principles, no matter in which of the various provinces the contract happened to be made, or in which of them it should happen to be broken. Furthermore, the laws of the various provinces in regard to bills and notes were substantially uniform already and no possible reason could be suggested for withholding from the central parliament the authority to legislate upon the subject. On other species of property and as to other descriptions of contract, the case was entirely different. Had they been assigned to the parliament of the Dominion the apprehension was a perfectly reasonable one that legislation might be adopted that would revolutionize in one of the provinces the system with which the people of that province were familiar, to which they were greatly attached and which they regard as being founded on more equitable principles and developed according to more logical and scientific methods than the laws prevailing in other parts of the Dominion. It is no part of my undertaking to-day to pass judgment upon this preference. I am not sure that any claim of superiority is made on the part of our friends from Quebec for the system of law that they have inherited and developed. It is sufficient for all purposes to know that they prefer it and that they have an absolute and undisputed right to be the sole and final judges in the matter. If a claim of superiority is made we may for the purposes of this argument without hesitation concede it. Possibly a fuller knowledge of the matter and a greater freedom from prepossessions than is possible to those of us who have been trained in a different system would dispose us to make the concession for all purposes whatever. But whether such a claim is made or not, whether we concede the claim or not, it must still remain true, that as to the other provinces of the Dominion, or most of them, there are many subjects, and that more especially among those falling within the definition of property and civil rights, upon which a uniform body of legislation would be as great a blessing as the uniformity of our legislation on bills of exchange and promissory notes has been found to be to the

Dominion as a whole. The law that regulates the sale of personal property presents as favourable a field for assimilation throughout the provinces in which the common law prevails as the law of bills and notes presented for assimilation throughout the Dominion at large. The principles applicable to the formation, operation and discharge of contracts generally present precisely the same conditions. Of the provisions of the statutes of Elizabeth against fraudulent conveyances and voluntary conveyances to the prejudice of bona fide purchasers, the same thing is to be said. So as to the principles that govern the validity and authentication of the contracts of incorporated bodies, so as to the rules of evidence in civil cases. So for the most part of the laws that govern the mutual rights and obligations arising out of family relationship, including the rights of the husband and the wife in the property of each other. So as to the devolution of real estate and the succession to personalty. There is even now in respect to all these and many other subjects that might be named, a large degree of uniformity in the legislation that has been adopted by the various provinces of the Dominion, so great a degree in fact that it is a matter of wonderment that it has not long ago been deemed advisable to consider whether an actual and absolute uniformity should not prevail in all the provinces whose system is founded upon the common law.

I have referred to these subjects only in the most cursory manner and I have done so merely by way of preface to the observations that I propose to quote from the speech of Sir John A. Macdonald in moving the ratification of the Quebec resolutions in the parliament of United Canada. All that I have been saying was obvious to the clear-headed and far-seeing statesmen who constituted that Conference at Quebec, and with a view of providing for such a uniformity as was desirable in the legal systems of the provinces governed by the common law they had embodied among the powers to be exercised by the Federal parliament the following, which was numbered 33 :

> Rendering uniform all or any of the laws relative to property and civil rights in Upper Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, and rendering uniform the procedure of all or any of the courts in these provinces; but any statute for this purpose shall have no force or authority in any province until sanctioned by the legislature thereof.

Referring to this resolution, Sir John A. Macdonald said :

> The 33rd provision is of very great importance to the future well-being of these colonies. It commits to the general parliament the rendering uniform all or any of the laws relating to property and civil rights in Upper Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, and rendering uniform the procedure of all or any of the courts of these provinces. The great principles that govern the laws of all the provinces with the single exception of Lower Canada are the same, although there may be divergence in details, and it is gratifying to find on the part of the lower provinces a general desire to join together with Upper Canada in the matter and to procure as soon as possible an assimilation of the statutory laws and the procedure of the courts of all those provinces. At present there is a good deal of diversity. In one of the colonies, for instance, they have no municipal system at all. In another the municipal system is merely permissive and has not been adopted to any extent. Although, therefore, a legislative union was found to be almost impracticable it was understood, so far as we could influence the future, that the first act of the future government should be to procure an assimilation of the statutory law of all those provinces which has as its root and foundation the common law of England. But to prevent local institutions from being over ridden, the same section makes provision that while power is given to the general legislature to deal with this subject, no change in this respect should have the force and authority of law in any province until sanctioned by the legislature of that province.

If I had any fear that the project outlined in the motion now before the House should seem to any hon. member to wear an utopian aspect, that the discussion of such a motion should seem to have an air of unreality and visionariness, I should point to these words of a statesman, who, whatever may have been thought his failings and shortcomings, was never accused by his bitterest enemy of the crime of visionariness or undue ideality. Far from it, Sir, he was a politician of a practical character, as we all know, and, that, in the intenser meaning of the term. When so practical a statesman as Sir John A. Macdonald used the language I have quoted, he most undoubtedly anticipated that among the very first measures of the Federal parliament would be an Act to carry into effect the wise provisions of this section for securing the uniformity of our provincial laws. These were no mere idle words inserted in the statute to indulge the fad of some visionary dreamer, nor was this provision intended or expected to remain upon the statute-book sterile and unproductive for more than thirty years. Sir John A. Macdonald expected to see it acted upon among the first enterprises of the newly constituted union. Why has it remained for so many years a mere unrealized dream ? Why, is it that, so far from seeing it fructify in a useful and serviceable body of legislation, we have seen it remaining for so many years—the good third of a century—as lifeless in appearance, yet, happily as capable of being clothed with life and vigour, as those seeds we have all heard of that were found in the hands of the Egyptian mummy.

Well, it may be that the reasons are not so difficult to find. During the earlier years of our history as a union, there were many problems to challenge the attention of our public men and many tasks awaiting their

busy and weary brains. There were sectional claims and aspirations to be satisfied or appeased. There was a recalcitrant province to be pacified. If there were not racial antagonisms to be reconciled there were racial suspicions to be removed. There were vast material interests clamouring for recognition, an Intercolonial Railway, the seal and bond of union, to be constructed, canals and waterways to be deepened and enlarged, conflicting views of fiscal policy to be adjusted, and all the vast and varied concerns of a nascent political community to be harmoniously regulated and directed to a common issue in the welfare of the new Dominion. No very great effort of the historical imagination is required to enable us to understand why this subject was under such circumstances allowed for the moment to sleep. But I venture to hope that the time has at length arrived when we may at least begin to think seriously about the matter, and to that end I will ask the House to permit me to set forth in order the advantages that in my judgment may be expected to follow the accomplishment of this task. I may not enumerate them in their logical order or even in the order of their importance. I will present them in the order in which they have occurred to my own mind.

First, then, by rendering our legislation uniform we may avail ourselves to the fullest possible extent and on the widest possible scale of the improvements in legislation that have been effected by the mother country in recent years. Let me amplify this proposition by reference to an illustration that has been already used for another purpose. A number of years ago Mr. M. D. Chalmers, as he then was, attempted to draw out and present in the form of a digest, a series of plain, perspicuous, intelligible propositions, embodying the legal doctrines and principles relating to the subject of bills of exchange and promissory notes—principles and doctrines which he deduced from the decisions of the courts extending over several centuries, running up into the hundreds and covering pages in the law reports that might be numbered by the thousand. In fact he has told us himself in an article in the 'Law Quarterly Review' that for the purposes of his work, whether the digest or the code that was subsequently founded upon it, I am not quite certain which, he read twenty-five hundred cases in the law reports and seventeen statutory enactments. His digest was subjected to the fire of professional criticism and was found to be an adequate and satisfactory statement of the law on the various points with which it dealt. After a trial of several years its various propositions were embodied in the form of an Act entitled 'An Act to codify the law relating to bills of exchange and promissory notes.' This was passed by the English parliament in 1882. It was, I believe, the first experiment in codification ever made by the Imperial parliament. It was not absolutely perfect. It did not even approach as nearly to perfection as legal knowledge and skill in the lucid expression of legal principles might have made it. It had to run the gauntlet of two Houses of parliament, each containing a number of members who considered themselves better authorities on the matter than Mr. Chalmers, who had made the subject his specialty. But nobody could deny that it made the law more accessible and more certain, that it set at rest a number of debated questions and was on the whole a luminous exposition of the legal doctrines and principles relating to the subject with which it dealt. That it was not perfect has been admitted. It must be confessed that one of its sections gave rise to a protracted litigation that could not have arisen if it had never been passed, but the amount involved was enormous, the litigants were wealthy and the result of the litigation established a general principle applicable not only to this piece of legislation but to all similar codifying statutes that may from time to time be adopted in any part of the empire. It was as to the particular section in question in the case referred to that the draftsman of the statute was frank enough to quote against himself the remark attributed to Lessing when one of his disciples questioned him as to the meaning of a passage in one of his lectures. 'My young friend' said the great philosopher, 'when I penned that passage, only God and myself knew what it meant, and now only God knows.'

The Bills and Notes Act was passed in England in 1882. Some years after it had been in force in the old country attention was directed to it in a series of letters in the 'Toronto Mail,'—the parentage of which modesty forbids me to disclose—and the government of Canada was urged to simplify and clarify the law for us in this country by enacting the statute here. The inference from post hoc to propter hoc is not always conclusive and I have no means of knowing whether it would have any validity in this particular case. It is sufficient to say, and it is the only material thing for us to know that within a twelvemonth from the appearance of this publication the statute was introduced here and passed in 1890, with some very slight modifications to make it more in accord with the mercantile and banking usages that had grown up in this country. It has been accepted by the banking institutions as a great boon and the public spirit and unselfish scientific instinct of the legal profession has welcomed it with equal cordiality, although rendering the law more simple, ascertainable and accessible it has to that extent taken away their usefulness and reduced their emoluments.

Since the passing of the Bills and Notes Act, other experiments in codification have been made by the Imperial parliament. The law relating to Partnership and the law

relating to the Sale of Goods have been embodied in codifying statutes drawn by the most competent hands, and which before being adopted by parliament have gone through very much the same ordeal by which the Bills and Notes Act was tested and proved. The Sale of Goods Act was introduced in the Imperial parliament in 1888. It remained in process of incubation for five years and was not enacted as a statute until 1893. It also is not perfect. One of the most competent judges pronounces the Act as in parts by no means easy to interpret, and occasionally very obscure, but in justice to the learned draftsman he adds that the difficulties for the most part if not in all cases have sprung from additions and emendations introduced into the Bill in its passage through parliament. But in spite of its defects, which this parliament, with the ten years experience of the working of the statute could very easily avoid, it remains a useful and convenient statement of an important branch of the law of personal property. Now there are precisely the same reasons for the enactment of this statute in all those portions of the Dominion where the common law prevails that there was for the enactment of the Bills and Notes Act for the Dominion as a whole. None of the provincial legislatures, so far as I am aware, has yet adopted this enactment. It may be confidently predicted that several of them will sooner or later do so, and it may be eventually accepted by them all. Let us anticipate for a moment what in that case is most likely to happen. In every legislature there will be found some hon. members who deem themselves competent to improve upon the work of Mr. Chalmers. Some will amend one set of provisions, some another, and some a third. In place of a uniform code of law applicable to all the provinces in which the common law prevails and in relation to a contract as to which no conceivable reason can be suggested for any differences in treatment in any of those provinces, we may expect to see a variety of different statutes creating wholly unnecessary confusion in respect to a body of legal principles which might throughout the greater part of the Dominion so easily be made uniform, simple, intelligible and accessible to all who have occasion to apply them to the transactions of daily life.

My friends from the province of Quebec will, I know, be the first to realize the importance of the considerations that I have just referred to. Their studies enable them, better than many of us can, to understand the inconveniences of an anomalous jurisprudence and to appreciate the advantages that flow from its uniformity and simplicity. Their ancestors in the old land enjoyed in fullest measure the blessings of a jurisprudence untouched by the meddlesome fingers of the law reformer. They will recall the conditions described with such amplitude of learning by my hon. friend the member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) in his work 'Sur les Origines du Droit Franco-Canadien.' They will remember that Voltaire, referring to those conditions remarked, in his accustomed vein of satire that the traveller in France had to change his laws as often as he changed his horses. Sir Henry Maine has told us that at that time 'France was smitten with the curse of an anomalous and dissonant jurisprudence beyond every other country in Europe. One great division ran through the country and separated it into 'Pays de Droit Ecrit' and 'Pays du Droit Coutumier,' the first acknowledging the written Roman law as the basis of their jurisprudence, the last admitting it only so far as it supplied general forms of expression and courses of judicial reasoning which were reconcilable with local usages. The sections thus formed were again variously subdivided. In the 'Pays du Droit Coutumier,' province differed from province, county from county, municipality from municipality in the nature of its customs. In the 'Pays de Droit Ecrit' the stratum of feudal rules which overlay the Roman law was of the most miscellaneous composition.' I hope my friend (Mr. Lemieux) will, in the course of this discussion, show us how this condition of things has been improved upon by the labours of French jurists in the old country and in this, for I am well assured that such an exposition will powerfully reinforce the argument that I have been endeavouring to present. I cannot imagine that our friends from that province who have been lifted out of the horrible pit and out of the miry clay of an unreformed jurisprudence will permit their neighbours to continue floundering in the same Serbonain bog of 'anomaly and dissonance.' They will sympathize with our aspirations after uniformity, consistency and simplicity and when we call for so easily accessible a boon as a law to regulate throughout our provinces the formation, authentication proof, operation and discharge of a contract of such every day occurrence as the contract for the sale of goods, I will be surprised and disappointed if we do not have their cordial assistance and co-operation.

But the Acts that I have mentioned, the Bills of Exchange Act, the Partnership Act, and the Sale of Goods Act, do not exhaust the possibilities of improvement in the form of English law. A bill has been introduced for the purpose of codifying the law relating to marine insurance. It has not yet been passed and it ought not to be passed without the most mature consideration, but we may be well assured that a bill on this subject from the hand of Judge Chalmers or some other equally competent will eventually be enacted and that other branches of the law will from time to time be taken in hand and subjected to the same treatment that has been applied to the subjects that have already been so dealt with. Now,

it is of the highest importance in the interest of scientific jurisprudence, it is of the highest importance in the interest of simplicity, lucidity and certainty in the statement of the law that we should be in the best position possible to avail ourselves of the labours of the jurists of the mother country in this field, and that wherever a codifying statute has been proved by experience to present a lucid, correct and orderly statement of the law, we should be in a position to make it applicable to all those portions of the Dominion to the circumstances of which it is adapted.

But there are subjects upon which we do not need to await the action of the British parliament or to be dependent upon the labours of old country jurists. Consider such a matter as the constitution of joint stock companies, the rights of their individual members, the powers of the governing body, the protection of minorities, the authentication and proof of their contracts, the provisions for putting them out of business when they should no longer be cumbering the ground, in other words their winding up and the distribution of their assets among their creditors or stockholders as the case may be. Let me ask the House if it would not be an inestimable boon to this country that upon these subjects there should be one simple, just and uniform series of provisions applicable not merely to companies incorporated under Dominion legislation, but to all companies throughout the Dominion so far as legislation by the combined action of federal and provincial authority can be adapted to the accomplishment of that result. On this and other subjects to which I shall not refer in detail I am entirely unable to anticipate what possible objection can be made to the proposal.

I have dwelt long enough on this aspect of the question. Let me refer to another of the advantages to flow from the adoption of this resolution. The wider the area over which a statute is operative the sooner its meaning becomes settled and understood. No matter with what degree of precision the terms of a statute are drawn, its provisions must of necessity be more or less in need of interpretation. It is impossible for the draftsman of a statute to foresee all the possible cases to which its provisions are meant to be applicable, and equally impossible to anticipate with certainty the meanings that will be attributed to the form of words he has used. The meaning of those terms can only be settled by the results of the litigation in which the statute is invoked. Doubtless the original framers of the statute for the prevention of frauds and perjuries imagined that they were passing an Act the terms of which were plain, clear and intelligible, drawn up in language which, if not understanded of the people would be easily comprehended by the class of trained interpreters who would be called upon to advise upon or interpret its provisions. If these were indeed their expectations, how have they not been falsified by the event. If it was no exaggerated praise of that statute to say as one luminary whose name I cannot at the moment recall is reported to have said, that every line of it was worth a subsidy, it was certainly a valid retort to answer that every line of it had cost a subsidy.

If you will examine such a work as Professor Langdell's selection of cases on the sale of goods, a subject to which one of the sections of this famous statute specially refers, you will find, what I believe is equally applicable to every other important section of the statute, that there is not a single significant praise contained in it that has not given rise to at least a score of cases in the courts, and that some of its terms have required for their interpretation not less than sixty or seventy cases. It is upon facts like this that the objectors to codification base their arguments in opposition to that project. But in the absence of a statute the case is to say the least no better. The law of contract in its general outlines has been more free from the operations of the legislature whether for good or evil than any other branch of the law. Examine then if you please, some such work as Langdell's select cases on contract, and note how many years of litigation it required; how many decisions of the courts were necessary to settle so apparently simple a question as the precise point of time at which a contract by correspondence becomes complete and binding on both parties by the communication of an offer, and its acceptance. You will find no less than twenty-nine cases massed by that learned writer upon this one topic. Those cases range over a period from 1789 to 1876, and after a hundred years of litigation Mr. Langdell was unable to answer one of the most obvious questions that could be asked and a question with reference to a contingency that might be expected to happen any day in the week. Even at this day, although one question that he could not answer has been settled since his publication by a later decision, two of the simplest questions that could be asked remain unsettled yet. It is not, according to the best text writer on the subject, regarded as absolutely certain that the rules developed for the regulation of contracts by correspondence apply in their entirety to communication by the telegraph, and two of the most widely accepted and authoritative text books present diametrically opposite opinions on the question whether the acceptance of an offer once committed to the post office can be recalled and cancelled by telegram before its actual communication to the person to whom it has been addressed. It is difficult to see on what grounds such a method of constructing a legal system can claim any

very clear superiority over the much abused expedient of codification. But the advocacy of this motion does not necessarily involve the difficult question of codification, and I should be sorry to have its success dependent upon my convincing the House of the feasibility and utility of codification. The point is that whether you depend for the development of your system of jurisprudence upon its evolution by the unaided operations of the judiciary or seek to hasten and give direction to its development by wise and sane legislation, you are still dependent to a greater or less degree upon the accidents of litigation for the principles of law that it will embody. The debt that jurisprudence owes to the individual litigant has never been adequately acknowledged. The quarrelsome citizen who goes to law with his neighbour may imagine that it is for himself, that he is spending his own money and destroying his neighbour's peace. Let that be his delusion. Or to speak more wisely, let him console himself whether successful or not in the immediate object that he may have in view with the consciousness that he has done the state some service, and more especially if he is a defeated litigant let him pocket his disappointment and allow his lawyer to pocket his fees, well knowing that he has made a contribution to the jurisprudence of his country, that far outweighs in its importance any momentary disappointment to which he has been subjected. In the vivisection controversy I remember having seen somewhere a reflection on the satisfaction that it might be conceived to afford to a dog that was being stretched upon the table of the vivisector were he only rational enough to understand and altruistic enough to appreciate the boon that his torments were destined to confer upon the human race in the alleviation of suffering and the prolongation of human life. The litigant who is stretched upon the table of the vivisector in this case is rational if not always altruistic and he should know the full extent of the consolations of which he may avail himself. The blood of the martyrs we are told is the seed of the church. In the same manner may we not say that the tears shed and the taxed costs paid by successive generations of suitors have been the gentle showers and stimulating manurance that have enriched and beautified that admirable jurisprudence in whose shadow we securely dwell.

But, perhaps the subject does not lend itself to either humorous or poetic treatment. Let me return to plain prose and cold-blooded common sense. The point I am endeavouring to make is that the wider the field over which a statute is operative, the more frequent the cases that arise calling for the interpretation of its terms, the more quickly the meaning of those terms is reduced to certainty, obscurities are cleared up, ambiguities are removed, and amendments adopted where found to be necessary for the elimination of inelegancies and the removal of inconsistencies. Instead of each little jurisdiction groping about in darkness and uncertainty because of the variant provisions of the statutes and the impossibility of borrowing light from one another, you have the light of all concentrated upon the same difficulty, the learning and the wisdom of all directed to the same problem and a jurisprudence evolved which must of necessity be characterized by higher wisdom, broader learning and more perfect consistency and lucidity than it would be possible to attain in the absence of the uniformity of legislation towards which this resolution is directed.

Let me refer to one more advantage that I contemplate from the adoption of this proposal. A large part of the body of positive law actually operative in this country and administered by our courts of justice consists of principles of the common law of England which as colonists we are supposed to have brought with us to this country, and statutes passed by the Imperial parliament before we had legislatures of our own. But all the common law of England has not come with us to this country. Some of it has been ad judged unsuitable for exportation whether because it was too good for us, or because it was not good enough, it is not necessary now to inquire. And so as to the old statute law of England, while some of it has been held to be in force in the colonies, some of it has been held to be inoperative here. Conflicting decisions have been made in different provinces as to the extent to which it is operative on this side of the ocean. In my own province it has been decided that while the whole common law of England is in force there, excepting such parts as are obviously inconsistent with the circumstances of the country, no part of the old statute law will be received unless it is obviously applicable and necessary. Other provinces have adopted substantially the same criterion. But the question must always present itself how are you to determine and by what lights are you to determine whether a given statute is or is not obviously applicable to the conditions of a province of the empire. Every ten years or thereabouts some enterprising practitioner makes discovery of some ancient statute of the realm which he contends is applicable to the circumstances of the province and the rights of suitors are thrown into a state of uncertainty until the merits of the contention are determined. Let me be permitted to say that this condition of things is not worthy to be dignified with the name of law. It is not law. It is the absence, the direct negation, of law; nay, more, it is the antithesis of law. It is not cosmos but chaos. In the province of Ontario they have done better. They settled the question once for all by a statute, 32 George III., and I observe that a compila-

tion has been recently issued under the authority of the Ontario government, presenting among other things in black and white in authoritative terms all the statutes of the parent country which are in force in the province of Ontario. In so far as these statutes relate to property and civil rights, I see no reason why the other provinces should not gladly follow the lead of Ontario. I am convinced that so far as my own province is concerned we would thus clear up many doubts and solve some questions that have hitherto been simply insoluble puzzles.

A still further advantage that would without doubt result from the adoption of this resolution would be the removal of anomalies and the correction of mistakes that occur to a greater or less extent in the laws of all the provinces. I would not care to detain the House with details in illustration of this point. I have had occasion in an essay that has been in print a number of years, to mention some illustrations under this head, and it will not be necessary to elaborate the matter further. It must be perfectly obvious that the moment a serious attempt is made to enact in the form of a statute a body of laws relating to property and civil rights for any considerable group of provinces, errors and anomalies must be brought to light which under our present system may go undiscovered for many years until some unfortunate suitor makes shipwreck of his estate and property because of their accidental discovery. The law relating to the consolidation of mortgages, for example, as settled by the jurisprudence of the equity courts, presented a case of possible injustice and surprise which called for the intervention of the Imperial parliament in the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act of 1881. This amending Act has therefore been in force in England for over twenty years, but some of the provincial legislatures have not yet discovered the fact of its having been passed, or if they have discovered the statute have thus far failed to realize the dangers against which it was meant to provide. There are without doubt similar cases in several of the provinces that would be brought to light the moment a serious attempt was made to grapple with the subject.

One further consideration and I shall have concluded my presentation of the case. I should consider it far from being the least of the benefits that would flow from the adoption of this resolution, that it would help to eliminate from our jurisprudence one cause of conflict between Federal and provincial authority. The cases on the British North America Act are full of instances which go to show how difficult it is to draw the line with precision between the legislation with reference to property and civil rights which is within the competence of the provincial legislatures and that which trenches upon the legislative authority of this parliament. Several of our provincial legislatures have undertaken to pass laws which seem for all the world to resemble a bankrupt law. They have certainly been sailing very close to the wind, and although the statute has been sustained by the Court of Appeal in Ontario, it is not absolutely certain that the last word has been said. A generation that has witnessed the game of see-saw that has been played between the courts on this side and on the other side of the Atlantic on such subjects as the Manitoba school law, the liquor license question and the question of the fisheries, will not be too sanguine as to the finality of any settlement until the highest court has spoken, and after the last word has been spoken by the highest court it seems that the services of the interpreter may still be called for. In any event, it would surely be an obvious advantage that in as many cases as possible where the legislative authority is debateable the question should be set at rest, as it would be under the provisions of this section by the combined action of the Federal and provincial legislatures on all questions of property and civil rights throughout the provinces to which the provision applies.

I trust I have been able to convince the House that there is at least something to be said in favour of the motion of which I have given notice. I have not exhausted the subject, whatever effect I may have produced in that kind upon the House. I have not stated even in outline all the arguments that could be presented in favour of the motion. To sum up the question in a few words, there were, speaking broadly, three classes of subjects of legislation which by the British North America Act were to be parcelled out between the Federal parliament and the various provincial legislatures. On one of these classes of subjects the requirements of all the provinces are precisely the same, the legislation is properly uniform, and for that reason the authority to legislate is committed exclusively to this parliament, saving, of course, the veto of the sovereign. As to another class of subjects, it is conceivable that each and every province may require provisions peculiar to itself, either because of exceptional conditions or for the reason that in respect to them it is deemed advantageous to the public good that the direct and immediate control by the provincial legislatures should be retained. As to this class of subjects the plenary authority to legislate has for one or other of these reasons been committed, subject to the right of disallowance, to the provinical legislatures.

Between these extreme classes there is a middle class of subjects with respect to which one province and possibly more than one may call for exceptional treatment, while as to all the others there is no reason whatever in the nature of things why their legislation should not be precisely the same. It is to this class of subjects that the provisions of section 94 refer, under which power

is given to this parliament to legislate for the purpose of rendering the system of laws of those provinces uniform, with the proviso that no such legislation shall be operative in any province until it has been ratified by the legislature of that province. The exercise of this power was confidently anticipated and assumed as a matter of course by some of leading spirits in the conference at Quebec. It was desired more especially, Sir John A. Macdonald has told us, by the lower provinces, which are the smaller provinces, and which one might have been inclined to fear would be a little jealous of their independence and inclined to retain it. The exercise of the power would, as I have shown, improve the body of our laws by giving us the benefit of those enactments upon which the law-reforming zeal and intelligence of the mother country have been engaged. It would render our system more certain, more intelligible and more accessible than it can ever otherwise become. It would result in the correction of dangerous mistakes and the removal of awkward anomalies. It would obviate a number of embarrassing questions of conflicting constitutional authority, and finally by conducing to the production of a harmonious and consistent body of jurisprudence, it would tend to realize that fitness for universal application which is the essential characteristic of anything that can be properly dignified with the name of law.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). It was originally expected that the hon. member for New Westminister (Mr. Morrison) would second the resolution of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) and bring forward a few observations probably from the standpoint of British Columbia. That hon. gentleman, not being well this afternoon, asked me if I would take his place as the seconder of this resolution. I do not profess to be so thoroughly enthusiastic over the prospect of the uniformity of the legislation of the Dominion and the various provinces as the hon. mover of the resolution, but I think it will be admitted by every one who has heard the admirable and well chosen observations of that hon. gentleman that he is entitled to the thanks and congratulations of this House for the able manner in which he has represented a case, perhaps not of overwhelming importance, but one of great general interest and one which may become important from time to time. If any steps are taken in this legislature for promoting uniformity in any branch of legislation appertaining to property or civil rights, or to the procedure of the courts, no doubt that hon. gentleman will receive a great deal of credit for his early advocacy of, in some respects, so desirable a consummation. It is easy to see, when you read between the lines of the debates and conferences on the British North America Act and the proceedings which led up to the adoption of that Act,

that clauses 94 and 97 are largely the results of compromise upon some important questions. The statesmen who came forward to promote the union of the provinces might be described as consisting of two classes, one favourable to legislative union with one parliament for the whole Dominion, legislating upon all the subjects which are now divided between the various parliaments, and another favouring the present constitution. But it was early seen and admitted by the most sagacious of these statesmen that the difficulties were enormous in the way of such a consummation not only because of the peculiar history and juridicsal system of the province of Quebec but owing to the difference in the early trend of affairs in the various provinces which form the union as well as to the new circumstances arising from the introduction of new provinces into the union. Therefore, I think it will be generally admitted that the clauses in question were inserted rather as saving clauses, or as suggestions of what was hoped for at some future time than as a serious attempt at constitutional legislation. The late Sir John A. Macdonald, who has been alluded to, and whose remarks in part, have been quoted, practically describes the situation as I have laid it down in some of his observations when the resolutions were being adopted by the parliament of old Canada. I will only quote a few words in order to show the view which that statesman took of this question and the reasons which animated him in supporting the placing of these clauses in the British North America Act. After describing the movement which led up to confederation and the difficulties in the way of a uniform system of laws for the whole of the provinces, he says :—

> So that those who were like myself in favour of a legislative union, were obliged to modify their views and accept the project of a federal union . . . . . because, although the law of those provinces is founded on the common law of England, yet every one of them has a large amount of law of its own. Colonial law framed by itself and affecting every relation of life . . . . . We found in short that the statutory law of the different provinces was so varied and diversified that it was almost impossible to weld them into a legislative union at once . . . . . And when we consider that every one of the colonies has a body of law of this kind and that it will take years before these laws can be assimilated, it was felt that at first, at all events any united legislation would be almost impossible. . . I am happy to state—and indeed it appears on the face of the resolutions themselves—that as regards the lower provinces, a great desire was evinced for the final assimilation of our laws. One of the resolutions provides that an attempt shall be made to assimilate the laws of the maritime provinces and those of Upper Canada, for the purpose of eventually establishing one body of statutory law, founded on the common law of England, the parent of the laws of all those provinces.

The clauses have been referred to in the resolution of the hon. member for Hants

are the clauses which in new form were subsequently placed in the Act. Clause 94 is peculiar in one aspect, to which I will call the attention of the House, one well worthy of the consideration of those who anticipate legislating upon any of the subjects mentioned by my hon. friend or upon any other subjects of a cognate character. Section 94 is as follows :—

Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the parliament of Canada may make provision for the uniformity of all or any of the laws relative to property and civil rights in Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and of the procedure of all or any of the courts in those three provinces, and from and after the passing of any Act in that behalf, the power of the parliament of Canada to make laws in relation to any matter comprised in any such Act shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act, be unrestricted; but any Act of the parliament of Canada making provision for such uniformity shall not have effect in any province unless and until it is adopted and enacted as law by the legislature thereof.

Later, when the conference came to consider the appointment of judges, looking back to section 94, they adopted section 97 along the same lines. It provided that :—

Until the laws relative to property and civil rights in Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and the procedure of the courts in those provinces, are made uniform, the judges of the courts of those provinces appointed by the Governor General shall be selected from the respective bars of those provinces.

I quote this section to show that the time may possibly come, with the enactment of laws under the programme laid down by my hon. friend, when the judges will be selected indifferently from any of these provinces for the Bench of either of the three provinces. But, the point to which I wish to call the attention of the House at this juncture is that the powers, with their wide and far reaching effects which were laid down by my hon. friend might not possibly affect other provinces. I speak with diffidence, but it appears to me that no legislation that this parliament has power to pass without an amendment to the British North America Act can affect other than the three provinces named, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario. Therefore, I think when the time comes the new provinces in the west, and Prince Edward Island as well as British Columbia, would be outside of the pale of the legislation suggested by the hon. mover of the resolution. How, either of these provinces in which it would be desirable and advisable to apply such legislation—because they inherit the same system of laws and present none of the difficulties which meets us in the province of Quebec—how, they ever can be made amenable to that constitutional system, I do not see. I do not think that the provisions of the Act by which these provinces were admitted into the union would redeem the case at all, because of the peculiar wording of the clause which provides that in all other Acts which by necessary intendment would apply to these provinces, this parliament would have power to legislate. In the Manitoba Act, the wording of that clause which is well known to most of us, is somewhat different from the wording of what is intended to be the same clause in the British Columbia Act. The provisions as regards British Columbia is a general clause of this kind :

10. The provisions of the 'British North America Act, 1867,' shall (except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to and only effect one and not the whole of the provinces comprising the Dominion, and, except so far as the same may be varied by this minute) be applicable to British Columbia in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the other provinces of the Dominion, and as if the colony of British Columbia had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

The Manitoba Act of union contains a clause the wording of which is slightly different from that, and what the effect of that difference would be, might perhaps require a great deal of consideration. I call attention to it, and it will probably strike our minds as being a little odd. In the Manitoba Act the clause reads :—

2. On, from and after the said day on which the order of the Queen in Council shall take effect as aforesaid, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment, may be held to be specially applicable to, only to effect one or more, but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba, in the same way, and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

The only point I wish to make at this juncture is, that as I conceive the application of the bearings of the British North America Act on this point, uniform legislation would not be possible without further legislation, except as affecting Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario, and based upon that presumption my few further remarks shall be made.

While no doubt it would be eminently desirable that a uniformity of laws should characterize our legislation upon many of the more important subjects comprised under property and civil rights, and even in the procedure of the courts in these provinces ; yet let us look at the extraordinary and peculiar character of the tribunal which is set to create or adopt this legislation. I venture to say that in no constitution upon the face of the earth, is there a legislature so extensive and peculiar as the legislature brought into force to enact such a law. In the first place the parliament of Canada must select one or more of the subjects upon which it deems a uniformity of legislation

eminently desirable. In the second place, after having in its own opinion adopted such a law as would be desirable to affect operations in the territory comprising those three provinces, the promotor of this legislation—the government or the private individual—must proceed to deal with three separate legislative bodies and induce them to accept the view of the desirability of the legislation as it has been accepted by the Dominion parliament. The legislatures could not be deprived of the fullest and amplest right of discussion, and one can easily see that the slightest variation upon any detail or technicality of the proposed law would be sufficient to destroy it. However, after the legislation has been adopted by the legislatures of the provinces—and I assume it must be adopted by all of the three legislatures to be effective—then the power of amendment or change is completely taken away from the local legislature and vested in the Dominion parliament. Thus, the constitution of the country as regards that special feature of property and civil rights, or procedure in the courts becomes henceforth one of the fundamental items of jurisdiction in the parliament of the Dominion of Canada. It in fact creates a complete change in the constitution. The only scheme of legislation at all similar to it is that in the neighbouring republic, where any amendment of the constitution of the United States must be first passed by congress and subsequently adopted by a certain proportion of the various state legislatures. Now, Sir, I need not call attention to the anomaly, and to the difficulty of obtaining legislation under these circumstances. If this Federal parliament were vested with power of legislation without conference with any other independent or sovereign powers, the difficulties in the way would still be very great. Many illustrations of this are in the minds of hon. members. Let us take the subject of bankruptcy; a subject with reference to which in its general scope and aspect, nine men out of ten are convinced there ought to be some kind of legislation by the Dominion parliament, and that it would be eminently advisable that either complete bankruptcy legislation as respects the status of the bankrupt or as affects the distribution of the property of the bankrupt, would be highly desirable in the interests of the trade and commerce of the Dominion. That is so much the case that several of the provinces, notably, Nova Scotia and Ontario, have adopted legislation dealing with the assets and the distribution of the affects of the insolvent. Yet, Sir, we know of the cold reception, the almost impossible reception which any proposal for that sort of legislation has received in this parliament. I simply point out these, and circumstances of a similar character to show the vast difficulties which would attend any attempt at legislating along the lines sketched by clause 94 and the succeeding clause.

Mr. FLINT.

It is well known that in order to carry any important phase of legislation through this parliament, or in fact through any parliament, there must be very strong pressure brought from some quarter upon the legislature. Where would the necessary pressure be obtained to operate simultaneously upon this parliament and upon the local parliaments to systematically enact, and to follow up these enactments in connection with such a variety of subjects. The local legislatures are peculiarly adapted to attend to these matters on account of the small number of subjects under their jurisdiction; on account of the small number of members dealing with these questions, and on account of their more intimate knowledge of the local circumstances. Of course, I do not suppose that even my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) would go so far as to advocate that laws relating to the devolution of intestate estates; and that the laws relating to the distribution of real estate should be dealt with by the Federal parliament, because these are peculiarly local questions. The habits and customs and feelings of a people who have been accustomed to certain modes of dealing with real estate, have grown up in different ways, and they become, so to speak, an ingrained portion of the characteristics of the people. It would be almost impossible for this parliament to deal with matters of that kind. I do admit that upon several questions to which my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) has referred it might be possible for this parliament to enact wise and satisfactory legislation. Still another difficulty presents itself to our minds—not an absolutely irremovable difficulty, but one which it is necessary for us to face honestly. It is this. In dealing with so many legislative bodies, there must necessarily be conferences between them. There must grow up out of any elaborate system calculated to carry out clauses 94 and 97, a conference between the Dominion parliament and the different provincial legislatures through the various governments; or there must be appointed a commission by the governments of the different provinces and by this government, in order that this parliament could deal properly with any preliminary legislation.

I only indicate a few of the difficulties—not to imply that they are insuperable, but to show with what caution and prudence we must approach this subject. Certainly, Sir, it is a most inviting one. Legislation in regard to property and civil rights reaches out in so many directions and touches so many interests that if this parliament is to assume the duty of legislation upon those subjects, we must expect an enormous increase of the business of this parliament. There must be some branch of the government, probably the Department of Justice, specially charged with the duty of following up and studying the various questions which may be presented to parliament for consideration with any reasonable hope of their being

carried to a successful issue. There is, however, one way, which I trust some hon. members may within the next few years take, to bring this question to an issue. It is not necessary that any law, in order to take advantage of section 94, should be introduced by the government. No one in this House is better fitted than my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Russell) himself to prepare a Bill on one of the numerous and important subjects which he has referred to. With his experience, his ability, his knowledge, as a student of practical law, and his enthusiasm, I believe no hon. gentleman could present a measure dealing with some aspect of trade and commerce, or property or civil rights, with better prospects of its successful passage through this legislature, than my hon. friend himself; and I would like to see the experiment tried of sending such a measure to some of the local legislatures for their ratification. But we must bring our minds to this conclusion, that once having taken any of these subjects out of the control of the local legislatures, this parliament will be charged with the responsibility of legislation on that subject for all future time. The difficulty of this, as I said before, is manifest, and is very great.

The terms of the hon. gentleman's resolution are that the time has arrived when steps should be taken to carry out this provision of the British North America Act; and if he has not proved, that the time has arrived to pass legislation of that kind, he has abundantly proved that the time has arrived when fuller attention should be given to the powers of this parliament in that respect and to the importance of some of these questions to the general welfare of the country. The attention which has been called to this subject by my hon. friend may induce some of our enthusiastic legislators to take up some of the questions to which he has alluded, and present to this parliament Bills dealing with those questions in the hope that after they pass this parliament they may be ratified by the local legislatures and become part of the laws of the Dominion, and effect to that extent a change in the constitution of the country. I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words on the important subject which the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) has brought before the House. It is a subject which to me has more interest than any other that has been introduced this session. The hon. gentleman suggests that something should be done, under clauses 94 and 97 of the British North America Act, to further the views of the men who drew up that Act, and who were the founders of confederation. First of all, we have to consider, as the hon. gentleman did, what were the opinions of those gentlemen when they framed that Act. He has entered into that question pretty fully, quoting from resolutions and protocols adopted at Charlottetown and elsewhere. As to the opinion of my old leader, I think the hon. gentleman has stated it fairly correctly. He was in favour of a legislative union of all the provinces. That fact meets the view in the British North America Act. He thought that by the decisions of a court to be formed, the Supreme Court, confirmed by the Privy Council, larger powers would be given to the Federal government than appeared in the British North America Act; and clause 94 was incorporated in the Act for the purpose of assimilating the laws of the different English speaking portions of the country. The hon. gentleman who has seconded the resolution (Mr. Flint) showed a difficulty. He said that this proposal to assimilate the laws only applied to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Ontario. That is true; but that is a very slight difficulty and could easily be got over by an amendment to the British North America Act. Now, what is the object of every English speaking person in this country? It is to have as nearly as possible a legislative union of the English speaking portions of the country. We do not wish to interfere with the laws of Quebec; but we hope to show, by an assimilation of the laws and a legislative union of the rest of the Dominion, that it would be of advantage, even to Quebec, to be included. As the introducer and the seconder of the resolution stated, there is no intention on the part of the rest of the Dominion to interfere with the right of local self-government in regard to property and civil rights which that province at present possesses. Now, what is the best way to accomplish the object in view? I know the idea has occurred to other members of this House. The first thing that ought to be done—and if I were a young man belonging to the maritime provinces, it would be the primary purpose of my politics—is to bring about a union of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. That is the first thing to be done in order to have common laws for the English speaking portion of the Dominion. It is absurd for these three provinces to have three separate legislatures and three separate systems of local government. If they were united, a great many of the difficulties suggested by the seconder of the resolution would disappear. In any conference between the different provinces, three of them would then be united into one.

I know that it was the opinion of my former leader, the late Sir John Macdonald—I do not know whether he ever stated it in public or not—that the ultimate result of confederation would be the accomplishment of that design. That would give the three disunited provinces a power in the Dominion which they had not before, and eventually bring about legislative union. But although we may entertain the hope of

reaching that goal of legislative union in the future, at present we have to do the best we can under the British North America Act; and until there is a far more serious agitation in the country than now exists, there is no probability of any change in the direction I suggest. I merely wish to explain what, in my opinion, was the view of the founders of confederation when they passed the British North America Act. I have not any doubt that, so far as the English portion of them was concerned, their object was a legislative union of the different provinces. Such a union would, I believe, be the best thing for the Dominion. I believe it to be the goal which we should all desire to reach. But at present there is no agitation in the country for any change, and we may look upon the idea as utopian—as a subject for academic discussion rather than any immediate practical solution.

I listened with pleasure to the remarks of my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Russell) in introducing his resolution. He has given us a striking picture of the difficulties under the present system and of the necessity of assimilating the laws of the different provinces. There are hundreds of provincial laws which might be assimilated by this federal parliament, without any objection on the part of the provincial authorities, and the assimilation of which the different provinces would have no hesitation in adopting. Among all members of our English speaking population, there is a strong desire for an assimilation of the various laws in the different provinces affecting civil rights and property, and which are in a different class altogether from municipal laws that affect only particular localities. I do not think that any insuperable difficulty lies in the way, but still nothing is done. As my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Russell) has said, it was the general hope and expectation that as soon as our first parliament met, a step would have been taken in that direction, but instead we have followed the policy of drift until we have reached the present stage, when that confusion exists among these various laws which the hon. member has so well described.

What effect this discussion may have I do not know, but the first thing to be accomplished is an assimilation of the laws in the maritime provinces. If that were effected, you would have virtually legislative union, to all intents and purposes, between the maritime provinces, and then legislative union between them and the province of Ontario would be easily accomplished. That would be greatly in the interests of the country, and would be a step towards the end which the man, who framed primarily the British North America Act, had in view, namely, the legislative union of this Dominion. He thought that would have been gradually brought about, even under the present British North America Act. He thought that the decisions of our courts, licked into shape by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, would have had the effect of giving us legislative union, but unfortunately, although our Supreme Court understood the opinion and wishes, not only of the framers of the British North America Act, but of the community generally, the Privy Council of England had a different opinion. Home Rule was then in the air, and instead of giving us decisions tending to legislative union, we had decisions affirming to the utmost provincial rights.

There is another reason why jurisdiction over the interpretation of our own laws should be final in this Dominion. Our own courts understand the wishes and hopes of the Dominion, and if the final jurisdiction over constitutional questions lay with these courts our jurisprudence would be so gradually licked into shape that the process of assimilation would be gradually and naturally accomplished, and the aspirations of the fathers of confederation become realized.

The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) has taken the place in this House formerly held by his old opponent, Mr. Weldon. Gradually gliding from the constitutional question to the question whether a codification of all the laws was better than leaving the laws as they are and construing them by the decisions of the different courts—whether it was better to have the laws codified or let them be licked into shape by the decision of the judges—he gave us one of those lectures with which no doubt he is wont to instruct his students. He pointed out the advantages of the one system and the advantages of the other, just as Mr. Weldon used to do when treating this House to lectures, previously delivered at Dalhousie college, and which, no doubt were very instructive. But after the dissertation of my hon. friend from Hants on the subject, whether a codification of the laws or laws licked into shape by the decisions of the courts is the better way, I am still in doubt. However, the House is to be congratulated on the introduction of the subject by my hon. friend. It is the most interesting one which has come before the House this session, and I am sorry I have not given it more study so that I might be able to do it justice. I merely listened to the remarks of my hon. friend, and have given expression to the few of the suggestions which occurred to me while he was speaking.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not very much to add to what has been said with regard to this subject this afternoon, except to say that the movement seems to me one, which, in order to be successful, must emanate from the provinces themselves. The parliament of Canada has the right, under section 94, to pass laws relating to property and civil rights, for the purpose of obtaining uniformity with regard to this subject in the three provinces that have been named. But, as has been pointed out by previous

speakers, these laws cannot come into force until they have been passed by the legislatures of the several provinces. It seems to me it would be idle for this parliament to undertake a work of that kind until the provinces had got together and ascertained whether there was any basis upon which they could agree on any subject coming within the definition of property and civil rights. And until that is done, any work that this House might perform in that direction would not be of much account. I do not wish to deny the ability that my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Russell) and my hon, friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) have shown in presenting this subject to the House and to the country at this time. But I would like to suggest that not only the Supreme Court of Canada, but the Privy Council as well have had a great deal of difficulty in the past in exactly defining what is intended by the expression 'property and civil rights' in the British North America Act, and we might have difficulty in framing legislation which would come within the 94th section. We have had various opinions and speculations in the Privy Council and the Supreme Court as to whether this or that subject came within the description of property and civil rights, or of some other subject as to which the provincial legislatures have jurisdiction under the British North America Act.

As far as the question of legislative union of the maritime provinces is concerned, I should say to my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that that is a subject which, from time to time during the last thirty years, has engaged public attention in the maritime provinces. At times, there has been a very strong feeling in the province of Nova Scotia, and, I believe, in some other provinces, in favour of that union. I believe that, on some occasions there have even been conferences between the public men of the different provinces looking to the union of that kind. At the present time, however, I think there is no agitation in any of the provinces for that purpose, and the accomplishment of maritime union seems to be as far from realization as ever. There is another suggestion which my hon. friend from Hants made, and it is an important suggestion. He says that if what he suggests were accomplished, it might lead to the enactment in this country of measures which have been placed in the form of a code in the mother country, and might, in that way, simplify the law of the provinces which would be made subject to such an Act. I do not think that the provinces really need a measure of that kind for the purpose of enabling them to adopt British legislation—and I do not think that my hon. friend intends that. But I would like to make the suggestion to him that the very aim he has in view, might, to some extent, be furthered by the fact that, in many of the provinces of Canada at this time, measures of that kind passed in England are being enacted by the legislatures of the several provinces with such alterations as the circumstances of each province demand. For example, while listenig to my hon. friend, I looked over the statutes of my own province, and I see that we have enacted in Nova Scotia many measures which have been enacted in the form of a code in England during the last ten, fifteen or twenty years. We have the Arbitration Act, the Married Woman's Property Act——

Mr. RUSSELL. Do you consider that a model ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think our own is the same as the English one.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps I may be allowed to mention that I pointed out the difficulty in the way of such a course. Each province would think it was able to do a little better than the British parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that there is that difficulty. We have passed also an Act relating to conveyances by married women, a Joint Stock Company's Act, and an Act relating to factors and agents, all based on English measures, I think. Then, there is the Judicature Act and rules which are in force in our province. These are practically the same as the English, and they have been enacted, practically in the same form in Ontario, British Columbia and Manitoba, as I understand. There are also various other measures which have been taken from recent English legislation. Now, the fact that these measures have been passed in my own province, and some, I believe, in other provinces, may lead to a certain uniformity of the statute law in the different provinces, which, will have the same practical effect in some measure as the legislative union which my hon. friend has so ably advocated this afternoon. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I might say that any person who is interested in the question of codification, either in this country or the mother country can gain a great deal of information from the recent work of Sir Courtenay Ilbert, which describes the difficulties that have accompanied any progress in regard to this matter in the mother country. In mentioning this work, I might say, as a very practical matter, that the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice might very well be directed towards a better and more perfect system of drafting statutes in this country. It is supposed by a great many people that any gentleman who is well versed in the laws of this country, and who is engaged in practising in the courts, is, by the very nature of his experience, capable of properly drafting a statute. We who have investigated the subject know that that is a very great fallacy indeed. A lawyer, even a lawyer of great eminence, is often a very poor person to whom to entrust the drafting of a statute. That work requires one who

is not only familar with the laws of the country but who, by training, experience and the bent of his intellect is specially fitted for work of that kind. Without desiring to cast the slightest reflection upon the condition of affairs under the present administration, without seeking to make it appear that the work done under this administration is different from that under any former administration, I venture to say that the drafting of the statutes in Canada for the past thirty years has not been at all up to the mark. I believe that this matter might well engage the attention of the government, and particularly the attention of the Minister of Justice. I think also that, as a practical matter for this parliament and this government, the attention of the government and especially of the Department of Justice might well be turned to the framing of general laws, more particularly with regard to companies. I have in mind especially legislation with regard to railway companies. A great deal of the time of this House both in committee and in the House itself is now spent in dealing with matters that might well be governed by general provisions. With such general provisions enacted, the time of parliament could be more profitably employed in dealing with more important matters. Now, just one further remark I have to make with regard to the codification which has been spoken of by my hon. friend from Hants. I appreciate everything that the hon. gentleman has said with regard to the advantages of having codification. But I must point out to him that, under the English system, no matter how clear and definite a code may be made, it must follow from the very nature of our judicial system that that code will, from time to time, be overgrown. We cannot remove all the difficulties that will meet us by simply framing a code. The constitution of this country, the British North America Act, is in the form of a code, yet I venture to say that no lawyer in the House will disagree with me when I state that more than the half of the British North America Act, so far as any provisions which require construction at the present time are concerned, is in the shape of the decisions of the court, and not in the British North America Act itself. We may make codes in this country as long as we like, but we cannot get rid of the difficulty that these codes will become overgrown with legal decisions. Therefore, the making of a code once is not enough; the code when made must be revised from time to time; and the decisions passed upon it will require to be embodied in the new Act, if we wish to bring about the state of things that my hon. friend from Hants so much desires to see. I am in sympathy with the motive which he had in view in addressing the House to-day; but at the same time I venture to think that any action which will be productive of definite results must come from the provinces themselves, and that the only effect of my learned friend's motion to-day will be to arouse the attention of the different provinces in pointing out to them the good results which might follow if a measure such as proposed were eventually passed by this parliament and by the legislatures of the different provinces.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). With what has fallen from the lips of the leader of the opposition with respect to drafting, I agree entirely. I think it is an absolute necessity that we should endeavour to have better drafting in connection with our statutes. I firmly believe in the statement which I think was made by Lord Chief Justice Fitzjames Stephens, at the time he prepared the Evidence Act in England—that it is as impossible for a committee of men to draft a law as it is impossible for a committee of artists to paint a picture. There must be unity so far as possible, and when our statutes go through committees it is important that they should pass into the hands of a competent draftsman so as to be put in proper shape before finally becoming law.

With what has been said on the subject of codes, I cannot of course be expected to agree. I myself come from the land of codes, from the province of Quebec, where we have a civil code, and where we have a code of procedure; and I believe myself in the words of the quotation that Smith adopted in relation to his volume of leading cases. 'Melius est petere fontes quam sectare rivulos.' Now, we must bear in mind that all the laws which have ever survived in this world are those that took the form of codes. To-day the Roman empire has passed away, but the Institutes of Justinian are a living force in all civilized countries. The name of Napoleon is growing more and more to be a tradition, but the Napoleonic Code is a necessity in all civilized countries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend should not understand that I was opposed to codification. I was only pointing out the result of the codification of statutes in England and in Nova Scotia, with which I am more particularly familiar, respecting a body of judicial decisions.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of course, notwithstanding that we in Quebec have our code. That code is construed by the courts, and the construction put upon articles of the code by the courts ought naturally to have great force with us. They have not force of law, but they certainly have force of reason. Now, let us come to the motion my hon. friend has proposed. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) said that this motion is not one of very great importance. I am disposed to think myself that the subject is one rather of academical importance than of real prac-

tical importance. But my learned friend asks us by his motion to declare that the time has arrived when we should have uniformity of legislation in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Ontario. Now, I think this motion is not of very great importance because, as pointed out by the leader of the opposition, section 94 of the British North America Act provides that before legislation which would be passed here could become operative as a law, it would be necessary for us to have that legislation approved by the local legislatures. Therefore, I think that the practical way to proceed in this matter would be to ask the local legislatures how soon they are going to be disposed to commit suicide, because the effect of this legislation would be to deprive them of power to legislate with respect to those subjects which warrants their continued existence. If you take from out of the jurisdiction of the local legislatures the laws affecting property and civil rights, then you have taken from them all those subjects which make their continued existence justifiable.

Mr. MACLEAN. So much the better.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am glad to hear my hon. friend say so much the better, because he evidently agrees with the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart). The hon. member for Lanark says that the intention of the fathers of confederation was that we should have, not a federal but a legislative union. Now, if he will pardon me for saying so, I think he is entirely mistaken in making that statement. Undoubtedly the intention of Sir John A. Macdonald and of those who followed him at that time was to have legislative union. But if he will read the speech made by George Brown, which he will find reported in the debates on confederation, if he will read the speech made by D'Arcy McGee—and I claim that no man took a greater part nor contributed in larger measure to bring about confederation than D'Arcy McGee—if my hon. friend will read the speeches made by George Brown and D'Arcy McGee, he will find that they both declared at that time—and they were not French Canadians, Brown was not from the province of Quebec—that they were in favour of a Federal union. It is, however, well for us to know that Sir John A. Macdonald desired to have a legislative union; and it is also well for us to note the admissions that fell from the hon. member for Lanark, to the effect that, having failed to get the principle of legislative union consecrated by the British North America Act, Sir John still fondly hoped that he might rely upon the Supreme Court, and upon the Privy Council, to defeat the intentions of those who brought about confederation, and to bring about a legislative union by means of judicial construction, It is well we should know that, and while I admit with the hon. member for Yarmouth that the debate is in itself not very important, the admissions which we have from the trusted lieutenant of Sir John A. Macdonald are exceedingly important.

Speaking now, not as a representative from the province of Quebec, but merely as a Liberal, I say that I stand for local self-government. My hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Russell) says we all stand for local self-government. He stands for local self-government, and he preaches legislative union; because after all, as I said a moment ago, if you take away from the provinces the power to deal with these questions of property and civil rights, you are taking away from them all those things which have been assigned to them as subjects of legislation and without which they would no longer have any reason to exist. Therefore, I say as a Liberal that I stand for local self-government, and I will tell you why. I remember reading not many years ago a speech of Mr. Gladstone in which he said, speaking to a meeting of Liberals, that we should cherish municipal, local and even parochial liberties, not only as nursery grounds for the production here and there of able men, but for the general training of public virtue and independent spirit. Those should be the views and the desire of the Liberal party. We do not want centralization, because centralization leads to paternalism in government. We want decentralization, because we want the development of the individual. I say more, we want our laws made by those men who are immediately under the control of public opinion, of the public opinion of the localities to be affected by those laws. In a country of this sort, where we have got a variety of races, with such a variety of interests, with such a variety of climatic conditions, laws affecting property and civil rights which, in the maritime provinces or in Ontario, would be acceptable, could not be made applicable in the altered conditions which exist in British Columbia and Manitoba. So I say it is in the interests of the people themselves that they should have local legislatures working under their immediate control, in order that the members of those legislatures may be in closer touch with public opinion and more amenable to that public opinion.

Now I do not know that it is necessary for me to have made this digression. But perhaps I ought to mention that this is not a new movement. When the hon. member for Lanark said that it was the intention of Sir John Macdonald to have a legislative union, and also that he hoped that the courts would help him to defeat the object of the fathers of confederation when they gave their assent to a federal union, he omitted to tell us that before the Supreme Court was established he had attempted that which the hon. member for Hants says we ought to do to-day. As far back as 1868, Col. Gray, then a member of this House, representing the city of St. John,

was requested by Sir John Macdonald to make a report on the condition of the existing laws in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario, in order to see how far it would be possible to bring about that which my hon. friend says is so desirable—that is to say, to provide uniformity in legislation. I remember reading in a book published by Col. Gray, a great many of the arguments—I do not say they were in the same form, and I do not suggest at all that they came from the same source as that from which my hon. friend drew his arguments—but they were on a line with a great many of the contentions we heard to-day. They were arguments to show the advantages of uniformity of legislation. But, when the question came up in this House, and was discussed here, Dorion, Blake, Mills, and other leading men of the day were found opposing the proposed motion, and as a result the whole matter was allowed to drop. The debates of that day do not contain any reference to what took place in the House. There was then no 'Hansard,' and I have had but a few moments to look through what is known as the scrap book 'Hansard' of the time and I have found no reference to the debate. But, the matter may be found discussed editorially in the newspapers of the day. Now, I am not speaking now as coming from the province of Quebec, but I say it is impossible for a Liberal to favour action of this sort, because the necessary tendency is to break down those barriers which are essential to the maintenance of a federal union. At the present time there can be no reason why we should move in that direction. We have had a good many years experience of the British North America Act, which would enable us to point out any inconveniences that might result from the operation of that Act, but, to-day we have had very few instances of such inconveniences pointed out to us. But, I would like to draw my hon. friend's attention to this, that after the experience we have had, and after the experience that they have had in the United States, we find the Australian Commonwealth not only asking for legislation on the lines of our Federation Act, but going farther in the direction of decentralization, in the direction of giving power to the provinces, or to the states as they are called. You will find that under the Act adopted by the Australian Commonwealth, the residuary power is in the states. Let me say in conclusion, that I want to put it again to the House that I do not speak as a member coming from the province of Quebec. But of course, I cannot help feeling that this action would be a menace in so far as Quebec is concerned. We are happy in the possession and enjoyment of privileges which we cherish, and I say here and now that in so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, we have to realize that those privileges that we enjoy came to us through the British North America Act, which was enacted by the Imperial legislature; and that the people of that province should bear in mind, as I am sure they do bear in mind, that they must look for the maintenance of these privileges to the Imperial connection, and the more we realize that here, the better it will be for ourselves. So long as we maintain the British connection, so long as we maintain our right to go to His Majesty, to the foot of the Throne, to maintain those privileges, so long will they be respected. I say this Confederation Act is a covenant between the British people and the people of Canada, that the British people respect their covenants, and that any lessening of the tie between us and Great Britain must be detrimental to the province of Quebec, in a greater degree than to any of the other provinces of the Dominion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll). Mr. Speaker, I would not have considered it necessary to address the House on the subject now under discussion if it had not been for the remarks of the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and for the interjection of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). Those who carried out the idea of the union of the provinces, thought that a day would come, perhaps, when it would be desirable to make uniform the civil laws of the three provinces, Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which were then coming into the union, and section 94 of the British North America Act was enacted. I need not quote the whole of the clause, but I shall quote the concluding part:

> But any Act of the parliament of Canada, making provision for such uniformity, shall not have effect in any province unless it is adopted and enacted as law by the legislature thereof.

I wish to draw attention to the last part of this clause, 'unless it is adopted and enacted as law by the legislature thereof.' This shows us what the intention of the fathers of confederation was; it was that the questions relating to property and civil rights were within the domain of the provinces and that it was only with the consent of such provinces that these laws could be changed or modified. This being so, what is the position to-day? Each one of these three provinces has since its very inception, preserved its civil laws, with the addition of the amendments made thereto by the legislatures. I will ask this question of the hon. member: Is there a real and serious grievance existing now which would necessitate the intervention of the Federal parliament in order to make uniform these laws? In a country like ours where so many important questions occupy the attention of the Federal parliament, the latter would not be justified in interfering unless it was at the formal request of each of the provinces. If the grievances are well founded, how is it that the

voice of the legislatures has not been heard? It strikes me that they would be the first to interfere, and it has not been shown in any way that it was the wish of the provinces to change the actual state of things. It is said that there is no difference between these three provinces. They use the same language, have the same customs and the same aspirations, and as this, to a certain extent, is true, the proposed reform offers fewer obstacles than would result in an attempt to legislate for a class of people who, by their temperament, their customs, their habits, their tendencies and aspirations differ from others; but the question here is to change a system which has been tested by the experience of time and against which there is no serious complaints. If the grievances are well founded, there is a very simple way to apply a remedy. Let the local legislatures undertake themselves the task of making these laws uniform, and let them agree between themselves, in order that the various dispositions of their laws be made uniform. The hon. gentleman has enumerated what subjects could be made uniform, but I submit that these could be remedied by an understanding between the different legislatures. The resolution which the hon. member has moved, has a tint of centralization, which may have serious consequences. It is asked that the parliament of Canada should intervene to make laws uniform in these various provinces; but, then it will be necessary to leave a gap between Ontario and New Brunswick, and agitators will ask the question, why this break in the continuity from the Ottawa river to the limits of the lower provinces, and then men not so well advised as the hon. member is, will ask why not uniformity in the laws of the whole Dominion. But the hon. gentleman will answer that there is our constitutional charter. Well it is better not to lay temptations in the way of those who are susceptible of yielding to temptation.

Though I entertain these views, I would not oppose the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) if it were proven that it was the wish of these three provinces that their laws be made uniform, because section 94 forms part of our constitution and that constitution we have accepted and are ready to abide by it. This is not the first time that this question has been agitated. During the Quebec Conference, as the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Haggart)has said, the question was at issue. It was agitated in this parliament during the discussion on confederation. It was agitated in 1871, and as the Minister of Justice has said, parliament voted an appropriation, and the Hon. J. H. Gray was entrusted with the task of making a preliminary report to the then Minister of Justice. What was the conclusion of that report ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. Solicitor General think that I ever argued that we could pass a law here which would be effectual, without the consent of the provinces ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not saying that at all. Here is the conclusion of the report of the Hon. J. H. Gray in 1871 :

> But there can be no doubt that an excellent practical code of law, simple in its language, easily understood, expeditious and economical in its administration, could be found by a judicious selection of the best of the laws of each of the provinces, by men who were severally acquainted with them.'

In this preliminary report to the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Gray sets forth the essential differences which exist between the statutory laws of these three provinces. The hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution has expressed his surprise that since that date no serious effort has been made to bring about uniformity, and he attributes that—not in this House, but in a lecture he delivered before the Dominion Bar Association—he attributes that to what he calls the vis inertiae of our parliamentary system. I would attribute it rather to the fact that no serious inconvenience, no real grievance existed. When I use the word 'grievance,' I do not mean the embarrassment which must result to the members of the Bar in the exercise of their profession, but I refer to grievances which result to the provinces themselves. I am confident that those provinces are jealous of their civil laws, and rightly so. They form part of the customs of the people, and as the Minister of Justice has said, if any legislation would give over to this parliament the control of the civil laws in the provinces, then the usefulness of the provinces would be at an end.

There is another consideration. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) has said that section 94 would apply only to the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Therefore, if the other provinces did not come under the provisions of section 94, we would have the western provinces, Manitoba and British Columbia—and later on the North-west Territories—and we would have in the east Prince Edward Island and Quebec with their different laws. Therefore, from a geographical point of view, at any rate, the uniformity which the hon. gentleman aims at could not be obtained. There is a still further consideration. Supposing that the parliament of Canada would enact uniform laws for these three provinces and that the provinces would sanction these laws, then the local requirements in each province would require amendments to be made. These amendments may meet the requirements of one province only and not of the other two provinces. What would the parliament of Canada then do, and what would become of the uniformity of civil laws in the three provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. The hon. gen-

tleman (Mr. Russell) in his able lecture has quoted: 'Non erit alia lex Romæ alia Athenis,' &c., &c. From the Roman point of view, I am sure there could be no objection to that, but I would be very much surprised if Athens were satisfied. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) is a distinguished linguist, I will quote to him in the original what Mr. De Lasteyrie, an able French writer, said of the government and constitution of Rome:

(Translation):

The principle upon which the government of Rome rested, was the destruction of individuals for the benefit of the state; it was the destruction of the provinces, for the benefit of Rome; it was the destruction of everything for the benefit of the Emperor. Each government should be allowed their own share of responsibility and they should assume no more of it than is necessary.

And then, this other quotation which I take from Burke:

There are in nature springs of justice whence are derived and flow like rivulets, all civil laws; and that their waters should take the different hues and flavour of the various soils through which they run is but natural.

These being my views, Mr. Speaker, and not having before me the proof that the provinces desire this change, I think it is well to let well enough alone.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). The Minister of Justice when he addressed the House, professed to be a Liberal and he held up Mr. Gladstone—as his colleagues always do—as the great type of a Liberal. But if Mr. Gladstone was anything he was an advocate of the doctrine of British constitutional progress. He believed that the constitution had not come to an end; he believed that it could develop; and if there is anything that places the British constitution before every other constitution in the world it is, that it has not become stereotyped, and it does grow and does progress, and under it they have the best laws in the world. Let me say that while I accept the Federal constitution as it exists, I am sorry we have it. I would very much prefer the government of Canada to be a free parliamentary one, as in England, with power to make a uniform law for this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The trouble with the Federal constitution of the United States is, that under it they have not got uniform laws, and so there is a strong agitation in the United States for uniformity, even if the constitution has to be revised. I am free to say that I am enough of a liberal and enough of a progressist to be in favour of constitutional revision, and I am sorry to hear hon. gentlemen on the other side say that the constitution of Canada is absolutely perfect and must for ever remain as it is. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) there is even under the constitution as we have it, provision for constitutional progress in this respect, and if so the motion of the hon. gentleman is a constitutional one, and it does away in no sense with the laws of the provinces. Speaking of the provinces, I have not a moment's hesitation in saying that the result of provincial government in Canada has been detrimental to the progress of the country. I say that the interpretation of the law that has been given by the English Privy Council in regard to the distribution of rights as between the provinces and the Federal power, has been against the interests of the country as a whole. That I regret. I agree with the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that some day we will have the whole jurisdiction in this parliament, and in some way we will work it out, and in some way we will increase the Federal power and wipe out gradually the provincial power. I take issue directly with hon. gentlemen who oppose that view. I say that provincial government, and the enlargement of provincial rights, has not been in the interest of this country, and I say that Sir John A. Macdonald was right, and was a most farseeing statesman if he believed in a legislative union and desired it carried out in this country.

We can say that without for one moment being chargeable with trying in any way to destroy the rights of the province of Quebec, I respect whatever rights that province has; but there is in our constitution as we have it to-day provision for constitutional progress and a unification of our laws; and notwithstanding what the Solicitor General says, the initiation of that matter is in this parliament more than in the provincial legislatures. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that they are Liberals. Are they? I have heard their leaders say that there is nothing to reform in this country. There is reform possible under that very British North America Act, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) to-day, and his statement has not been contradicted; and there is need of reform on the lines pointed out by the hon. leader of the opposition. Yet we are told that there is no hope of progress, that the main thing is to uphold local rights. That is the doctrine of the Minister of Justice of Canada. I take issue with him there. The thing which the Conservative party of this country committed itself to was to build up a nation, with a unification of laws, if that was possible, and that this country should in some way try to recover the federal power which has been lost to the provinces in the last few years. Although the Solicitor General quoted the instance of Australia, which has adopted a federal constitution, I say that federal constitutions have not justified themselves in the way the free parliamentary system of Great Britain has justified itself. England to-day, by reason of her free parliament, can do anything, and can deal with any question, and deal with it immediately in one week. In the United States, under their federal sys-

tem, where they are governed by men who have been in the cemetery over a hundred years, they can do nothing, and they have a multiplicity of laws that are directly against the public interest. The two great questions in the United States are how to secure a uniformity of laws and how to handle the great trusts which have grown up, and which the lack of federal law seems to prevent them dealing with effectually. So that what has been said on the other side of the House to-day in regard to constitutions, is not borne out by the facts. The federal system, as we know, is not perfect, and it is the duty of a parliament to try to be progressive and to try to improve things. There is in our constitution, as we have it, room for progressive legislation on the lines suggested by the hon. member for Hants, and I hope that hon. gentleman will be more than academic, and will bring forward a measure in that direction. If he does, I will give him my support. That, is a much better way of dealing with questions of this kind than discussing them in an academic way. At the same time, I compliment the hon. gentleman on the step he has taken. For one thing, he has raised the question in the public mind, and has shown that constitutional revision is a live question in this country. I am not afraid to say that I am ready to see the constitution of this country revised. It has got to be revised; it is over thirty years of age. The British constitution changes every day. The time has arrived when public attention must be directed to this subject, and when it cannot be dismissed as hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to dismiss it to-day ; and the proof is that an hon. gentleman who is a supporter of the government has brought it up. The question being up, it will not down; and one reason is that the constitution may be strained too much in the province of Quebec. I say that in all friendliness—and perhaps it is being too much strained to-day by a Bill which has been introduced in regard to the Supreme Court.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Which Bill was introduced in 1880 by one of the present judges of the Supreme Court.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am not disputing that; but I say it is an argument for constitutional revision coming from the province of Quebec. Does the Minister of Justice deny that ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not at all. The Bill is on the lines of what was suggested at the time the Supreme Court Act was introduced.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is a straining of the constitution under the British North America Act. But the question of constitutional revision is in the air, and it must be settled in some way, and cannot be dismissed by saying that we have a stereotyped constitution. Above all things, men who call themselves Liberals and say they are living under a British constitutional system entirely ignore the spirit of that constitution when they ignore its progressive character.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, according to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean), who has just spoken, our constitution, which is hardly thirty years old, is in sore need of being revised. Why, Sir, one would think from what he said that he was just hailing from France, where they talk of nothing else but constitutional revision.

I think that if there is anything which places the British constitution before every other constitution in the world, it is that it progresses very little and in an almost imperceptible way. Clearly, my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) does not share on that point the ideas of the great English parliamentarians. But it seems he would fain import his ideas from France, a country whose law-makers, when they are not busy with framing a new constitution, which occurs every twenty years, make up for it by agitating every year the question of constitutional revision, so as to keep abreast of the times.

The hon. member from East York (Mr. Maclean) in his comments upon the Bill I have introduced this afternoon, stated that I was aiming at the overthrow of our constitution. The hon. gentleman may rest assured that I have no such ambition, as I am perfectly satisfied with the constitution as it is now. This Bill aims at restricting appeals to federal matters. The constitution provides for the constitution of a Court of Appeal and of lower courts for construing the laws of Canada.

All legal authorities agree that it was open to doubt whether, under our constitution appeals could be heard by the Supreme Court in matters coming under provincial civil law ; and yet, that point was decided in the affirmative by the Supreme Court.

The object of the Bill which I have introduced is not to amend the constitution, but merely to constitute the Supreme Court into an exclusively federal court ; or in other words, as a tribunal which would pronounce judgments on all matters except such as did not come under the civil laws of the provinces. In all cases where the Dominion government or the provincial legislatures, or again, private individuals bringing an action against a province were the interested parties, this court could hear such appeals. Therefore it is not contemplated by this Bill to change the constitution of Canada.

The hon. member for East York has made references which are far from bolstering up his claims. There was a time when people used to sneer at the United States. And no less an authority than the illustrious Joseph de Maistre once said that the United States of America was yet a child in swaddling

clothes, and that it must be allowed to grow and develop, before pronouncing upon the merits of its constitution. But later events have given the lie to Joseph de Maistre, and all the European powers agree that the American Republic is now occupying one of strongest positions in the eyes of the world. Through their federal system of government, and through their own exertions, they have reached one of the proudest positions as a nation, not only in the new world, but in the whole world.

My hon. friend has also scornfully referred to federation. Why, Sir, does the hon. gentleman forget that the Imperial parliament, which is the embodiment of the ideas and feelings of the English people, which is perhaps the most practical and the wisest of all peoples, has just granted to the Australian colonies a federative constitution, and that parliament did so, in the light of the experience of the working of the Canadian constitution ? And yet, the nation they had to deal with was a perfectly homogeneous people. Unless you should pretend that we are to be treated as outlanders in this country of ours, you will agree that it is necessary that our laws should not be interfered with.

But, Sir, England is not the only country in Europe from which we may take an object lesson in this matter. And that lessou, we learn it from a country which successfully competes with the United States and Great Britain herself ; a country, I say, that has taken the lead in literature, in science, in political economy, and that country, Sir, is Germany. Since Germany has evolved into a confederation, she has reached the status of one of the greatest world-powers. From the example of Germany we may gather that the fate of Canada is not so much to be pitied after all, and that there is no reason why we should hasten to do away with the covenant entered into by our fathers in 1867, by which the French minority has been guaranteed the rights secured under the treaties.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 12) An Act respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—Hon. Mr. Costigan.

Bill (No. 10) An Act respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company (as amended by Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines).—Mr. Parmelee.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 8.20 p.m.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John & Iberville).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 13, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough) presented the Third Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. BELL. I give notice that to-morrow I will move that the report of the Committee on Public Accounts be recommitted with instructions that P. S. Archibald be summoned to give evidence before this committee.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Maxwell.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 45) to amend the Companies Act.—Mr. Thompson.

QUESTIONS.

WASHOUTS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. What was the total expenditure for repairs occasioned by washout on the Tantramar Marsh in the spring of 1901 ?

2. On how many occasions was the Intercolonial Railway track washed out during the spring and summer ?

3. What means were eventually found effective to prevent any further washout ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Two thousand and thirty dollars and thirty-two cents, ($2,030.32).

2. On three occasions, once in April, once in May and once in June.

3. A dyke was built two thousand feet long, two and a half feet above the lowest point of rail level parallel to and eight feet from the centre of the track.

LOCOMOTIVES FOR CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Kemp—asked :

1. How many locomotive engines have been ordered for the Canadian government railways since the 1st July, 1896 ?

2. How many have been delivered up to date?

3. Have any locomotive engines belonging to the Canadian government railways been leased, rented or loaned to any other railway corporation or company ? If so, how many have been leased, loaned or rented ; to what company or companies, and on what terms, and for what length of time ?

4. At what dates were the engines loaned, leased or rented ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. One hundred and twenty-one locomotive engines have been ordered for the Canadian government railways since the 1st July, 1896.

2. Eighty-four have been delivered up to 1st March, 1902.

3. Eight locomotive engines were hired to the Canadian Pacific Railway at $8 per day. No stated length of time.

4. Four on February 15th, 1902; 2 on February 25th, 1902; 1 on February 26th, 1902; 1 on February 28th, 1902.

RAILWAY CHARGES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF FRUIT.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Has the resolution of the Georgian Bay Fruit-growers' Association been received calling attention to alleged excessive charges by railway companies for transportation of agricultural produce generally and on fruit in particular; and urging the appointment of a commission in reference to this matter ?

2. Does the government propose to take action in this matter this session; and if so, in what way ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes, a resolution of the Georgian Bay Fruit-growers' Association has been received calling attention to alleged excessive charges by railway companies for transportation of agricultural produce generally and on fruit in particular, and urging the appointment of a transportation commission to remedy this grievance.

2. The intention is to introduce a Bill dealing with the regulation and control of railway freight rates at the present session.

FENIAN RAID MEDALS.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

Is it the intention to issue Fenian Raid medals to those volunteers who, in 1869, in anticipation of the Fenian Raid, were ordered by the Canadian government to man the gunboat 'Prince Alfred,' and patrol the waters of Lake Huron ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). General order 63 of July, 1898, which prescribes the conditions under which these medals may be granted, does not authorize their being issued for the year 1869, but I will cause further inquiry to be made to ascertain whether the order should be amended in the direction indicated in the question.

CANADIAN TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. EMMERSON asked :

Has the government taken any action upon the petition or memorial of the Maritime Baptist Convention, through the president and secretary of such convention, praying for certain amendments to the Canada Temperance Act ? And if not is it the intention of the government to take any action with respect to the matter during the present session of parliament ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I believe that such a petition has been received from the Maritime Baptist Convention and that two similar petitions have also been received. The matter is now receiving the consideration of the government.

INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order being called for :

The second reading of Bill No. 8 to amend the Interpretation Act.—Mr. Monk.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I understood that we would wait until there were more members from the province of Quebec present as this Bill interests the province of Quebec particularly.

The PRIME MINISTER. Stands.

Order allowed to stand.

MEDICAL COUNCIL IN CANADA.

Mr. T. G. RODDICK (Montreal, St. Antoine) moved second reading of Bill (No. 11) to provide for the establishment of a medical council in Canada. He said : Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of the Bill for the establishment of a medical council in Canada it is my desire to be brief, because I had an opportunity last session in this House of explaining this measure very fully, and besides, I understand several hon. gentlemen wish to speak upon this subject. My main object for framing this Bill for the establishment of a medical council in Canada is for the purpose of establishing a qualification for medical men which would be acknowledged and accepted in all parts of the Dominion of Canada. As you are doubtless aware, Sir, we have at present no fewer than eight examining and licensing medical bodies in this country. Some of these are doubtless doing good work and keeping up, or at any rate, assisting in keeping up the standard of medical education, but their usefulness is limited to the territories over which they have special control. Barriers have been erected, as you are doubtless also aware, Sir, around these eight territories so that it is practically impossible for a medical man, for a graduate in medicine, to receive a qualification to practice in more than one of the provinces. The barriers are so marked, so strong and so high, that very few indeed have the opportunity of representing the profession of medicine in more than one province. The frontiers are so closely watched, Sir, that we constantly hear of medical men being fined, and in cases where this fine has not been paid, imprisonment has been threatened for crossing a boundary river, or an imaginary line between two provinces, in order to serve and probably to save the lives of citizens of this Canada of ours. Therefore, Sir, I contend that there is reason for interference on the part of this parliament. I be-

lieve, Sir, that section 91 of the British North America Act can well be evoked by this parliament in meeting cases such as I have mentioned. Section 91, which refers to the peace, order and good government of Canada, I contend, might well be brought into operation by this parliament in cases such as those I have cited. Such a state of affairs exists in no other country probably in the world. Even between the countries of France and Germany, I am credibly informed, a neutral territory of 15 miles has been marked out over which medical men may travel in the discharge of their professional duties so as to be able to assist the sick and wounded of either nationality. Therefore, I think it is time something was done in Canada in order to remedy so serious an evil. It may be asked why these unfortunate men who have been fined do not take steps to procure licenses in the neighbouring provinces to which they are obliged constantly to travel. The reason is that it may be absolutely impossible for a man to receive a license in more than one province. If he has begun the study of medicine in one province and if he matriculates in that province, he never can receive a license to practice in any of the other provinces. For instance, if an Ontario graduate, having changed his mind as to his domicile, having passed his examinations, wishes to practice in the province of Quebec, he cannot do so simply for the reason that the medical board of the province of Quebec insist that he shall begin by passing the matriculation examination of that board. Some of the ablest men in our profession to-day have been shut out from practising in Quebec and in Ontario where they might be very useful in hospital and professorial work.

Another object which I had in framing this Bill and in bringing it before the House, was to obtain reciprocity with Great Britain. That, Sir, can be done so soon as we have a central examining board for the Dominion. In 1886 the British Medical Council enacted that :

> On and after the prescribed day where a person shows to the satisfaction of the registrar of the general council that he holds some recognized colonial medical diploma or diplomas (as hereinafter defined), granted to him in a British possession to which this Act applies, and that he is of good character, and that he is by law entitled to practice medicine, surgery and midwifery in such British possession, he shall, on application to the said registrar, and on payment of such fee (not exceeding five pounds), as the general council may from time to time determine, be entitled, without examination in the United Kingdom, to be registered as a colonial practitioner in the medical register.

The definition states :

> The expression 'British possession' means any part of Her Majesty's dominions exclusive of the United Kingdom, but inclusive of the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands; and where parts of such dominions are under both a central and a local legislature, all parts under one central legislature are for the purposes of this definition deemed to be one British possession.

That means that so long as the provinces are separate parts of the confederation, we cannot register in Great Britain as provinces. The British Medical Council will not undertake to look after the education of the various provinces, but I do state positively that so soon as we have a central examining board in the Dominion of Canada, the British Medical Council will at once accept the licenses from that board and allow our men to register immediately in Great Britain, or in any part of the empire over which the British Medical Council has control. That is a very important matter. It means that we would have open to our young Canadian medical men, the army and navy of Great Britain, as well as colonial appointments, many of which are very lucrative, especially in the East and West Indias. It will also open to Canadian medical men appointments under the British Board of Trade, so that ships surgeons may be appointed directly from this side whereas now our young men have to go to England to first receive a license in one of the colleges of Great Britain before they can take a steamer across the Atlantic. I have here some letters from the management of the Elder-Dempser line which bears on the subject, and which I will ask the permission of the House to read :

> Liverpool, February 27th, 1901.
>
> Messrs. Elder, Dempster & Co.,
> Montreal, Que.
>
> Dear Sirs,—We are most anxious to have Canadian doctors on board our Canadian steamers, and we want you to arrange it so. If we have an English doctor on any of the ships, we want you to put a Canadian doctor alongside him to come to this end so that he may take charge of the ship from here.
>
> Yours truly,
> (Sgd.) ELDER, DEMPSTER & CO.
>
> Liverpool, February 22nd, 1901.
>
> Messrs. Elder, Dempster & Co.,
> Montreal, Que.
>
> Dear Sirs,—Canadian doctors. From what we have seen of these gentlemen we have the highest respect for them, and we are most anxious they should become practitioners on board our West African and West Indian steamers. Would see no reason whatever why Canadian doctors should not be allowed to sail with their Canadian diplomas on equal terms with English doctors. What is the next step to take? You will see we have written to the High Commissioner here and he says the only thing to do is to get the doctors to come to England for examination. What does this mean ?
>
> Yours truly,
> (Sgd.) ELDER, DEMPSTER & CO.

Mr. Colmer, secretary to the High Commissioner, writing to Mr. Jones, of the Elder-Dempster line says :

February 21st, 1901.

Alfred Jones, Esq.,
African House,
6 Water Street,
Liverpool.

Dear Mr. Jones,—I duly received your letter of the 13th inst., in reference to the question of Candian medical men being registered in this country.

The difficulty is, as your medical superintendant points out, that while the Medical Act of 1886 leaves the door open to Canadians, providing the medical authorities in the Dominion offer similar facilities, the provisions of the statute have not yet been applied to the Dominion.

The only course for a Canadian doctor, therefore, is to come to England for an examination which, if passed, will entitle him to registration.

I return the inclosures to your letter herewith.

I am, dear Mr. Jones,
Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) J. E. COLMER,
Secretary.

This correspondence indicates how unfairly our medical men are treated, but we have the remedy in our own hands, and that remedy is simply the establishment of a Dominion medical council and a central examining board in order to meet the requirements of the British Medical Act of 1886. We have had numerous opportunities of testing the disabilities under which Canadian medical men labour during this present South African war, and we have constantly heard of how medical men attached to Canadian battalions were not allowed to attend Tommy Atkins. It was in fact thought, that they were good enough to attend Canadian soldiers, but not good enough to look after English soldiers. That is a positive fact. Several of those gentlemen who have returned from South Africa have cited instances to me, and I have correspondence bearing on it which I could produce if time would permit, showing that a great injustice had been done to our Canadian medical men, and done probably to force our hand. Knowing as I do several members of the British Medical Council, I am satisfied that nothing would give them greater pleasure than that we should arrange in Canada here a scheme which would meet them half way. Other objects of this Bill of a minor character might be referred to, but I shall not touch on them at this particular time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in arranging a scheme of this kind, there is no intention; nor is there any necessity for any interference with the autonomy of the provinces. I am aware that the fear of such interference is the great objection which has been offered to this measure of mine. It is not intended to do away with the provincial boards in any way. They will still continue to exist as they have existed hitherto. They must exist for certain purposes. They must exist for the purpose of taxation and discipline. With the provincial boards will be left the question of taxation and all matters relating to the discipline of the profession. They will not be disturbed. Their autonomy will not be interfered with in the least degree. I would be the last man in this House to seek in any way to override the provisions of the British North America Act. I have the greatest respect for that piece of constitutional machinery, and I believe that any interference with the autonomy of the provinces is unnecessary and uncalled for in any way. Where the provinces wish to continue an examining board, as now, they can do so. I have no doubt at all that the larger provinces, that is Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and Manitoba at any rate, will each continue to have an examining board for the purpose of examining and licensing men who wish to practice in a particular province only. For instance, a man who goes up before the Ontario Medical Council, when this Act comes into force, as I hope it will, may be examined by them as he is now. They will undertake to examine him and give him a license to practice in the province of Ontario only, and he cannot go outside of the limits of that province on that certificate. It will be the same in the province of Quebec. I think that for a great many years to come the system in Quebec will continue as it is now, but I have it on good authority that the smaller provinces will probably discontinue the examining of candidates who come before them. I state without hesitation, and without any detriment to the smaller provinces, that in the light of the present progress in medicine—judging from the rapidity with which some of the subjects at any rate are progressing—it is impossible for a man who is not a teacher connected with a university to keep up sufficiently well to be able to examine in these subjects. Among the provinces there are four which have no university—British Columbia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and the North-west Territories; as they have as yet no teaching body, their men are not able to keep up sufficiently well to examine. On that account, and for the reason I have given, there is no necessity, I repeat again, for disturbing the provincial board and its present methods; so it will continue as before.

This Bill, then, is a purely permissive Bill. It is necessary, in order that it may come into operation, to have the consent and co-operation of all the provinces. It is necessary for the medical board in each province to go before the local legislature and ask for a short clause to be tacked on to the present Act. Every province has its medical Act, and it will be simply necessary to add to that Act something like the following—though it need not be in exactly the same words :—

When there shall have been established under the authority of the parliament of Canada a

medical register for Canada, under the control of a medical council for Canada, then, notwithstanding anything contained in any of the Acts hereby amended, any person duly registered in the said register as a medical and surgical practitioner, or as a student of medicine and surgery, shall, without any further or other evidence of qualification, be entitled to be registered in the medical register of this province as a duly qualified medical and surgical practitioner, or as a duly qualified student of medicine and surgery, as the case may be, upon production of a certificate under the hand of the registrar of the said medical council for Canada, certifying that such person is so duly registered upon satisfactory proof of the identity of such person, and upon payment of such fee as may be prescribed by the medical council of the province in that behalf.

A short amendment of that kind, tacked on to the medical Act of each province, is all that is required to bring into effect the measure I am advocating.

Now, as to the scheme itself. How is this Act to be put into operation? It is necessary, first, to have a medical council, which may be called the Dominion Medical Council or the Medical Council of Canada, which I think would probably be a better term. The composition of this council has been a great puzzle to those of us who have had to do with the framing of this Bill. It has occasioned me personally a great deal of thought and consideration. We have tried two or three schemes, which have all given more or less satisfaction, but which have not quite met the requirements. When I addressed this House a year ago, I stated that the plan which seemed to satisfy all the provinces was that three members of the council should be taken from each province —one appointed by the Governor General in Council, one elected by each provincial medical council, and, the president of each provincial medical council. That, we found, gave dissatisfaction in the larger provinces. The province of Ontario, with its 2,300 odd doctors, said, 'It is unfair to us to give us the same number only as the little province of Prince Edward Island with something like 96 doctors.' Pressure was brought to bear so strongly that I looked for another scheme, and I think I have found one which will give general satisfaction. It is, that for the first 100 or fraction of 100 practitioners in each province, there shall be one member. That will let in Prince Edward Island, and will also let in the Yukon when it has a central board established. For the second 100 or fraction thereof over 50, there will be one member; and for every 600 above that, one member. That principle can be continued ad infinitum. Then there will be appointed members—one appointed by the Governor in Council from each province. There will also be university representatives, each university having a teaching medical faculty being entitled to send one, and there will be three homeopathic representatives from the entire Dominion.

Mr. RODDICK.

Now, it may be said: Why ask the government to appoint one from each province? I have been constantly met with the objection that this would bring politics into the organization. I do not think so. I think the ablest men in our country will be selected, very often at any rate, by wise governments for a purpose of this kind. But, Sir, there are two other reasons, cogent reasons, why the government of the country should have a voice in the composition of this council. Doubtless some day, when it gets thoroughly into operation, this body will be used by the Dominion government as an advisory body, having, as it will undoubtedly have, the best men in our country upon it, on great questions of quarantine, or concerning epidemics or pestilences that may reach our shores, in order that it may back up the authorities who are dealing with such matters in the Dominion and in the various provinces. This use is made today of the British Medical Council by the government of Great Britain, and its meetings and investigations have been exceedingly useful and practical. Another reason —it is a sordid one, perhaps, but one of considerable practical interest—is that having eight representatives of the government of the day upon it, this council may well come to the government and ask for some assistance, in the form of a grant for a certain number of years, which I feel satisfied my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) will be able to arrange for us, because he has been in the past—I take this opportunity of saying—exceedingly kind to the medical profession. In 1897, when the British Association visited this country, he came forward, and without hesitation presented the profession in Canada the sum of $5,000 for the purpose of entertaining their distinguished visitors. For these two reasons, which I have given, I do not think that the provision for the appointment by the Governor General in Council of one member will receive much opposition.

Each university in Canada, which has a teaching medical faculty, will be represented by one member. There are nine such universities in Canada to-day. There are ten active teaching medical faculties, but one of these, the Trinity school, is not attached strictly to any university. We hope, however, that arrangements may be made to take that body into the composition of the council. It is possible that owing to the fact that the universities of Quebec and Montreal are practically separate and distinct, Laval might claim another representative. That will give to the province of Ontario a total of nine; to the province of Quebec eight, to Nova Scotia four, to Manitoba four, to New Brunswick three, to British Columbia three, to the North-west Territories three, and to Prince Edward Island two, making altogether thirty-six, besides three homeopathic representatives, which brings the number to thirty-nine. It may be thought

that this council is too large, but we must not forget that it represents the whole Dominion. In the province of Quebec alone there are forty members on the local board and in Toronto thirty members, so that there will be fewer in reality on this committee for the whole Dominion than there now is on the board of one single province. These figures of course will have to be constantly altered. A year ago, on the very day I addressed the House, I received a telegram from the North-west Territories, stating that there were 110 medical men there. Yesterday I received another telegram, stating that the number had increased to 211, which doubtless is an evidence of the increase of population in the Territories.

The homeopathic representatives will be elected by the homeopathists themselves, from ocean to ocean, by ballot. That is their own proposition. Dr. Campbell, of London, who is one of the leading homeopathists in Canada, said that they would undertake the election themselves and send three representatives to the council. These gentlemen will serve a certain number of years. The appointees of the Governor General will be named for four years. Those who are elected from the profession or by the various councils will serve during the life of the council. The university representatives and the homeopathists will be retained for four years. The whole scheme will, at the start, be under the supervision of the Minister of Agriculture who will call the first meeting, preside at it, and arrange to have the council put into business shape. The first meeting will be held in Ottawa, and it is possible that all the meetings will be held there.

This council will elect from time to time an examining board, to be composed of English and French examiners, and every candidate may elect to be examined in either the English or French language. Examinations will be held in the centres where hospital facilities are the greatest and the students most numerous, so that it will not be necessary to disturb the students. As a rule the students in this country are to be found in five different places—Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg, and in these centres the examinations will be held.

It will be necessary to exact a five years course of all students in the various universities in Canada, because that is now exacted by the Ontario Medical Council and also by the British Medical Council. The final year of the course will be purely a practical one, having to do with the practical subjects which the practitioner really deals with in his daily life.

There is in the Bill a retrospective or retroactive clause intended to admit those members of the profession who have been a number of years in practice. It is thought that every medical man who has been five or seven years in practice—the time has not been decided upon, but will be in the committee when we meet the delegates of the various provinces—should have the privilege of taking advantage of this Act. These practitioners will be registered and allowed to move from one province to another or change their domicile for the purpose of practising, but the chances are that when a man has been anchored five or seven years in the one place he is likely to remain there, so that there will be no stampede of these gentlemen towards any of the newer provinces. By making the limit five or seven years, any danger of such a stampede will be avoided.

There will also be a board of arbitration in order to meet difficulties which may arise in the early meetings of the council. It might occur that a representative of a province might indicate that the standard was not kept up, as promised originally, and that standard must of course be at least as high as anything in existence at present. In this event, the board of arbitration will meet and be composed of three members—one to be appointed by the Governor General from the Supreme Court of Canada, the second will be appointed by the council; and the third will be a member of the council from the aggrieved province. These three will sit upon the case, as it were, and find out exactly where the grievance is, whether it should be considered, and what remedy should be applied. It is a very important part of the machinery, and, while I hope it will never need to be brought into operation, I think that, if it becomes necessary, it will be found useful. It was thought that a judge of the Supreme Court would not be influenced by any prejudices of a local character.

Now, the advantages in connection with this Bill are that we shall have a more uniform standard of education and examination in this country ; we shall have the barriers broken down which at present exist on the frontiers of provinces ; and medical men will be able to get a license to practice on both sides of the Ottawa river, on both sides of the imaginary line between any two provinces. I believe, Sir, that it will lead to removing, or, at any rate, lessening the congestion which at present exists in the medical profession in some of the provinces. Medical practitioners will be more generally distributed, and it will allow a number of our young men to roam, as it were, in any part of the empire. By registering in Great Britain, as I said before, they will be able to practice in any place where the British flag flies. The Bill will thus have the effect of encouraging that spirit of Imperialism which is rife at the present time, and which should permeate. to the very marrow, every true Canadian. I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Peter Macdonald, East Huron). I agree very largely with the promoter as to the value of this Bill to the medical profession. It is a Bill that is agreed to, I believe, by the six thousand medical men of the Dominion of Can-

ada almost unanimously. We have been, ever since confederation, under disabilities in the various provinces, on account of the education of medical men by the provinces. In my opinion, it was an error to place the education of medical men under the provinces ; but with this I do not intend to deal. The education that is necessary for a medical man qualifies one that has received that education to practice his profession in any part of the world. We are not exactly in the same position as lawyers in this respect. Law differs in different countries, and even in different provinces ; and thus a person who may be qualified to practice law in one country or one province may not have the education to fit him for the practice of it in another. But, our profession being based upon the same principles, and our practice being the same, one who has received the necessary education is fitted to practice it anywhere. We are placed under disabilities in regard to our rights in the respective provinces of this Dominion. When we receive our diploma and license, these only permit us to practice in the province in which we obtain them. And if a young man—or an old man, for that matter—wishes to remove from one province to another, he is met with the laws of the other province, which exact from him, in most cases, an examination and the payment of a large fee. We believe that that is contrary to the spirit of the constitution of Canada ; we believe that when we spend four or five years of the best period of our lives, and pay also a little fortune, in order to acquire a profession, the license or diploma obtained should carry us a little further than the locality in which we live. Let me point out to you the difficulties which we experience at times. A large number of our young men go to our new western country to assist one another in developing that country. Among others is a certain proportion of young medical men who go. But as soon as they go they find themselves forbidden to practice until after they have complied with the regulations of the province in which they wish to settle. For instance, if a young man has received his diploma, let us say, from one of the Toronto medical schools, which require four years of actual study, and has also passed his examination before the medical council of Ontario—a very high examination—yet, when he enters the province of British Columbia, where they have no teaching body, and where they are willing to accept a three years course, he must pass an examination and pay a fee of $100. Now, we think that a hardship. Let me give you instances. There were two young men of my own town who graduated in medicine a few years ago. One of them was a graduate of Trinity, who was the winner of a silver medal. He passed his examination before the medical council in due course. He decided to go out to the new country to practice his profession, and help, with others to develop that new country. He arrived in British Columbia a few days after the examination had been held. He could not go up for examination for six months. It was impossible for him to remain in British Columbia spending money and doing nothing for that length of time, so he concluded that it would be better for him to return to Ontario, which he did, and he is practising in Ontario to-day. Another young man in my town was thoroughly equipped in the medical department of Toronto University, having taken a high place in the examinations there. He passed the medical council's examination. He, like the other man, went to British Columbia. Being met with the same difficulty, he also decided that he could not wait for the examination, and, in any case, he had not $100 to pay his fee. This result was that he went to California and established himself there. He is practising in California to-day, and Canada has lost a very good citizen. In order to overcome these disabilities, Canadian medical practitioners wish to establish the Dominion Medical Council before which any person who wishes to practice in any of the provinces outside of the one in which he has taken his diploma may come and obtain a diploma which will give him the right to practice in any province of the Dominion. As the promoter of the Bill has very truly pointed out, when medical practitioners are living near the border line between provinces, they may be called in cases of emergencies to treat persons on the other side of the provincial line. And, medical men have actually been fined for going across the border to treat persons in cases of emergency. Such a case happened within a few miles of this very city of Ottawa. A medical man of the city of Ottawa, no matter how high his qualifications, cannot cross the interprovincial bridge at the Chaudiere to treat a person on the other side of the river. Now, such anomalies, I think, should not prevail in a country where we have such large views of nationality.

Then, again, we are hampered, as the doctor has pointed out, by our position in the British possessions. Medical men from Australia, and from its various divisions previous to the establishment of the Commonwealth, were permitted to register under the General Medical Act of Great Britain, and therefore could qualify themselves to occupy any position they might receive in the civil service, the navy, the militia, or the service of the East Indian Company ; in fact, any position in the gift of the British government, could be bestowed upon those gentlemen living in Australia, British India, the British West Indies, South Africa, and New Zealand. But the graduates from Canada were denied that privilege because they were not graduates of a British possession as defined in the British Medical Act. My hon. friend from Montreal made reference to this matter, but allow me to read the clause under which the graduates of other colonies register in Britain, and the one un-

der which the graduates of Canada wish, under this Bill, to register. This is the article in the Medical Act passed in 1896 by the British parliament, which relates to that matter :

On and after the prescribed day where a person shows to the satisfaction of the registrar of the General Council that he holds some recognized colonial medical diploma or diplomas (as hereinafter defined) granted to him in a British possession——

Now, note the expression 'British possession.'

——to which this Act applies, and that he is of good character, and that he is by law entitled to practice medicine, surgery and midwifery in such British possessions, he shall, on application to the said registrar, and on payment of such fee not exceeding five pounds as the General Council may from time to time determine, be entitled, without examination in the United Kingdom, to be registered as a colonial practitioner in the medical register.

Now, that is the privilege extended by this Act to medical graduates in a British possession. But if we turn to section 17 of this Act, we see the definition of a British possession and by that definition Canadian graduates are shut out from the right to register under the British Medical Act. This is the definition in the clause that shuts us out :

The expression 'British possession' means any part of Her Majesty's Dominions exclusive of the United Kingdom, but inclusive of the Isle of Man and the channel islands ; and where parts of such dominions are under both a central and a local legislature—

Notice, that is the position we occupy.

—all parts under one central legislature are for the purpose of this definition deemed to be one British possession.

Now, Canada is a British possession in the meaning of that expression, but Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, any or all of them are not British possessions; and consequently, as we are graduates of one or other of the provinces, we cannot say that our diploma is from a British possession, and therefore we are excluded from being registered under the British General Medical Act, and are excluded consequently from all those courtesies and advantages which would otherwise come to us. Now, for these reasons the general profession in Canada is unanimous in asking the parliament of Canada to remove these disabilities so that our practitioners may have the same opportunities of obtaining these positions in Great Britain as have graduates from the other colonies of that great empire. If this Bill is passed and crystallized into law it will be accepted almost unanimously by every member of the profession. There is nothing in the Bill from the preamble down to the last clause which compromises the interests of any party inside or outside the profession; and therefore I think that parliament would act wisely and judiciously, would act in the interest not only of the profession but of all those who call the profession to their assistance, by passing this law and enabling us to establish a Dominion Medical Council before which students and practitioners might come to receive a diploma from a British possession, and thus they would be eligible to advantages from which they are now excluded.

Then again, as was pointed out by my hon. friend from Montreal, this medical council is to be so composed as to be of great value as a consulting body to the government of Canada. The Governor in Council is to appoint one of its members from each province ; the members of the council from each province of the Dominion are to appoint one more ; then the universities which are engaged in teaching are to have the right of appointing one, and the medical profession will appoint the balance. So you see it is to be fully representative of the various classes of practitioners throughout the Dominion. It is representative of the Dominion; and because each province in the Dominion is to be represented on this council, therefore it will be representative of the provinces. When the advice of such a consulting body is required in regard to general health, epidemics or diseases, the government can call to their assistance these eminent men, who will be members of the council, and in this way the public at large will receive great advantage from the constitution of that body, a body the like of which does not now exist, representative of such large areas or of so many classes in all the provinces.

In view of all these facts, I am sure the House will agree, as I believe it is proposed to do, to submit this matter to a special committee, who will go over the various clauses of the Bill and see that each one is put into such a shape as not to affect prejudicially any class of the community. When the committee reports, and the Bill comes back to the House, and is submitted to a Committee of the Whole, any changes can be made which may be deemed necessary to make the Bill perfect and in the interest of the profession as well as of the community as a whole. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for me to say any more. I think the considerations I have placed before the House are sufficient to convince hon. members that some change of this kind is necessary, and in the interest of the great profession which has given so much time and so much skill, without fee or reward, to promote the health and prosperity of this country.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The Bill which is now engaging the attention of the House is one that meets with my hearty support, and one which I think will meet with the approbation of every hon. gentleman in this House, whether he is a member of the profession or not. The hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill and who

has judiciously, during the last two years, held it over from session to session in order to have it perfected, is deserving, in my opinion, of great credit for the expenditure of time, of labour and of trouble which he has made in educating the profession to take the very progressive step the Bill is intended to accomplish. The subject matter of the Bill is one of considerable delicacy, and requires a good deal of diplomacy in its proper handling in order to harmonize the varied interests. Our educational affairs being under the jurisdiction of the local legislatures, the members of the profession in the various provinces have been jealous of their rights and privileges. The colleges and universities, the degree-conferring institutions, have been anxious to safeguard their present privileges. The various provinces have local laws which practically debar members of the profession in other provinces from invading their field unless they comply with these local laws, which are in many instances onerous and difficult to comply with.

Now Ontario is justly proud of the high standard and excellence of its medical education. For a long time the profession of that province stood out against entering into any arrangement for a system of Dominion registration unless their particular standard and regulations, or similarly high ones, were adopted by the other provinces of the Dominion. On the other hand the other provinces of the Dominion had laws which they considered useful to themselves and which they considered equally applicable to their particular part of the Dominion and they also took the same ground. The colleges and other degree conferring institutions looked at first with suspicion upon this movement fearing that their vested rights might be tampered with. All these difficulties had to be met and overcome. It has required years of agitation and education until now all the varied interests are practically a unit in assisting to secure the passage of this Bill. Viewed from a selfish standpoint, we, the medical men in the west, are not so anxious that this legislation should be crystallized into law as those from the east. In fact, in many respects, looking at it from a selfish standpoint, it will be a detriment to us, but I am glad to say that the medical men of the west are not animated by any sectional feeling, and that they will join in any movement for the good of the medical profession at large and for the good of the public at large. The profession in the west is not at the present time in a congested state, although in the North-west Territories alone, according to the report presented by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick), there have been more than one hundred practitioners who have gone into the North-west Territories during the last twelve months. That is a new country which is opening up and developing and population is flowing in so rapidly every year that we have not more medical men than the demand requires. However, in the east the supply more than equals the demand and new graduates must seek new fields in which to practise their profession and if they desire to practise under the British flag in the Dominion of Canada they must seek new homes for themselves on the prairies of the west. It is therefore of more importance to the practitioners of the east that this Bill should become law than it is to the practitioners of the west.

What an anomaly it is, as has been pointed out by both speakers who have preceded me, that a gentleman holding one of the best university degrees in the province of Ontario, probably a graduate of Toronto University, possessing special knowledge and ability, practising his profession in Ottawa, is unable to cross the boundary line, to cross the Ottawa river without being subjected to fine or imprisonment by incurring the penalties imposed by the province of Quebec? And, vice versa graduates of McGill University, which is now turning out some of the best medical men on the American continent, men of standing in the practise of their profession, cannot cross an imaginary boundary line without being subjected to the penalties imposed upon them by the laws of other provinces. If it were a fact that the standard of medical education were so very much inferior in one province than in another there might be some excuse for such a law as this, but, the day has gone by when such a contention can be set out. It is not like it was in some of the states a few years ago when medical men were turned out by whole sale as goods are turned out of a factory. On the contrary, to-day, the standard is very high in each of the provinces of the Dominion and there is no possible excuse why such a law should be in existence at the present time.

Another feature that has been adverted to by the hon. member for Montreal is, that at the present time graduates from the different provinces of the Dominion are not placed on the same footing in the motherland as are graduates from the other colonies of His Majesty's dominions. For instance, a medical man who graduates in the commonwealth of Australia is allowed by simply paying his fee to obtain his license and practise his profession in the old country, while a practitioner from the province of Quebec, or the province of Ontario, must spend a certain length of time in the old country before he can go up for examination and then he must pass his examination and pay his fee before he can secure registration entitling him to practise. It is not because the standard is so very much higher in Australia than it is in Canada. I think we have as good colleges, if not better, in Canada than they have in Australia, but it is simply because of the lack of uniformity in our degrees in Canada. We cannot expect the motherland to recognize our

degrees from the different provinces when we do not recognize them between the provinces in our own Dominion, but, by having a Dominion registration board and allowing any graduate of any province to appear before that board, pass his examination and secure medical registration for the Dominion it will not only allow him to practise in any portion of the Dominion but to practise in the motherland as well.

By the passage of this Bill no vested rights are assailed; there is no proposal to take away from any of the colleges or universities any existing rights or privileges. The Act is not a compulsory one to compel any one to pass the examination before the Dominion board. Any person graduating and desiring to practise his profession in a particular province has simply to comply with the laws of that province, but should he desire to place himself in a better position so that he will be able to practise in any of the provinces of the Dominion he may do so by appearing before the Dominion board, passing his examination, and securing the privilege of practising in any portion of the Dominion. There are one or two features in this Bill different from those contained in the Bill introduced during the preceding session to meet objections raised principally in the province of Ontario. One of these is in regard to the basis of representation and another in regard to the re-registration on a provincial degree. It was considered at first by the promoter of the Bill that representation on the basis of population would make the Bill too cumbersome and too unwieldy and it was proposed to allow each province the same number of representatives. To this there was objection made by the older and larger provinces that it would not give a fair show to the larger number of medical men in the larger provinces compared with the smaller number in the smaller provinces and a change has been made in the proposed Bill by which the profession according to population, as laid down by the hon. member from Montreal, are allowed representation. This, I think, will be satisfactory to the smaller provinces as well as to the larger ones. The other objection that has been made is owing to the fact that in Ontario, where the Medical Council is the examining board, they do not allow a graduate from, say Toronto University, to practise unless he appears before the Ontario Medical Council and obtains a license from that body. It is a very strict examination and they consider that a graduate coming from Manitoba, having a degree from Manitoba University, should not be allowed to register before this Dominion board and go into the province of Ontario to practise his profession. A clause has been inserted, subsection 3 of clause 10, to meet this objection which reads as follows:—

> The possession of a Canadian university degree alone, or of a certificate of provincial registration founded on such possession, shall not entitle the possessor thereof to be registered under this Act.

These are the two principal objections that were made to last year's Bill, and they have been remedied in the Bill as it now appears before the House. It is scarcely necessary to enter into a discussion of the various details of this Bill. I trust it will be referred to the committee that will be moved later on and that it will be thoroughly threshed out, where delegates from the various provinces will meet with the members of that committee. I believe that if this Bill becomes law it will not only be in the interests of the profession but also in the interests of the public.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the Bill introduced by the hon. member from West Montreal (Mr. Roddick), now under consideration, being referred to a special committee of the House, provided the principle of the Bill be not adopted now. Interested as we are in the welfare of the medical profession, we are still more anxious to uphold the constitution.

I believe that the most serious objection that can be offered to this Bill, is that it is unconstitutional. It is provided by the constitution that in each province, the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects assigned to that legislature. If we except agriculture and immigration, both of which subjects come within the jurisdiction of both the Dominion and the Provincial governments, I submit that, as regards all the other subjects, this parliament has no jurisdiction; and that were we to pass into law the Bill introduced by the hon. gentleman, we should be encroaching upon provincial autonomy. And even should this Bill be made to apply to the Dominion at large; even were we to enlarge the geographical area of its operation, it does not follow that it would thereby become constitutional.

Let me call the attention of my hon. friend to Lefroy's work, 'Legislative Power in Canada,' and to the following quotation from Judge Burton's judgment:

> I think the principle must be clear that neither the Dominion parliament nor the local legislature can attract to itself a jurisdiction in matters assigned exclusively to the other power by the mere device of enlarging the geographical area so as to include the whole of the provinces, nor in the other case of restricting the area in which the power is to be exercised.

And Sir Oliver Mowat is quoted as follows:

> It is clear that an alleged or supposed expediency of the law being uniform throughout the Dominion on any subject which is otherwise within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures does not give jurisdiction to the federal parliament to create uniformity.

Further on, the Hon. Edward Blake is quoted as saying:

We must recognize as an inconvenience inseparable from the federal system a lack of power anywhere to make uniform regulations, co-extensive with the whole Dominion, on subjects relegated to provincial authority.

Now, if we return to the British North America Act, we see that under clause 92, subsection 13, the legislature is empowered to exclusively make laws in relation to property and civil rights in the province ; surely, the right of practising medicine in another province is a civil right, and therefore, the parliament of Canada cannot pass into law such a Bill as is now under consideration.

Under clause 3976 of the Revised Consolidated Statutes of the province of Quebec—and I have no doubt that similar provisions are in force in all the other provinces—it is provided that no person shall be entitled to practise medicine in the province of Quebec, unless such person has first secured a diploma from the Medical and Surgical Board of the province of Quebec.

Should we adopt this Bill, does it not stand to reason that it would conflict with the existing provincial laws ? So, if all civil matters, with the exception of agriculture and immigration, are relegated to the provincial authority, we are forced to the conclusion that the Bill of my hon. friend, desirable as it may be in other respects—and I agree that it would be much more convenient for medical men to have the right to practise in any one of the provinces—cannot be adopted. Moreover, another thing which clearly shows that this Bill is not within the purview of the powers of this parliament is that it contemplates the establishment of a central examining board and a uniform standard of education and examination. Now, is it not true that all subjects relating to education are relegated to the provincial legislatures ? At all events, only in such exceptional cases as are mentioned in the constitution is the federal parliament free to interfere. On these several grounds I say that parliament should not undertake to pass this Bill, as this is not the proper place to deal with such matters. After all, it seems to me that the various medical bodies of the Dominion could easily come to an understanding and form into an association, with a view to promoting their interests throughout the different provinces, without going to the length of having this association recognized by the federal parliament. With this end in view, they could bring their combined influence to bear upon the provincial legislatures, so as to secure some reciprocity in the practise of their profession. Such a reciprocity, for instance, has been brought about by the bar of the province of Ontario and the bar of the province of Quebec. We have in our respective statute-books provincial Acts under which barristers from the one or the other province are allowed to practise their profession, upon payment of the usual fee. For instance, not long ago, the solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was admitted to the bar of the province of Quebec, without having had to pass any examination, and upon payment of the customary fee.

Such a reciprocity existing between the two provinces, I say that it ought to be no difficult matter for the medical bodies to exert their influence, so as to secure from the provincial legislatures a similar privilege.

The main argument urged by the hon. member from Montreal, in support of his Bill, was that medical men cannot get a license to practise throughout the British empire. I think that on this point my hon. friend is also mistaken, and that he is putting a wrong construction on the British General Medical Act. As a matter of fact, under this Act medical practitioners in the British possessions, as well as medical men from foreign countries, are entitled to practise medicine and surgery in the United Kingdom.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think Molière's aphorism : 'A door must either be open or shut,' applies here. Now, one of two things : we either belong to a foreign country or we form part of the British possessions ; there is no getting out of that dilemma. The British Act applies to all countries, and my hon. friend is wrong when he says that it does not apply to the province of Ontario. Moreover, if we turn to clause 27 of the British General Medical Act, incorporated in our statutes, 50-51 Vic., we see the definition of the words 'a British possession and foreign countries.' If Ontario were not a British possession, it would rank as a foreign country, and even then, under clause 27 of said Act, medical men from Ontario would enjoy similar privileges. Clause 27 reads as follows :—

The expression 'British possession' means any part of Her Majesty's Dominions exclusive of the United Kingdom, but inclusive of the Isle of Man and the channel islands ; and where parts of such dominions are under both a central and a local legislature, all parts under one central legislature are for the purpose of this definition deemed to be one British possession.

In my view, this means the very reverse of the construction put upon the clause by the hon. gentleman. Is it not true that the province of Ontario is a British possession ? under the control of a central legislature ? To my mind there is not even a shadow of a doubt about it, and the hon. member for Montreal West has put a wrong construction upon that clause. Besides, as I said, if Ontario were not a British possession, within the meaning of the Act, then it would be a foreign country, and in that case medical men from foreign countries are entitled to the same privileges as are enjoyed by medical practitioners in the British possessions.

On these several grounds, Sir, although I do not object to this Bill being referred to a special committee, I do object to the principle of the Bill being now affirmed by the House.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Would the hon. gentleman kindly inform me whether he has received any communication from the authorities of Laval university in connection with this Bill ? I ask this question because I was not in my seat when the hon. gentleman rose to address the House. A few days ago I got several copies of this Bill—and I may say that I have not had time to thoroughly examine it—and I sent them to the dean of the faculty of Laval university. As I have received no answer yet, it occurred to me that perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Demers) was speaking on behalf of the faculty.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) I do not belong to the faculty of Laval university.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). (Translation.) I may say that I have inquired, in a general way, of the hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Roddick) whether the members of the faculty of Laval university, were in favour of this Bill or not. From what I was told, I gather that the faculty has not taken a positive stand on the matter. I am further informed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roddick) that Dr. Lachapelle, the chairman of the Provincial Board of Health, and one of the members of the faculty, is a supporter of this Bill, but I have reason to believe that the faculty of Laval university is opposed to this measure.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I asked the hon. gentleman that question because, having sent the Bill to the faculty without receiving any answer, I wished to inquire of him about the position taken by the Laval professors.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There seems to be considerable doubt as to whether or not this Bill is within the purview of the powers of this parliament. The authority which has been cited by my hon. friend from Iberville (Mr. Demers) would tend to show that this parliament has no jurisdiction. At all events, even if this parliament had jurisdiction over this matter, yet in view of the fact that we know there is a good deal of jealousy on the part of the provinces which are at present exercising the same jurisdiction, I doubt if it would be well for us to legislate contrary to their wishes. As to the merits of the Bill, I understand from the discussion which has taken place to-day, that there seems to be some difference of opinion even amongst professional medical men. It is an old saying that doctors differ even in the exercise of their profession, and therefore it is not to be wondered at that they differ as regards legislation. I understand from my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick) that the only thing he has in view to-day is to refer the Bill to a special committee with the object of looking into its merits, and the law as well. It is a recognized principle that when the House gives a second reading it approves of the principle of the measure, and but for the fact that my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick) has stated that his only intention is to refer this Bill to a Committee of the House; for my part I would not feel justified in supporting the second reading. But with the qualification which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roddick) has made, and with the object of further having the matter investigated and reported on later, I think the House will do well to consent to the second reading, reserving to itself the privilege of judging on the principle of the Bill when it comes before us for its third reading, if it should come to that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to say that so far as I am concerned, that I do not share the doubts of certain hon. gentlemen as to the power of this parliament to pass this Bill. It is a statute which creates a corporation not having provincial objects, and on that ground alone I think that this parliament has jurisdiction to enact it. It is not an absolute test it is true, but would any of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the subject, venture to say that any provincial legislature in Canada would have the power to pass a statute of this character. I venture to think not. I believe that this parliament is the only legislative body in Canada that has power to pass such a Bill. A great many illustrations might be given from the very work that was cited by my hon. friend (Mr. Demers) to indicate that the weight of authority at the present time is not in favour of the principle which I understood him to enunciate. However, that question is not being debated just at present because the right hon. gentleman has consented that the Bill shall be referred to a committee for the purpose of being discussed there, and I suppose the question of its constitutionality, if we desire to discuss it, can be dealt with later on. So far as the merits of the Bill are concerned, I have not examined it very carefully, but there is one feature in it that appeals to me very much, and that is the principle of giving to the medical men of Canada a national standing which they do not seem to have at present. I am somewhat surprised to learn that an Imperial statute of the character referred to by the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Macdonald) has been permitted to exist so long, and that on account of it, medical men in Canada; men qualified to practise medicine in Canada have not been able to take the standing to which they certainly are entitled, in other countries, and particularly among our troops in South Africa. It seems to me that we ought to feel ashamed that medical men going from Canada; having the right to practise in any one of the great provinces of Canada; should in South Africa be submitted to the humiliation of not being allowed to attend the wounded among the

Imperial troops, simply for the reason that they have no standing among medical men in England. If I understood the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick) that is the position our medical men serving in South Africa were compelled to assume. I, for one, as a Canadian, feel ashamed of that state of things, and I am prepared to advocate any reasonable legislation which will obviate so disgraceful a condition of affairs. As the Bill is going to a special committee and is to be considered there much more carefully than it can be considered in this House, I will not now take the time of the House stating further the reasons on account of which I am in favour of this Bill. I have not sufficiently examined it to say that I am in favour of all its provisions, and so I am confining myself entirely to the principle involved.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). I was not in the House when the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick) and the hon. Deputy Speaker spoke, but if, as I understand they made the statement that Canadian medical men were not allowed to treat the wounded in South Africa, I think there is a mistake somewhere. I certainly saw Canadian doctors treating the wounded on many occasions.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time.

Mr. RODDICK. I beg to move, seconded by Dr. Macdonald :

That the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee to be composed of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Messrs. Geoffrion, Casgrain, Belcourt, Bell, Morrison, Ganong, Oliver, Boyd, MacKinnon, and Drs. Macdonald, Sproule, Christie, Ross (Rimouski), Mignault, Kendall, Reid (Grenville), Johnston (Lambton), Roche (Marquette) Bourbonnais, McLennan, Lewis, Vrooman, Horsey, Beland and the mover, with power to send for persons, papers and records and to report from time to time, and that rule 78 be suspended as regards limiting the number to serve on said committee.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). I think the name of the Minister of Militia ought to be added to that committee. He is a doctor, and would be a very useful member.

Mr. RODDICK. I had intended that the hon. minister should be on the committee, but I think he has some objection. I would be very glad if he would serve.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think some objection might be offered to the committee as it is now composed. As that committee will be called upon to consider whether this Bill is constitutional or not, I think the names of a few lawyers might be added to it. There are too many medical men on the committee in proportion to the number of lawyers.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) Should there not be a sufficient number of lawyers on the committee to kill the Bill, then the names of a few lawyers might be added to it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Is the name of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence to be added ?

The PRIME MINISTER. With the permission of the House, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick) has no objection, I would suggest that the name of Dr. Borden should also be added to the committee.

Mr. RODDICK. I should be very much pleased.

Motion as amended agreed to.

DOMINION ELECTION ACT.—1900. AMENDMENT.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell) moved second reading of Bill (No. 27) to further amend the Dominion Election Act, 1900. He said : Mr. Speaker, I introduced a similar Bill last session, and as I then explained, the object of the measure is to prevent as far as possible a new and very dangerous system of intimidating voters at the polls. The object of the Bill is to prevent persons who have an interest in promoting the election of a candidate from going about circulating the report that the present ballot and mode of voting is not secret. It is no answer to say that the present ballot is perfectly secret, and that the voting is secret, because the persons who circulate that report know that it is secret, and therefore their crime commences the moment they set their statement afloat. I know nothing of more far-reaching influence than for persons to be permitted, at the time of an election, to go about saying to voters that the mode of voting and the ballot is not secret, and that it can be discovered how any person has voted who votes against a candidate who may be an employer of labour or is supported by an employer of labour. I will not take up the time of the House discussing this measure further, because it seems to me so perfectly obvious that it is necessary in the public interest. If we are to have anything like pure or fair elections on either side, we must meet these difficulties as they occur. The ingenuity of people in discovering new means of evading the law is so great and so frequently exercised, that we are constantly called on in this House to pass restrictive measures to meet such cases. To show that this Bill goes no further than we have already gone in protecting candidates and maintaining purity of elections, I will read section 118 of the Elections Act :

Any person who before or during an election knowingly publishes a false statement of the withdrawal of a candidate at such election, for the purpose of promoting or procuring the election of another candidate, is guilty of an unlawful act, and shall also forfeit the sum of one hundred dollars to any person who sues therefor, with costs.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the person who circulates a report which he knows to be false uses a weapon for the purpose of intimidating voters. Now, all voters do not know that the ballot is a perfectly secret one, and it would be utterly impossible to convince some of them that there would be no danger of their losing their position if they voted in a certain way. I hope the House will see its way to accept this Bill as a proper measure for the protection of both sides, to guard against an evil which experience has shown to be one of the worst and most insidious forms of intimidation. I beg therefore to move the second reading of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I would ask my hon. friend not to press this matter further at the present time. There are on the Order paper, some other amendments suggested to the Elections Act, and there are some others not yet introduced which we have to consider later, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to suspend his motion for the second reading of this Bill until we have time to consider all the amendments together. My hon. friend will bear in mind that this measure was proposed last year, and I think also the year before, and the House rejected it.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. minister rejected it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would not like to assume that my objection was the only one. At any rate, I want to consider the matter further in connection with these other matters, and I would therefore ask my hon. friend to let his Bill stand for the present.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no objection to let it stand, with the understanding of course, that it will be considered with the other Bills.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Certainly.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing :—

1. The number of timber limits, and where located, that have been disposed of by the government since July, 1896, in the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

2. The names of the purchasers in each case, and price paid for each limit.

3. Copies of tenders for each limit, and names of newspapers in which advertisements appeared. —Mr. Roche (Marquette).

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply :

Militia—Pay and allowances, $392,100.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the hon. minister explain the reasons for this increase of $2,491 over last year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). One thousand four hundred and ninety-one dollars of it is due to increased lodging allowance for district officers commanding in Toronto, London and British Columbia. The amount provided was too small. A $1,000 of the increase was required to pay the guards of honour.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What increase in the number of officers of the permanent corps has been made during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There has been no increase above the establishment. During the time the contingents were serving in South Africa, a considerable number of permanent corps officers were in that country and had to be temporarily replaced. Now, however, nearly all the permanent force officers have returned, and we have not at all increased the establishment. It is precisely as it has been.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would the minister be good enough to explain why a number of the officers of the permanent corps who are the juniors of many men in the militia—men of greater experience—have been promoted to the rank of colonel over their seniors ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The officers of the permanent corps who have been gazetted colonel are Otter, Lessard, Drury and Evans. They had served in command in South Africa, and were specially mentioned by the War Office and recommended in regular course by the general officer commanding. I was very ready and glad to approve of the recommendation.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I agree with the hon. minister that these were proper cases for promotion to the rank of colonel, on account of their services, whether they were senior or junior. Could the hon. gentleman give me a list of all the promotions, including these gentlemen ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will bring it down. I understand that it is to include honorary colonels as well.

Mr. INGRAM. From whom could I find out the items of back pay given to those who served in South Africa ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think there is a statement of the amounts in the blue-book which was issued last year as a supplement to the militia report. If the information is not to be found in that book, I shall be glad to get it and bring it here ; or if the hon. gentleman will come to the department—if he does not desire the information publicly given—he can get the facts at any time from the accountant, who has an account with every one of the officers and the men who served in South Africa.

Mr. INGRAM. I did go to the department. The officers were very obliging and gave me all the information they could. But they could not give me these items, but recommended me to a certain officer who had paid some of these soldiers. However, I have not been able to get word from that gentleman either personally, by telephone or by letter.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Who was the officer ?

Mr. INGRAM. He was not a departmental officer, but it was his duty to pay out the money. If the hon. minister has any means of getting the information, I shall be glad to have it. I will apply for it privately.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). As I understood the hon. minister those officers who had been mentioned in the despatches of the British general were given the rank of colonel. But why were not all officers who were equally creditably mentioned in these despatches given the rank of colonel ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as I am aware, they were—that is, I will not say they were given the rank of colonel; but they were given additional rank to that which they held.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Were all officers who were mentioned promoted ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think so.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I know they were not.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I understand the minister to say that all officers who were recommended for the position were appointed—not all officers who were mentioned.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. And all officers who held positions of command in South Africa.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) to ask whether there were any who were mentioned in despatches and who held command, yet were not appointed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not aware of any, but I will inquire.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I must enter my emphatic protest against the attempt that is being made—I shall not blame the minister for it—but the department, the red-tapeism of the department to give undue prominence to the permanent corps. It was so when those who are now in opposition in this House were in power, and I presume it will be so until the end of the chapter. Ever since the establishment of the permanent corps, there has been an attempt on the part of the gentlemen in that corps to place it superior to the active militia. There is a fear—a well-grounded, properly-grounded fear—not only on the part of the active militia, but on the part of the men on the side lines who pay the taxes of this country, against what they are pleased to term the spirit of militarism. They dread anything in the shape of an active militia regiment being established in their locality for fear of strengthening that spirit. Now, we have fought for years—I fought when my own friends were in office—against giving prominence to this permanent corps. We were told : These gentlemen will understand the drill-book and drill better than an ordinary militiaman. Why, there is not a school boy, there is not a page on this floor, but could read in a week all the books that these gentlemen have to read. And, for a man of ordinary intelligence holding a position in the active militia of Canada to become perfect in the book knowledge that is required to command a permant corp or a militia corp in this country is a very easy and a very simple matter. There are scores of men throughout the length and breadth of this country who are infinitely better posted than the men of the permanent corps. I can tell you, Sir, that some of the gentlemen whom this government has been pleased to create full colonels, when proceeding to active service in South Africa did not know the difference between a hired ship and a regular military transport. Further, officers in command en route to Africa—permanent corps officers, of course, for no man who was not a permanent corps man had any chance; officers of the militia, captains, and even men of higher rank could enlist as privates and have the privates of the permanent corps placed over them as non-commission officers, but when it came to commanding, all the positions of command were given to officers of the permanent corps—actually undertook to try the stewards of the ship, men in the pay of the captain of the ship. Why, they actually thought that they were the superiors of the captain of the ship. They did not seem to know that the captain could place the officer in command in irons if he chose—and the mystery to me is that, in some cases, that was not done. Yet we are told that these men are much superior to the men of the active militia of this country. I want to point out to-day, as I have pointed out on many occasions in this House and out of it, that, from the earliest times in Canada until the present day, the irregulars, what you may term the active militia man, given as good arms and ammunition—in short, given equal opportunities with the regular—has trimmed the regular to a finish on every occasion. Take the history of the world, and it repeats the same thing over and over again. The defeat of regulars by irregulars in South Africa is only repeating the same story. The boys of the French Revolution period defeated the picked troops of Europe in every engage-

ment. In India, at the close of the eighteenth century, Britain had to find her Clive in a civilians office, and he it was who led her troops to victory. Again, at the time of the mutiny, she found her Nicholson, in the civil employment of the empire, and he also organized victory for British arms. It was so in the United States during the civil war. Though the big positions were given to the regulars, the permanent corp men, the greatest success were due to the men from the farms. And even to-day the American nation finds in a farmer, a man who, three years ago was tilling the soil of Kansas, the man who in the Philippine war has brought it out of the wilderness, while the regulars, the permanent corps men of the United States have not proven equal to the occasion. So history everywhere proves that the irregular, the militiaman, given half a chance with the other, his individuality comes to the front and he proves himself a better man on every occasion.

I am free to say that the permanent corps men who will be able to tell off a drunkard may be a little better than an ordinary active militia man. He may be able to manage what is termed office affairs. He may be able to require the men to salute and go through the little etiquette, so to speak, of the service to better advantage than the men of the ordinary active militia. But that he is a better fighting unit for the defence of his country than the other, I am here to deny. I need not point to officers in this House who are fit to take their place in the command of men side by side with the best colonels in the militia of Canada to-day. I need not point to scores of officers in this country who are fit to lead their men in active service, or who are fit to lead their men in ordinary brigade parade, side by side with the officers of the permanent corps, and do it infinitely better than they. Let me relate what took place on a field day in the city of Toronto a few years ago. An officer, I think it was an officer of the Grenadiers, or of a Hamilton battalion, detached two companies in order to guard the other flanks. The attacking force came on, and the umpires, who were largely permanent corps officers, happened to see these companies detached at the flanks and they ruled them off the field. The only sensible move of the whole day was to put these companies there, yet they were ruled out of action by the permanent corps men, one of them an officer with the rank of Lt. Colonel in His Majesty's Imperial service. On being remonstrated with, it was pointed out that these companies would have been cut off instantly had they been in an actual engagement. Let me point out, Sir, that the magnificent Guards brigade at the battle of Magersfontein was held in check for more than half a day by seventy-two men of the Scandinavian brigade, although they did not occupy a position at all to be compared with the position held by these two infantry companies of Toronto and Hamilton ; the magnificent Guards brigade were held in check for upwards of half a day by 72 men, about half the number that were detached from this Hamilton and Toronto regiment in that sham fight ; and, Sir, they held a position nothing like as strong as the position held by these people here. Again, I may point to an incident at Queenston Heights, where a permanent corps officer was in command, and where an ordinary hayseed brigade full of ordinary hayseed commanding officers——

Mr. THOMPSON. Order, order.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) was not present.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) was present.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, I was. I make no claim to be any better than an ordinary officer commanding a hayseed regiment. But this permanent corps officer, after having made dispositions for defence, found himself suddenly surrounded with two battalions and a half of men on the Heights, within a hundred yards, although neither he nor one of his men had seen them go there. Again I can point to an incident in the past season where two permanent corps officers were acting as umpires to watch some companies occupying an impregnable position, much stronger than that held by the Scandinavian detachment at Magersfontein, and the companies were ruled out of order, although there were one hundred and there were only a hundred men opposed to them, by these permanent corps officers.

I would not bring these matters up were it not for a deliberate attempt that is continued year after year to put permanent corps officers in senior positions. I am not blaming the minister, it was begun long before he ever became Minister of Militia and Defence, and these evils then, I believe, were much more patent than they are to-day. But a constant attempt is made on the part of those interested in upbuilding the permanent corps in this country to place them superior to the ordinary militia force of Canada. I say that permanent force was created, not as a standing army, not as a police force, but it was created as an educational institution. Now, Sir, I stand here to-day to say that that permanent corps to-day does not perform the functions expected of it ; and if it does perform the functions of an educational institution, then, as a matter of mere arithmetic, if you take the cost of that force and divide it by the number of certificates issued, you will find every certificate issued to a young fellow from the country costs this country away up in the thousands of dollars—a rather expensive education. Now I wish to point out here in connection with the permanent

corps that they should be there as an educational force. I shall not discuss that matter any further at the present time, because I have a motion on the paper relating to it, and intend to discuss it at length when that motion comes up.

But I wish to point out to the minister that the militia of this country and the people of this country will not consent to see these gentlemen placed as seniors over men who have borne the brunt of the work of upbuilding the militia force of Canada and bringing it to the position it occupies to-day. There are scores of men in the militia force of this country who were in it almost before some of the men were born who are full colonels to-day. I am not saying anything against these gentlemen, but they are placed senior to the militia men, and I want to know what they have done for it. I may as well take up the question of military schools in connection with these permanent corps, although it will come up under another item. I may say that I took the same lines when the Liberal-Conservative party were in power on this question that I am taking to-day. I had the privilege of pointing out to a Conservative Minister of Militia and Defence in those days what I am pointing out to the Liberal minister to-day. I contended that the schools of those permanent corps as an educational institution, do not perform the functions that the people expect of them.

How does a young fellow get into the schools to-day ? I will give you an instance of a young fellow from a clean honest farmer's home, who becomes an officer in one of our militia companies. He wishes to attend the schools. He makes his application, but not being able to attend at the time fixed, he names another day when he wishes to attend. For instance, one young officer applied to go on the 1st of January. He was notified that he must attend on the 1st of November, or some date in that neighbourhood. It was absolutely impossible for him to go then, and as a consequence his transport was sent back. Two days before the 1st of January, when he had heard nothing whatever about the possibility of such an arrangement, two days before that date he received notice that he could attend school on the 1st of January. But the young fellow had made other arrangements. He had been refused admission previously for the 1st of January, and had made other disposition of his time, and it was absolutely impossible for him to go then. Now supposing he had gone to the school, what would have been the routine procedure ? He would have had to purchase a little uniform. I am pleased to say that under the present minister and his predecessors there has been a little improvement—because after a few years of hammering away I did get our Conservative minister to relax a little on the red tape of the proceeding, but it took session after session of effort in this House and in the country to get the rule removed so that these boys from the country would not require to procure not only a full dress but a mess uniform before going to Toronto. We have got it down finally to something that is not very burdensome, but nevertheless they have got to buy a sword and a uniform, and they go down to Toronto, young fellows who know little or nothing about military work, and they are rushed into the ante room. There are certain little points of etiquette there that they have to follow. But these boys are not, many of them, in the habit of treating, or 'setting it up,' as it is termed. They are led innocently into violating this or that rule in connection with the routine of the ante room, and very frequently they are led into violating these rules by officers of the school, by officers of the permanent corps of this country, and then the punishment is 'setting it up' for the boys. I can give you instances of young fellows whose fathers are rather averse, as a rule, to their boys entering into the corps, because there is a dread on the part of parents to see their sons rushed into this sort of thing. A young fellow has to haul out three, or four, or five dollars, as the case may be, and pay for 'setting it up,' in other words, for his little mistake in the ante room.

Little things like that should be obliterated from every military school. I do not see that any advantage would be gained by a man going to the military schools of this country and living in the barracks. What is he going to learn by living in the barracks ? Our young men can go to the universities and medical colleges of the country and board wherever they choose throughout the city. Why should not a man in the military service be permitted to do the same thing ? The best men in the military service to-day were allowed to do this when they attended the old military schools. They were not obliged to go into the barracks and room with some fellow, possibly a decent fellow and possibly not. They were treated as self-reliant and responsible beings. To-day there is the old discipline of repression, the old spirit of dark ageism, and I shall discuss that point at more length on another occasion. The old spirit of repression is still in force. If we examine into the military systems of the nations of the world we find in them the remnants of dark age repression, of slavery, and of the discipline of the prison instead of the discipline of free men. Take our soldiers in the permanent corps to-day ; they are treated as children and not as men. I am glad to say the conditions are improving but improving slowly. I am sorry to say that the improvement is not making as fast progress as is the improvement in prison discipline. In the armies of France and Germany and the armies of other nations the discipline is being strengthened and an attempt is being made in this country at the present moment to fasten upon it the tyranny of a British

military system. I stand here to say that that will never succeed with a people living in a free country like Canada. Instead of the discipline being made more repressive, or continuing along repressive lines, it should be relaxed and men should be made freer. The discipline should be such as to promote freedom and individuality with the object of developing individuality rather than repressing it by enforcing the discipline of the slave and of the prison. I shall not take up the time of the House now, but on another occasion I purpose discussing this whole question of the training of officers and I shall then enter into the subject at greater length. Mark you, however, the present hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden) deserves credit for having wiped out some of these objectionable features from time to time as they have been brought before him, or as soon as he possibly could. I am free to say that he has done a good deal in that line, but I would point out to him that there are a great many more reforms to be made in the permanent corps if we want the militia of Canada to be what it should be. I maintain that the militia of this country must always be the backbone especially in modern times with long range rifles. I shall not take up the time of the House by pointing out that long before the present war occurred I stated in this House that standing armies had to vanish. They must vanish under modern long range rifle practise and the only safeguard of any nation is to have the whole body of the people trained to the use of arms and possessing sufficient discipline to manage themselves so that they could easily get their positions. In that way the whole fighting population of the country could attend to business in time of peace and in time of war shoulder their rifles and march to the front, and by their expert marksmanship and overwhelming power, they would make a short, sharp war something that would only be possible in a country that has a great militia force. I shall not say anything more on this item until I hear from some other hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) are certainly entitled to consideration always. What he says on military subjects is entitled to consideration, and, I think, in view of his remarks in condemnation of the permanent force, he is entitled to receive from me some answer, if an answer is possible. I am glad to be able to agree with the hon. gentleman in all the good things he says of the active militia of Canada. I believe we have, in Canada, elements from which can be made as efficient a fighting force as can be found in any country in the world. The arguments, or statements, which my hon. friend has used against the permanent force, if they mean anything, seem to me to mean that the permanent force should be immediately abolished. That is the only logical conclusion——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why not reform them ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The only logical conclusion to be drawn from my hon. friend's statements is that, as at present constituted and with the personnel which we find to-day in the permanent force, it is utterly useless, and of course, if useless, is really worse than useless if any strain were put upon the forces of this country in the way of demanding a defence. Now, I beg to differ entirely from my hon. friend. I cannot say that I am particularly in love with a standing army. I have said more than once that it is opposed, and I agree with my hon. friend that it is opposed, to the ideas and the wishes of the people of this country to have a standing army as such. But, we must have the nucleus of an army for the purpose of defence. We must have in certain permanent places garrisons, especially now when we are left entirely to depend upon ourselves. We must have teachers to instruct——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. To instruct the officers and non-commissioned officers of the militia force of this country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is just what we want.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Very well. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that we have, taking it all in all, a good average set of men as officers of our permanent force, that they have done their work fairly well and that they are doing their work fairly well to-day. I found, when I came into office, a certain condition of things existing in the militia, the result of development during some thirty years. I did not, after looking over the field, consider it to be my duty to wipe away all I found, although there were some things which I found which I did not approve of. I believed then, and I am more strongly convinced to-day than I was then, that the condition of things in the militia of Canada at the time I took office was fairly good, as good as could be expected in view of the money which had been voted from time to time and the attention which had been given to the militia. I have endeavoured, not to tear down or destroy, but improve, to build up and to add to the condition of things which I then found. Now, I most positively deny that the officers of the permanent force are men who are not entitled to the confidence of the people of this country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the hon. minister say that I said the officers were not entitled to the confidence of the people?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What I said was that they were not more entitled than scores, I would say hundreds, of the active militia men.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Quite so, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) must remember that I have been trying to point out that we must have a permanent force in this country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The minister will be good enough not to place words in my mouth that I have never uttered.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I fail to see the point of the hon. gentleman's argument. He stated that on the occasion of certain military evolutions at certain points, the permanent force officers were not capable of commanding a brigade even.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I say so.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is exactly what I thought the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I say so.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then, if we have in the permanent force of Canada officers so ignorant that they are not able to fulfil the ordinary duties of an officer—to come back to the point I started with—the argument of the hon. gentleman means that we should sweep the whole force away as it exists to-day. The hon. gentleman has made comparisons between the active militia and the permanent force, and he said the Militia Department had shown undue favours to the permanent force. To use his own words, he said: No man had any chance unless he belonged to the permanent force. My hon. friend knows, that of the officers that were sent to South Africa fully nineteen-twentieths of them belonged to the active militia. But perhaps my hon. friend will say that positions of command were given to permanent force officers. That is true. Positions of command were given to permanent force officers because it was thought necessary to place over the other officers and over the men sent to South Africa, men who had had experience, scientific and educated soldiers, men who had had the opportunity of being taught in the schools in England; men who had had the opportunity—in time of peace, it may be—but whether in time of peace or not, had had an opportunity of continuous command in this country, and therefore should be more familiar with the duties required of them. These were the men who were selected. I selected them on the recommendation of the general officer commanding. I have had no reason in any one case to regret the selection made. These officers went to South Africa and they did their duty with distinction to themselves and with credit to their country. Then as to the active militia does my hon. friend forget the record of the active militia officers who served in South Africa? Does he forget Colonel Turner, who won the Victoria Cross and the D.S.O.; does he forget Captain Cockburn of Toronto——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And Morrison of Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Does he forget Colonel Hurdman of this city, who was in a position of command? Does he forget all those men who distinguished themselves?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly not.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The argument of the hon. gentleman against the permanent force is not well founded. I think the House will agree with me, that we must continue our permanent force. While it is not perfect it is a fairly good force, and it is in the interest of the militia of this country that we should maintain it. As to the schools, the hon. gentleman has said that the principal object of the permanent force is education.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is no question about that. But the hon. gentleman has said that there are some difficulties found at the schools, and he objects to our insisting upon the officers from the active militia to be required to live in barracks.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The minister has misunderstood me. My chief objection to the officers living in barracks is this: That you can only pass a very few officers at very great expense. I am not specially objecting to men living in barracks, although I have yet to see the advantage of a man living in barracks over a man living outside.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There would be I suppose the same advantage as in the case of a student attending a university, who has the advantage of living within the walls of the college. He has an advantage over the student who lives outside. When a man lives in barracks there is a military atmosphere pervading——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Pretty thick sometimes.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. However that may be, there is the advantage of lectures, there is the advantage of constant association with military officers, there is the advantage of the

officers being attached for duty, as they are in many cases, so that they may learn their duties by actual experience. I agree with the hon. gentleman in the main, that it is desirable to give much wider opportunities to the officers of the active militia to acquire knowledge, and that we should when possible carry the schools to the officers at certain centres. That we have done.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, I know.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That was done by the former government and we have continued it so far as possible, but the staff of the permanent force is limited, and it is difficult to carry on the schools at the depots and at the same time detail the necessary officers to carry on the schools elsewhere. But it is being done at all events to the utmost extent possible. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) spoke with regard to treating. Whatever might have been the case as to treating in the past, I believe that to-day, at the depots, treating is discountenanced altogether and it is against the rules.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am glad to hear it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. An officer of the active militia who is attending the school is forbidden to treat, so that there ought be no objection on that score at the present time. When the hon. gentleman brings the question up on his motion, I shall be very glad to discuss the matter with him as fully as may be necessary.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman seems to be under a misapprehension as to what I have said. The minister told us that one of the advantages of a man living in residence was that he would be attached for duty. Can the minister or any one else point out one duty that a residental officer performs which under the old system was not performed by an officer boarding outside. I have had a military school experience and experience elsewhere, and I must say that the system of boarding outside the barracks was infinitely better both in a disciplinary sense and in the sense of being attached for duty. We had to get up in the morning and walk a mile or so and be in our places at 6 o'clock, and that in itself was good discipline. Then, every man had to be attached as a non-commission officer on guard duty, or canteen duty, or ration duty, or some other duty. There is no duty which an officer or non-commissioned officer performs in residence that he would not perform if he boarded outside. The minister certainly labours under a misapprehension when he supposes that I would sweep the whole force away. I would sweep it away as a standing army, but I would increase it as a teaching body. I would entirely do away with the red tape and the standing guard. Why should you require to have a man standing sentry at the gate of your barracks, night and day, as if he were guarding the gate of a prison? This is a free country. Our camping experience shows that those camps which have no guards are the orderly camps, while those which have guards at every tent door, hedging the men in, are the camps where there is disorder and where discipline fails. I do not believe in repressive discipline; I believe in educational. I purpose taking up this subject on another motion, when I will show that the training of officers is not being carried on at the present time in this country. We are not even keeping pace with the number of officers who are leaving the regiments. I venture the statement that there are fewer qualified officers in the force to-day, excepting those who have been qualified by their service in South Africa, than there were twelve months ago, and that there were fewer twelve months ago than there were twelve months before that. They are gradually falling off, and it is next to impossible to get an officer into the schools. But I intend to take this whole question up on another motion, and to enter into it at length.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Is the minister's report down yet?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I do not wish to stop the passage of these items; but I would not like to have the large items passed without seeing what the general and the officers say on the whole subject.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I expected to lay the report on the Table to-day. Would it do, as we have often done, to reserve one item for the general discussion?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That means that it may pass some night at 12 o'clock when there is nobody here.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. We will practically pass the items to-night, and we will agree not to discuss them over again unless the report contains something that makes it necessary to do so. I am sure we are most anxious to go on; but I do not think it would be proper to be placed in the position of having passed all these items without seeing the report.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is almost six o'clock, but I would like to occupy two or three minutes to say a word in favour of the permanent schools which my hon. friend has attacked, it seems to me, with rather undue severity. As a friend of the active militia, I take a second place to no one; but I believe that the permanent force also

is a most useful force. While it may be improved, and I believe it will be in the future, it is giving valuable service to this country. Last session the minister introduced a pension system which will have the effect of inducing better men to enter the permanent force, because their old age is provided for. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) spoke of the incompetence of those men in South Africa for active warfare. I think that if that war has demonstrated anything, it has demonstrated this, that war alone is the test of a soldier's efficiency. A man may be trained ever so well, and may yet show in the field of battle an incompetence for war. But among the officers who distinguished themselves in South Africa were Colonel Otter, Colonel Buchan, Colonel Lessard and Colonel Evans, every one of them permanent officers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And Colonel Durie.

Mr. THOMPSON. And Colonel Durie—I have not time to mention them all.

An hon. MEMBER. He is not a permanent officer.

Mr. THOMPSON. These men did good service in South Africa. The hon. member for Victoria did extremely good work there too—I have heard that from many men—and he is not a permanent officer. I wish to pay him that tribute. I have been told that there was no more efficient free lance in South Africa than Col. Hughes. My hon. friend left the impression on the mind of the House that these permanent schools were places where young men learned bad habits—where they spent a great deal of time in drinking. I have had three courses at Stanley Barracks in Toronto, and I can assure my hon. friend that we had no time for hard drinking, even if we had the inclination, which we had not; and the rule against treating in the ante-room was rigidly enforced. There may be occasionally a young man who, in the words of Kipling, sometimes 'goes wide a bit;' but that is not the fault of the place, but only the result of youth and foolishness.

At Six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Excise—salaries of officers and inspectors of excise, &c., to provide for increases depending upon the result of excise examination, $327,429,37.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). There is an increase of $5,530, composed as follows: Regular increases, $4,882.50; increases due to change in classification of division, $850; increases due to promotion and promotion examination, $1,405; total, $7,137.50; less decrease resulting in filling positions vacant by deaths, superannuation and resignation, $1,607.50, leaving a net increase of $5,530.

Mr. MONK. How does the minister grant the regular increases? Does the clerk get his increase on the recommendation of the chief?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The increase is regulated or fixed by Order in Council, five per cent on their minimum salary.

Mr. BELL. Has the statutory increase been granted to every member of the staff?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. MONK. There are no exceptions, granted to all?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No exceptions.

Mr. BOYD. Does that item include inspectors of coal oil?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have no special officer of that class. The ordinary officials are performing the duties of inspecting coal oil.

Mr. BOYD. I wished to know if the inspector of coal oil at Fort William comes under this head.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I may state to the hon. gentleman that we have no special inspector of coal oil. Our regular officers of the excise perform these duties.

Mr. BOYD. Who inspected the coal oil last summer coming into Fort William from the United States?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The collector of customs at Port Arthur.

Mr. BOYD. Has there been any complaint made to the department regarding that coal oil.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, we have had complaints.

Mr. BOYD. Who did you find was to blame in regard to it?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have had some complaints, and we are now investigating them.

Mr. BOYD. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that there is a matter that has caused widespread dissatisfaction throughout Manitoba and the North-west. During the last season there came into that country from the United States quantities of coal oil that was simply abominable. It was distributed throughout Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and in many cases it was found so unfit for use that it was thrown away, or destroyed. Now, I believe and the people of that country believe, that this government, and the department who has charge of it, are directly responsible for the admission

of that coal oil. We know that since this government took charge of the affairs of this country they have made alterations in the coal oil inspection, they have made regulations in regard to importation of coal oil by permitting it to come into this country in tank vessels, and by certain other changes they have put the whole of the coal oil business into the hands of the American or Standard Oil Company. That is pretty well established throughout Canada at the present time. The coal oil that I speak of is brought in by that company, and as I say, was distributed throughout the west. Certain complaints were made, in fact the whole press of that country was ringing with complaints about that oil, I may say from Calgary to the Red river. At first the Liberal press claimed that the government were in no way responsible for it, and the manager of the Standard Oil Company explained it in a way, saying that they had brought it in in large quantities, had stored it in large tanks, and that by reason of storing it in these large tanks and drawing it from the top or the bottom, I forget which, a certain sediment had formed in it, and in consequence the oil turned out to be bad. But he claimed they were not to blame, that they were looking into it, and were going to ascertain what bad oil was in the country and have it returned. But as I say, the Liberal press of the country claimed the department was in no way responsible. Afterwards, however, I understand that the department began to recognize their responsibility, and directed their officers to inquire into it and ascertain if an inferior oil was being sold. They were to examine the oil that was being offered for sale after giving the company, as we believe, ample time to remove the inferior oil from the hands of the merchants. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious state of affairs, and I expect that the minister is prepared to give us a full explanation.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I may state to the hon. member that there are two ways by which that oil is inspected. When it is Canadian oil it is inspected at the refinery ; when it is imported it is inspected by the customs officer. We had some complaints made during the fall. We ordered an analysis made of oil from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and after such analysis it was found that this oil was in conformity with the law as it stands now, and as it has stood for the last eight or ten years. Afterwards we had another complaint, and we ordered a collection of samples to be made in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and that oil is now being analysed by Mr. Kenrick, of Winnipeg, and we are waiting for the result of his analysis.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The minister states that samples that were examined were found to be all right according to the law of the past ten years.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Has the law been changed in any respect during the last ten years ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, not with regard to the gravity or flash of the oil.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I think the minister is mistaken. Has there not been some omission with regard to testing as to quality?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. BOYD. Did the minister take any samples from the tanks at Fort William in consequence of this complaint ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. BOYD. Was it not known to the department that the company had taken samples of this oil, and had taken it to their headquarters at Chicago in order to ascertain if it was of inferior quality ? Is the government aware of that ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The department is not aware of that.

Mr. MONK. Who is specially charged in Montreal with the inspection of oil ? I do not know if the minister is aware that there have been a great many complaints in all the counties surrounding Montreal in respect to the quality of the oil imported. Have these complaints reached the department ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. None from the district of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. Was there an inspector appointed specially for the inspection of oils in the district of Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. MONK. Is there no inspection then of oils coming into Montreal ? There is a large consumption there.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is inspected by the customs officer, as I have already stated. We have no special officer for that purpose. Some of the officers of my department perform that duty when required.

Mr. MONK. Have there been any analyses of these oils arriving in Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Not since I have been in the department.

Mr. BOYD. I understood the minister to say that there had been no changes made. I find the old Act reads this way :

The quantity and quality of imported naphtha or petroleum in each package should be ascertained by weighing and measuring, by the inspector.

The new Act says :

The quantity of petroleum or naphtha should be ascertained by weighing or measuring.

Nothing about quality.

Mr. MONK. I understand from the minister that the inspection by the customs officer does not cover the quality of the oil. Is there any report made to the government as to the quality of the oil imported into Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. BOYD. I do not think the minister has explained this matter satisfactorily to the committee. If that oil was properly inspected, as it should have been, it would have been impossible for such a large quantity to be sent broadcast over the country to be sold. It was one of the leading planks in the Liberal party, when they were asking to be returned to power that the people were charged too much for their coal oil. I remember that the present leader of the government shed tears—an hon. friend suggests that they were crocodile tears, but that is a matter of course—when he condoled with the women of Selkirk over the enormous price they had to pay for coal oil, a necessary of life, in the long winter evenings, when better coal oil could be bought on the other side of the boundary for very much less money. We find the coal oil is the same price in Manitoba and the North-west Territories to-day as it was then. But, owing to the changes that have been made, the coal oil is not so good. There was an inspection in those days for quality as well as quantity. The government is certainly responsible for the change, and the mere fact that the coal oil comes in in small packages, or large packages, in vessels or in tank cars, does not exonerate the government in the least. And, if it is for the payment of these officers and the continuation of this system that the government are asking for this money, it is well that the public should understand it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. My department has only to comply with the law which requires that oil should be tested for its flash and gravity. As I have stated, the inspection of oil coming from the United States is made by the customs officers, while the test of the Canadian oil is made at the place where it is refined. We did not refuse to act upon the complaints that were received. As I have stated, we analyzed samples and found that they complied with the law, with regard to flash and gravity. But, the complaints having been repeated, we ordered a collection of new samples and these are now undergoing chemical analysis. If the law is defective, the government or the department may be held responsible for the necessary changes. But I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that it would be better to await the result of the analysis before changing the law. Except for the changes that the hon. gentleman has stated, the terms are the same. The department will always be ready to hear complaints and to remedy any evils that are found to exist. As to the payment of the officers, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) is going a little too far. I have already stated that we have no special officer to inspect coal oil. That work is done by the regular excise officers. But these officers are the same men who occupied the positions before the advent to power of the present government. I do not think the criticism is fair to these gentlemen. I have been associated with them for two years, and, with a few exceptions, they have fulfilled their duties faithfully.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand that the same inspection of coal oil coming into this country in small barrels is practiced as was formerly practiced ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, there has been no change. What the officers used to do in the past they are doing now.

Mr. BLAIN. In the past, when coal oil was brought in in small barrels, a stamp was put on the end of the barrel, so that the retailer selling the oil had an opportunity to understand the test that had been made. How is that arranged now ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I understand that the law requiring a mark on the package was done away with in order that the oil might be shipped in in tank cars. The amendment was made in 1898 or 1899.

Mr. MONK. We are asked to vote this large sum of $490,000; and I see on the next page of the estimates a vote of $122,000 for the inspection of weights, measures, gas and electric light. I understand that the immense quantity of coal oil that comes into Montreal now, for which we pay a higher price than we did before the present government came into power, and as to which there has been complaints, is left absolutely without inspection as to quality.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If I repeat myself, it is only that I may be well understood. There is no special inspection of such oil by the excise officers of the Inland Revenue Department. That inspection is made by the customs officers.

Mr. MONK. As to quantity, not as to quality, I understand.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. As to the test required by law.

Mr. OLIVER. For the information of the minister, I wish to speak on behalf of the

section of the country I represent, but I understand that the case is common over the whole country. During the past winter, consumers of coal oil have been practically robbed by having sold to them an oil of quite inferior quality. This is a condition of affairs that has not hitherto prevailed. I do not know, and it is not material as I understand the present discussion, whether the law provides for such a case or not. The point I want to make is that the condition exists and that it is absolutely necessary to provide fully for that condition at this session of parliament, so that, if an effort should be made to again impose upon the public, effectual means will have been provided against that imposition.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not pretend to say that the experience of the past year or two will not make necessary changes in the law. But my hon. friend must await, as I do, the result of the analysis that is now going on, and which, I claim, will be completed in time to enable us to change the law if it is found necessary. We have done what we thought was our duty to do, and the government cannot be held responsible for the importation of that oil. All we have to do is to comply with the law as it is. If it is proven that the law is insufficient, then it will be the duty of the government to change it in order to remedy these evils.

Mr. BLAIN. What qualifications has the officer at Fort William to inspect oil ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He is not an officer of my department, but a customs officer. I cannot vouch for his qualifications. I do not know the gentleman who has charge of that duty.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I take a position to some extent opposed to the minister when he says that we must await the result of the analysis before we change the law ? I say the analysis which the consumers of coal oil have been compelled to make during the last six months is sufficient evidence that action is required. If the law as it is now does not cover the case, then it should—I will go so far as to say that it must—be made to cover that case for the future, irrespective of any chemical analysis. The analysis may be necessary to decide just exactly the terms in which the law should provide for the future, but it is clear either that the law has not been maintained or that it does not properly provide for the protection of the public.

Mr. MONK. I would like to know what this law is. For it seems to me that under this government the Standard Oil Company has been allowed to import oil in tank steamers, and we have been deprived of the certificate which was on the package which formerly was necessary. Under the law, the Department of Inland Revenue has power of inspection. There is nothing in the law to prevent the Department of Inland Revenue from inspecting coal oil coming in without any mark as to quality. And surely it is impossible, I do not say for the minister, but for the officers of the department, to ignore the fact that there have been complaints. Complaints are rife throughout the country—I know they exist in my own section—as to the great deterioration of the quality of the oil imported for three or four years past. This is all the more remarkable as there has been an increase in the prices.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When the law was changed in 1899 it was at the request of the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories who wanted to have the price of oil reduced. In order to reach that end the law was changed and it was made permissible to carry coal oil in large tanks to be distributed at a cheaper rate. But, in regard to the inspection of oil, there was no change and the only way to deal with the matter that I see at the present moment is that when the analysis is made, if anything is wrong, or if any other oil or mixture enters into the oil which is imported or sold, then, we might change the law, or enact a law, in order to have a closer inspection. But, just now, we cannot exceed the power we have as to the test of the oil, and in that respect I understand that the law was not changed.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman accounted for some of the increases that appear here by stating that there were some changes made in the inspectoral divisions. Will the hon. gentleman state where these changes were made and what is the effect of them ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) knows that we have six classes of Inland Revenue divisions. When the business of a division which belongs to, say, class 4, is such as to entitle that division to be changed from the 4th to the 3rd, or 2nd class, the salaries of the officers of the division are thereby increased according to a certain schedule of salaries of collectors, deputy collectors, excise men and clerks.

Mr. CLANCY. Were not some changes made in the Windsor division within the last few months ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. No changes ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Not in regard to a change in the classification of that division.

Mr. CLANCY. I mean in the personnel.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There were changes in the personnel of the staff.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman state what the changes were ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Perhaps my hon. friend will give me another opportunity. There are changes contemplated and suggested, but I am not open now to say what these are because they require the signature of His Excellency. In a week, perhaps sooner, I will be in a position to state to the hon. gentleman what these changes are.

Mr. CLANCY. Have there been any changes yet made in the personnel of the staff ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. None, except the superannuation of Mr. Gow.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state the reason for superannuating Mr. Gow ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He is 70 years of age and he, himself, asked for his superannuation.

Mr. CLANCY. His age is his crime, I suppose?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We were very anxious to retain his services, but, he himself pressed us to grant him superannuation.

Mr. CLANCY. I fancy that there are not many men pressing for superannuation. I fancy that when we look over the records, and if the newspapers are to be credited, we will find that hon. gentlemen are dropping heads into the basket either by superannuation or dismissal. I suppose Mr. Gow did not want to go to the guillotine and he asked, rather than suffer a worse fate, to be superannuated ? Was that the case with this gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that he had better rely on what I say and not on the newspapers. I am perfectly sure of what I say. He asked for his superannuation and we granted his request. He pressed us because he was sick as the hon. gentleman must know and he could no longer fulfil the duties of his office.

Mr. CLANCY. Was there any marked increase in the business of that division ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No marked increase for a year or two past, except perhaps that caused by the establishment of one or two tobacco manufactories.

Mr. BOYD. I would like to know a little more in regard to this question of coal oil. I find on looking over the coal oil inspection matter that the date referred to by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) regarding the complaints was between the 20th and 30th of November. It seems that it took from that time until about the 24th of January before the cry which was broadcast, as has been stated by the hon. member and myself, throughout the country, could reach the ears of the department here. The papers, as I have already remarked, were full of it, and now, on the 15th March, the minister comes to this House and asks us to defer judgment until such time as the department is able to ascertain something further in regard to the complaints that have been made. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, about this at all. It is a scandal and there is no use in the government trying to get away from their responsibility by asking us to defer judgment, because they have had since the 24th of November last to find out about the quality of this coal oil. I would like to know the name of the man who inspected that oil and who permitted oil of that kind to come into the country. The Standard Oil Company have said that it was owing to the large tanks they stored it in, but we have learned that the same class of oil has been sold by that company to the people of North Dakota on the boundary line adjoining Manitoba, showing, beyond doubt, that the same class of oil was being supplied by that company to the purchasers of oil in the adjoining districts. I think the least the hon. gentleman could do is to let the items stand until such time as he is able to give us more information than he has yet given us regarding this matter.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not think I can give more information to the hon. gentleman than I can give tonight. I have already stated that I was not aware of the complaints in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The first intimation we had in the department that there were complaints was about six weeks ago. A sample of the oil was sent down to the department and was analyzed and in order to give satisfaction to the people who had complained we ordered our inspector at Winnipeg, Mr. Barrett, to make a collection of samples of the oil throughout Manitoba and the North-west Territories, the said samples of oil to be analyzed by Mr. Kenrick, and we are now waiting for the result of this analysis.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Is this analysis in regard to quality of the oil ? The law does not call for a test of quality. Is it not so that the present law does not demand an analysis so far as quality is concerned ? I think the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has read the old law and the new law, and as he read it, in the new law there is no tests of quality.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There was no test for quality in any law beyond a test for flash and gravity.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. member for Macdonald read the old law as he

thought it appeared and it certainly called for a test of lighting quality. The hon. minister states that this law was changed at the instigation of the people of Manitoba in order that they should secure cheaper coal oil. They certainly did not get what they asked for. They are paying just as much for their oil to-day as they were before the change. I think the hon. minister is wrong in stating that there has been no change in the law so far as the test as to quality is concerned. It is because of the change that inferior oil is coming into this country. The Standard Oil Company have admitted that the quality was inferior although they say it was limited to one or two tanks that were admitted at the port of Emerson. The oil has been of the most inferior character and a great outcry has been raised through the west irrespective of politics. I may say that if the people asked for a change in the law for the sake of getting good oil at a reasonable price, they have failed in their purpose because they have got inferior oil.

Mr. PUTTEE. May I ask the hon. minister if it is possible that oil may pass the inspection for flash and gravity and still be ferior for illuminating purposes ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It may be.

Mr. PUTTEE. So that the law in no way protects us as to the burning quality of the oil ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is the same as in the past.

Mr. OLIVER. It seems a remarkable thing that when oil exists for the purpose of giving illumination the question of the illuminating quality of the oil is not provided for in any test that is made. We do not care so much about the flash test, or the gravity of the oil ; what we want to know is whether it will give light when it burns. As a matter of fact, a large part of the oil that was supplied in Manitoba and the North-west Territories during the past winter would not give light and some of it would not even burn.

I actually have seen my lamp go out. It does not make any difference to us what the flash test is, or what the gravity is so long as the illuminating power of the oil is not there. I am astonished to hear the Minister of Inland Revenue say that this condition of affairs did not come to the knowledge of his department until six weeks ago. If that is the fact it is high time that the Inland Revenue staff in Manitoba and the North-west should be changed from beginning to end; from top to bottom. We want men in the employ of the Inland Revenue Department and in the other departments of the government as well, who are aware of the facts that are transpiring around them and who understand what their responsibility is to the public, as well as to the department itself. If they think that their only business is to draw their salaries I would like them wakened up from that idea. The grounds on which we vote their salaries here at any rate is, that their business is to look after the protection of the public and if they have not informed the head of the department of this condition of affairs which has been a matter of universal comment throughout Manitoba and the North-west Territories for the last five months, it seems to me they should be called sharply to account.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. BOYD. Not yet. It seems that the department has no information on this matter and so we will try to supply them with some. They do not seem to know anything about it, so it is just as well to tell the minister all we know about it. I wish to ascertain if it is true, that the Standard Oil Company, now that they are permitted to import oil in tank vessels and otherwise control the oil business of this country ; is it true that they are selling their best refined oil to-day in foreign countries where they have to meet competition, and that they are passing off on the people of the North-west a quality of illuminating oil that some years ago they sold as fuel oil. That is what they are doing. They are sending their best oil to Europe to compete with the Russian oil, but as they completely control the markets of Manitoba and the North-west they are selling us their worst quality of oil, and they are allowed to do this under the inspection of the government, and with the approval of the government officers. We have shown here to-night that the people of the west have been imposed on and have been robbed in this connection.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is under the impression evidently, that there has been a change in the regulations concerning the quality of oil. The officers of the department state that there has been no such change, and certainly I am not aware of such a change. It has not been the policy of any government, as I understand it, to determine the quality of the oil in the sense in which the word has been used here. The safeguards are against oil of a dangerous character being used. That has been the main purpose of the checks surrounding the sale of petroleum.

Mr. BOYD. I do not think the Minister of Finance would say that if he had the old Act at hand, and read the clause——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the Act, but my hon. friend has, and if he will read it he will find it is quite consistent with what I say. I am informed that the only place where the word quality is used is with reference to the

marks on the barrels; that the quality and quantity shall correspond with the marks on the barrel and the marks on the barrel allude to the quantity, the specific gravity and the flash test. The essence of the whole question is, whether there has been a change in the law respecting the quality of the oil, and the officers who are well informed on the subject say there has been no change whatever, and that it was not the policy of any previous administration to determine the illuminating power of the oil. There are thousands of things sold in Canada which are not up to the standard, nor always up to sample even, but they are not in all cases inspected by the government. If a man buys an inferior article and pays a high price for it he is wronged, but that is not the fault of the government. It may be that there should be some wider law on the subject; it may be that the illuminating power should be guaranteed; it may be that the quality of flour and fish and various things which are inspected only in a limited way, should be guaranteed; but whether or not that be the case, the point is that there has been no change in the law with respect to the quality of the oil.

Mr. MONK. How is it then, that bulletins are frequently issued by the Department of Inland Revenue giving the results of the examinations of such articles as pickles, butter, cheese, mustard, &c. It is possible that under the present law the power does not exist in the department to cause an inspection to be made of this illuminating oil. I understood from the Minister of Inland Revenue that that inspection had not been made once in the district of Montreal, and I understand further that he maintains that it cannot be made under the law as it at present exists. Is there a law governing the inspection of the articles which I have mentioned, but which restricts the department from inspecting coal oil?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The articles mentioned by the hon. gentleman are articles of food, and there is a law with respect to the adulteration of food.

Mr. OSLER. Let me read this clause from the old Act, and I think that you will find that it contradicts what the Minister of Finance has said:

> The quantity and quality of imported petroleum so imported in each package shall be ascertained by weighing and testing by the inspector.

That does not mean that the inspection is merely to ascertain what marks are on the package, but it says that the oil itself is to be inspected as to its quality.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that the word 'quality' there as read in connection with another section has reference to the marks on the barrel.

Mr. OSLER. That surely cannot be the meaning of the clause.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend has the Act there and I have not. I am assured by the officers who are supposed to know all about it, that there has been no change whatever in the Act with regard to the inspection as to the quality of the oil. It has not been the practice to do more than to ascertain that the oil was of the gravity and flash test required. Whether or not there should be the power to further inspect as to quality is a fair question for discussion.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the Minister of Finance to say that at no time has there been a test made to determine the illuminating power of the oil?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has not been the practice of the department to guarantee the illuminating power of the oil, and there has been no change in the law in that respect in recent years.

Mr. BLAIN. Prior to the introduction of the new law, tests were made and these tests were stamped at the end of the barrel. Could the minister tell the House what these stamps indicated?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The usual marks for quantity and the test for specific gravity and safety are on the barrel, but there is no mark certifying to the illuminating power.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). In the investigation which is now going on by the department, are you testing the illuminating power of the oil?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. In view of the statements made by the members from the North-west Territories and Manitoba, will the minister make a regulation or have the Act so amended as to prevent people from selling an adulterated article.

Mr. SCOTT. The remarks of the last speaker (Mr. Taylor), strike the nail on the head. It seems to be somewhat an academic question whether any change has been made in the regulations, or whether it is possible under the present law to remedy the defect. If it is not possible to apply the present law for the protecetion of the people in this matter, would it not be possible for this House to confer upon the government, power to apply a remedy? With regard to many articles of merchandise, which are not subject to inspection, the public are protected by competition; but there is not competition in coal oil in the North-west. A monopoly has control of the whole market, and if the government cannot afford protection to the people against the poor article which without any shadow of doubt has

been fraudulently sold to them during the past few months, then they are without any protection whatever.

Mr. BLAIN. It seems to be very difficult for the members to understand the change which has been made in the law. Will the hon. minister be good enough to read to the House the old law and the new clause, so that the House will understand the change that has been made ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will have the law in a few minutes ; but in the meantime, in answer to my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), I may say that the moment the department heard that there were complaints, we instructed our officer in Manitoba to collect samples in order to ascertain the quality of the oil, and I think it is only just and fair to await the result of that investigation, when the law, if necessary, will be amended.

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume my hon. friend will have the result of that investigation before the House rises—in time to amend the law.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, within a couple of weeks.

Mr. BOYD. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that it was about three months after the complaints commenced that we are told the department took action. The manager of the Standard Oil Company stated in an interview with the press that instructions had been given by their company to withdraw all the inferior oil. Now, the government proposes to take samples of the oil offered for sale after giving the company, as it would seem, plenty of time to withdraw all the inferior oil from the market. I asked the minister to-night if samples were taken from the tanks, and he answered me no. That shows the untenable position the government occupy in this matter.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I would like to ask the minister how long it is since the investigation began, who conducted it, and how soon it is expected to be ended and the report handed in ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have already stated that about six weeks ago we received some complaints. Immediately we ordered that a sample of the oil be sent to the department. A sample was sent. We heard something further about the matter, and we immediately instructed our officer in Winnipeg, Mr. Barrett, to collect samples, and have an analysis made by Mr. Kenrick. Under these circumstances, I think it would not be fair to the officers of the department to act as if they had not done their duty. I regret that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) says that these officers should be dismissed. What would be the use of dismissing them and replacing them with men of less experience, who would be in the same position, that is, prevented from doing what my hon. friend asks us to do, bearing in mind that the law does not permit us to go any further at present.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The minister states that it is only right that we should await the report of this investigation before we have any amendment made to the Act. I do not think that is necessary at all. That is equivalent to saying that he does not know whether there has been spurious oil sent into the country or not. Surely it is not a spurious agitation which has taken place all over the North-west. The Standard Oil Company themselves admit that they have sent in inferior oil. What better proof do you want than that ? They say only a limited quantity was sent in ; but I think they underestimate the quantity. The oil sent in during the last few months has been spurious without any doubt, and I think it is not necessary to await the report of this investigation before amending the Act. The Act should be amended right away, without waiting for the report of Mr. Barrett or any one else, because it has been stated here by members on both sides of the House that the oil is inferior in illuminating power.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think my hon. friend has misunderstood me. I have positively stated that we expect the report of the analysis within two weeks, and then we shall be ready to take action. I think the House will be still sitting at that time, and we shall have ample time to change the law, if it is found necessary. With regard to these complaints in the North-west, there was no complaint made except at the time I have already stated. It may be that the hon. gentlemen who represent Manitoba and the Territories may have heard more than I heard myself ; but that is no fault of the department, and we acted as soon as any complaint reached us, which was about six weeks ago.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the minister if the Act, Chapter 102 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1886, 'an Act for the Inspection of Petroleum,' has been changed?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, it has been.

Mr. MONK. If it has been changed, it can only have been changed in such a manner as to extend the powers of inspection of the department. I have not read the Act over with attention, but I have no doubt that the fire test has not been changed.

The expression fire test or burning means the ignition and continuous burning of any fluid hereinafter referred to, on the application of a light or spark under regulations established by this Act.

That has not been changed, and with such a statutory condition as that, there is no

doubt that the department itself possesses power to make regulations for the naming of an inspector to remedy the evil mentioned by the hon. members from the North-west. If that is the case, then the department is at fault, and the suggestion made by one of the hon. minister's own friends, that the whole staff ought to be dismissed, including the head—because he said from top to bottom—should be carried out.

Mr. SCOTT. It seems from the statements made by the minister so far that action on the part of the government depends on the report that may be made by the officers after their investigation of certain samples which they have collected. If it should turn out, however, as the hon. member from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) suggested, that the officers procured samples of good oil, then we have to take it that the department will feel justified in not taking any action at all. It seems to me that the evidence given by several members on the floor of the House to-night should be sufficient for the department. I can give the hon. minister my own word, from painful personal experience, as to the very bad character of some of the coal oil that was sold in the North-west during the last few months. I have attempted to read newspapers by lamp light produced by some of this oil, and it was almost totally impossible to do so. I believe the stuff would freeze readily at zero, and I believe that more profanity has been caused in western Canada by this bad oil during the last few months than was caused even by the grain blockade we were talking about on Monday. I know that nothing less will satisfy the people of that country than a definite statement by the government that they intend to protect the public in this matter. As I have said, the coal oil trade there is in the hands of a monopoly; there is no competition to protect the people, and the conditions during the past season have shown the necessity for the inspection going farther than it has gone, so that the purchaser may know that the article he buys will give the expected light.

Mr. BARKER. I think that if the minister had complied with the request made to him to read the clause, as to the inspection under the old Act, and the new clause we might have been saved some time and discussion. Is the minister prepared to do that now? If the two Acts are as stated in the paper that has been read from on this side, then, it is quite clear that the old Act was sufficient for the purpose. When you are testing illuminating oil, I presume the first thing is to test its illuminating qualities.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is another paragraph in the clause.

Mr. BARKER. That is the reason that I am asking that the old section shall be read as well as the new one. If the old section is as quoted on this side, it seems sufficient, and the new clause is not sufficient for the purpose.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That there may be no misapprehension in the mind of any hon. member, I will read the whole of section 7:

> The quantity and quality of imported petroleum or naphtha in each package shall be ascertained by weighing and testing by the inspector, and the allowance of the tare of the package shall be in accordance with the departmental regulation in that behalf.

And section 14 provides:

> Every refiner, manufacturer or importer of petroleum or naphtha, and every person who deals in or keeps or offers any petroleum or naphtha for sale shall be responsible as to its quality and as to the quantity contained in each package that the same shall not be inferior to the quality nor less than the quantity designated by the marks and descriptions then on the packages in which it is contained. All of which marks and descriptions the person in whose possession it is shall maintain in a perfectly legible state.

The last part was amended.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. minister read the last part in section 7 after the word 'inspector'?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will read it all:

> The quantity and quality of imported petroleum or naphtha in each package shall be ascertained by weighing and testing by the inspector, and the allowance for the tare of the package shall be in accordance with the departmental regulations in that behalf.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the departmental regulations in that behalf?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is the regulation which was in force before the law was amended.

Mr. BARKER. Can the hon. minister tell us what they were?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It was that it should be inspected by weighing and testing by the instruments that were described in the regulation.

Mr. BARKER. It seems to me that the request made by some hon. gentleman from the North-west that this matter should be allowed to stand until we have an opportunity to look further into the question is a reasonable one. In view of the difficulty we have had in ascertaining what the law is, I think we ought to be granted that grace.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not see how allowing the item to stand can affect the general question which has been raised as to the desirability of a better inspection law. That is a fair question for discussion, but I do not see how it can be affected by this item or how a good purpose can be saved by having the item stand.

Mr. BARKER. The question is not so much what the law is, as it is whether the department has been at fault in not making a proper inspection in that, in inspecting illuminating oil, the one point they did not inspect was its illuminating quality. Before this money is voted for the department, we want to see whether the department is at fault or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. minister has made a very positive statement—and I believe that there is no dispute about the fact—that there has never been an inspection of that particular character. The question is somewhat technical, and I do not offer any opinion of my own upon it. But I am informed by those who ought to know that the marks upon the package showing the gravity and the flash test are enough to enable those who understand these matters to work out the illuminating power. But, if the illuminating power does not result, there is some defect somewhere.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister seems to think that because a thing was never done before complaint was made, that is a reason why it should not be done after complaint has been made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at all.

Mr. BARKER. That is the result of the hon. gentleman's argument. I do not understand that, in times past, the people of the North-west have had oil which would not burn or would not give light. A few months ago they got that kind of oil and complaints were made. And, those complaints having been made, the department should have ascertained the grounds for them.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think it would be of no use to have the item stand. For, if it takes two weeks before we can ascertain what kind of oil is used in the North-west, the House will have no opportunity of discussing this question any more. I have already stated that, since the law was first enacted that law was found workable. About six weeks ago we heard complaints. Were we derelict in our duty? No, we acted as soon as we heard those complaints. They may have reached members of this House from the North-west before they reached us. I do not say those hon. gentlemen were derelict in their duty, but I do say that if we had been sooner informed of their complaints we could have taken action sooner. But, the moment we were informed that complaints were made in the North-west, we took action and had samples sent here to be tested, and I immediately ordered that samples should be collected for analysis. How can we change the law if we do not know in what sense it should be changed? It is very well for these gentlemen to say—and I do not say that their information is inaccurate—that the oil sold is of inferior quality, but we want to have the evidence by way of a more strict inspection. I have already said, and I repeat, that, as soon as we see that a change in that law is necessary in order to protect the people in Manitoba and the North-west, with the assistance of the hon. gentlemen from the North-west, we will make the law to meet the case and give satisfaction to the people. I cannot say more. I have no objection to the discussion of the item. But I regret that, not being master of the English language, I do not seem to make myself well understood. If I cannot convince my hon. friends by using their language, perhaps I shall be obliged to use my native French.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister assured us that if he ascertained that it is necessary, he will have the law amended. But I think he went just a little too far when he said that the law would be so amended as to give the people satisfaction. That I do not think he can do, because our friends from the North-west say just what we on this side said in 1897. I spoke pretty strongly on that myself. When the government came down with a Bill to amend the law as it then stood permitting the Standard Oil Company to come into this country with their tank vessels and tank ships, we opposed it; and when a gentleman from that side of the House who was interested in the Canadian oil industry—I refer to the late Judge Lister—got up and threatened to oppose the government if they went on with the legislation, it was dropped. I said then that the Standard Oil Company were just getting what they had paid for, because they had made a large contribution to the election fund in 1896.

Mr. CALVERT. You ought to know.

Mr. TAYLOR. To my hon. friends opposite, who promised the legislation. However, the government withdrew the measure that year. By the next year the late Judge Lister had been removed to the bench, he was not in the House to make any opposition, and then the government came down and carried out the bargain they had made with the Standard Oil Company previous to the election. They introduced and put through that Bill that we said would give the monopoly that our friends in the North-west say now they have got. They got just what the government had bargained for. We told them when they changed that law and let the Standard Oil Company into this country, that it would drive out the Canadian industry, and that they would get control of our market. They have got it, and they are getting now just what they bargained for when this government sold the country to the Standard Oil Company.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the minister to say that under the old system of in-

spection and stamping on the end of the barrel, one of those stamps indicated the quantity of oil in the barrel ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Under the old system, then, all the coal oil that was brought in from the United States to Canada came in small barrels holding about 40 gallons. On the end of each barrel were these stamps, one stamp indicating the quantity of oil contained in the barrel. As I understand now, since the change has been made, most of the oil coming in from the United States comes in large tanks. For illustration, it comes into the city of Toronto in large tanks. There are many towns within a radius of 50 miles of Toronto where there is no distributing tanks going through the town. When these towns get their oil which is sent from Toronto by the Standard Oil Company in small barrels, the same kind of barrels as was used before the change in the law, will the minister be good enough to tell us what system of inspection they now have, so that the retail merchants may know the quantity of oil contained in the barrel that he now gets under the new regulations ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On one point the hon. gentleman is mistaken, in saying that prior to that change in the law all oil was brought in in barrels. The oil was brought in under the old system in tank cars as well as in barrels, but not in tank steamers. There were other minor matters, but the material change in the law was to the effect that if you could bring in oil in tank cars in the western part of the Dominion, you might be allowed to bring it in in tank ships in the eastern part of the Dominion.

Mr. BLAIN. The effect was that every gallon of oil used in the western part of the province of Ontario was brought in in small barrels.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it was brought in in tank cars, largely.

Mr. BLAIN. Brought in in tank cars prior to the change of the law in 1899 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was brought in in tank cars in large quantities, and was only put in barrels after it was imported into the country.

Mr. BLAIN. There was an inspection, then, and the inspection was stamped upon the end of the barrel, and now there is no inspection. That is the change, is it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is an inspection, but it is not stamped.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is it not stamped ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not an expert in coal oil, but I have just read the statute, and here is the conclusion to which I have come with respect to the requirements of the statute. Under the old system all coal oil was brought into the country either in small packages, in barrels, or it was brought in in tank cars. The oil brought in in tank cars, before it could be sold, had to be barrelled. When barrelled it was inspected, and the result of the inspection with respect to the flash test and the gravity was stamped on the end of the barrel. Under the new law which is in force since 1899, oil may be imported in tank cars, or in barrels, and in tank ships. The difference between the old law and the present law is that, instead of insisting upon the oil being barrelled before it is offered for sale, it is now permissible to sell the oil by the gallon from the tank car, or from the tank ship, or from the barrel. The inspection is made, but the result of the inspection is not stamped on the barrel. That is the difference, as I understand it, reading the two statutes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not familiar with the statute, but it seems to me a rather singular provision that there should be an inspection of the oil in barrels, and that the result should not be stamped upon the barrel.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The inspection would be made before the oil is put in the barrel.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But here you have a barrel containing a certain measureable article that has undergone inspection. I am not at all suggesting that the Minister of Justice was wrong about it, but merely suggesting that it seems to me a remarkable provision that there should be an inspection, and that the public should not be made aware, by some mark upon the package containing the article, that there has been an inspection and what the results are. I do not know when such a measure passed the House, but I am bound to say I do not think it is a very wise provision of this legislature or of any other legislature, to have an inspection without announcing the result upon the package.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The inspection we have now is absolutely the same inspection as that which was in force previous to 1899—the one inspection, both as to flash test and gravity.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a difference in this respect, that formerly the result was on the package and now it is not.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, we have to assume that to be the case, that there is no information conveyed to the public in respect to the result of the inspection. Of course the inspection has taken place in order to ensure the safety of the public. The inspection by the customs official is ample for the purpose.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). It is very distressing to hear the complaints from the North-west regarding coal oil, and I am sure we are all extremely sorry that they are in the dark up there. I would suggest that the western members move down to Ontario where we have good coal oil. I happen to be a dealer in coal oil, among other things, and can vouch for the quality of the oil that is delivered in Ontario. We used to buy it altogether for retail use in barrels, now it is delivered in tanks, and we have to take the word of the wholesale dealer who sells it to us. His wagon comes around to our shops, and he fills up our tank, and we suppose it to be of the proper gravity, and flash, and everything of proper quality. We have no complaints regarding it. Our people are well satisfied with regard to the quality of the coal oil ; and I think in that respect, at any rate, the matter is quite satisfactory to the people of Ontario. I can well understand though that if a dealer chose to be dishonest, if he took coal oil from the tank and put it in the barrel without having it properly marked by an inspector, there might be an invasion of the law there. I rose to say that the present mode of delivery of coal oil in Ontario is quite satisfactory to the dealers and to the public.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that now the system is that tank wagons come around and deliver the coal oil ?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Yes, they come around our way.

Mr. BLAIN The hon. member lives at Port Perry ; does the tank call at his town?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. And at other towns in the riding of South Ontario ?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. All the other towns ?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I do not know that.

Mr. BLAIN. All I have to say is that the town in which I live is very much larger in population than Port Perry It is marvellous how much these hon. gentlemen know about population, and how little about coal oil. Although the town of Brampton where I live has a very much larger population than Port Perry, every gallon of oil sold in that town comes in in barrels the same as it did for the last 20 years.

Mr. HOLMES. You are behind the age.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) knows as much about coal oil as he does about binder twine. I had occasion to hear his observations on binder twine a few weeks ago and I think it would enlighten the House very much if he would repeat his discourse upon that very important subject before the hon. members of this House. There seems to be some fault found with the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue and with the department because coal oil is not tested for its illuminating qualities. It is well understood that the quality of oil depends upon two conditions, first, on its specific gravity, and second, on the flash test. Upon the specific gravity depends the illuminating quality of the oil and on the flash test depends safety from explosion. When you have these two tests, as was mentioned by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), you certainly have an assurance of the illuminating quality of the oil, because, having the specific gravity and flash test, you will find in these the illuminating qualities of the oil. I may say that the test of Canadian oil as to specific gravity is 794 as compared with water at 1,000, while the test of American oil is, for its specific gravity, 784 as compared with 1,000 of water.

Mr. MONK. May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) what he is reading from ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. What does it matter to you ?

Mr. MONK. I ask the hon. gentleman to state what he is reading from ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Are you prepared to state that what I am reading is not correct ?

Mr. MONK. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that we have a right to know what the hon. gentleman is reading from ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am reading from notes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I think an hon. gentleman is allowed to read from the notes he has before him without having to tell the committee what he is reading, just as any hon. gentleman can read the notes which he has prepared containing any figures that he has put down, and therefore, if he says these figures are before him in the form of notes, he has a perfect right to read them.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, it is not the rule of the House ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was interrupted——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No hon. gentleman can be interrupted against his will.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He may rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am only making these statements to show that the best samples of Canadian oil are superior to those of American oil at the present time. There has been a very great improvement in the quality of oil in the last few years and now the best quality of Canadian oil is equal to

and better than the best quality of American oil. It may be that there was poor oil sent into the North-west Territories.

Mr. BOYD. It was not Canadian oil at all.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not prepared to say whether it was Canadian or American oil, but I am sure the position taken by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue ought to satisfy the committee, inasmuch as he has now under investigation the complaints that were made to his department and as he assures the committee that within two weeks the result of this investigation will be known and that upon the result being known action will be taken. Surely, to my mind, that ought to satisfy the committee that the department is alive to its duty and has the interest of the public at heart.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not quite understand the hon. gentleman's figures in respect to the flash test, &c. Would he be good enough to repeat them again to the committee ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I gave you a comparison as between Canadian and American oils.

Mr. BLAIN. It is then in respect to the flash test ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The specific gravity.

Mr. BLAIN. Oh, the specific gravity. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he referred to the illuminating qualities of the oil. Was that correct ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. On the specific gravity depends the illuminating quality of the oil.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, I understood him correctly. Now the hon. gentleman tells the committee that the specific gravity that was formerly stamped on the end of the barrel indicated the illuminating quality of the oil. The hon. Minister of Finance has told the committee that there never was any inspection in respect to the illuminating quality of the oil.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. BLAIN. What did the hon. gentleman say ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that the illuminating power of the oil, in these terms, was stamped on the barrel, but I did say that when you get specific gravity and the flash test both correctly, I was informed that they produce the illuminating power, and that any one who understood it might have indicated to him the illuminating power of the oil, but there was no specific mark in these terms that the illuminating power of the oil was so much. It had to be deduced from these figures, as I have been informed.

Mr. BLAIN. The fact is that at this present time, under the new regulations, there is no test for the reason that there is nothing stamped on the end of the barrel. The changed regulations do not give an opportunity for the dealer or the consumer to know anything at all of the illuminating quality of the oil. The hon. member for West York has been good enough to read myself a lecture in respect to binder twine. I wish he would be good enough to read the House a lecture in respect to counting ballots of voters who voted four or five times in his last election. I was delighted with his remarks in his county in his recent election in respect to what an ardent protectionist he was, and with his promise that the minute he reached the House he would enter a complaint against the government for their failure to give more protection and that he would ask them to put the tariff up higher.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) where that was ?

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman asks that question, because he changes his policy so quickly that he does not remember. It depends entirely on where he made the statement, as to what the statement would be. We understand that very well. He was a free trader at one time and now he is a high protectionist.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As each hon. member has departed from the rules of order and as each has had his way, I hope both will be good enough to come now to the consideration of the item under discussion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would be just as well to stop it at the beginning and not at this juncture.

Mr. OLIVER. I understood two hon. members to say, the hon. Minister of Finance, and the hon. member for West York, as with authority, that the flash test ensured safety and the specific gravity ensured illuminating power, or if I am not stating it correctly, that the two tests together, the flash test and the specific gravity test, ensured illuminating power. Am I right ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not state it as on authority. I said I was informed.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the hon. member for West York said it as an authority. Am I right ? I am right. Then, this oil sold in the North-west Territories during the past five months did not have the illuminating power; therefore, it could not have passed these tests properly if the statement made by the hon. member for West York is correct. Now, I wish, as a member representing the west, this point to be tried out here and now. If it is a fact as stated that the flash test and the specific gravity test do give the illuminating power, then, the officers of the Department of Inland Revenue have been greatly at fault and this country has suffered consequently. If the flash test and the specific gravity test do not

necessarily give the illuminating power, and I believe they do not, then, we require legislation along the lines of the evidence that has been placed before the House here to-night without regard to what may be the result of the special analysis made by the officers of the department. We members representing the country affected by the sales of this unilluminating oil ask to be understood as making the charge on the floor of this House on our responsibility as members, that the oil did not have its proper illuminating power. We do not care who says it has. We do not care what officer applies what tests he pleases. We make the statement and on behalf of our constituents we demand redress.

Mr. CLANCY. I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Campbell) that you have been asked to take the chair at this moment because I was left in a very painful state of uncertainty.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) read carefully from a paper, and even though he would not disclose his authority, the statement was a very important one. I remember when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) held a very different view as to the quality of Canadian coal oil. He told us to-night that the specific gravity and the flash test of the Canadian oil was much higher than that of the American oil and that therefore Canadian oil was better. It is not very long since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) went about the country contending that the American oil was infinitely superior to the Canadian oil, that our people were slaves paying tribute to the oil kings of Canada and that the duty should be taken off oil. I am not quite sure that he did not even carry a gallon of coal oil in his hand to demonstrate his contention. Well, it is a good thing if the hon. gentleman has been converted, and we are glad to know now from him that the American oil was never as good as Canadian oil, and that he was all wrong about that in the past. Whether the law has been changed or not, enough has been said here to-night to warrant this matter receiving the serious attention of the government. I am glad to hear from the Minister of Inland Revenue that it is the intention of the government after full inquiry to see that no inferior oil is put on the market so far as it is possible for the department to guard against it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have already given that assurance.

Mr. HOLMES. I understood the hon. member (Mr. Blain) to argue that the oil which was supplied in Western Ontario came in in small barrels as it formerly did. Although the town of Brampton may be in darkness to the extent of receiving oil in barrels at the present day, it is a fact that generally throughout Western Ontario, the oil is delivered in tank wagons from tank supply centres. I cannot speak for the consumers, because I do not use oil myself, but so far as the retail dealers are concerned in the counties of Huron and Bruce with which I am most familiar, they endorse very cordially the present system and speak of the law as being thoroughly satisfactory.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister inform the House what flash light specific gravity means in respect to illuminating quality. Surely the minister in charge of the department should understand that.

An hon. MEMBER. That has been asked a dozen times.

Mr. BLAIN. Some hon. gentleman says that question has been asked a dozen times and I agree ; but the point is that we have not had an answer to the question.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I must confess that I have not very extensive practical knowledge on the question of coal oil, and even my theories do not go very far. When I took charge of the department a certain law had been in force for eight years, and that law has not been altered since with regard to the quality of the oil. Let that be well understood. I may know a great many other things, but I cannot speak with 'connaissance de cause' in regard to the quality of oil. What I have said, I repeat now, and that is, that after an experience of eight or ten years under different governments, if we find that the law is not sufficient to protect the public then we are prepared to change or amend the law in that respect. I think that should be sufficient. It is not to be expected from me that I should enter into a scientific discussion of the quality or the purity of coal oil ; but if I be in default on that I perhaps will have some one to teach me. Even if I have to repeat myself ten times, I think it is sufficient for the House that I should say that I took the law as it was ; the law which was operated by the same officer for ten years, and the very moment that we perceived that under the existing law we could not give satisfaction to the public, we took means to ascertain to what extent the public are suffering and we are prepared to remedy the defect. I cannot say more.

Mr. BLAIN. A very large quantity of American oil comes to Toronto for distribution in Ontario. Would the minister tell us who inspects that oil ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When it is imported to this country it is inspected by the customs officer, and when it is manufactured in Canada it is inspected by the inland revenue officer.

Mr. BLAIN. When is it inspected ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When it crosses the frontier I suppose.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there a stamp put on the tank ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do not the Minister of Finance, as well as the Minister of Inland Revenue, think that it is a defect in the legislation that there should be that inspection without any mark on the package to indicate that there has been inspection and the result of the inspection? I am not sufficiently familar to the trade to know the details, but looking at the question in a general way it seems to me that the legislation is defective in that respect.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The oil is imported in large packages and does not reach the consumer in that state. Though you put a stamp on the tank car it would be of very little value to the consumer, for he never gets it in a tank car. There is a heavy penalty on any person who sells coal oil in Canada which has not been inspected in the manner prescribed, and that is the protection which the public enjoys. I have been informed that until this recent matter cropped up in the North-west, there has been no complaint sent to the department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How would it be possible to show under such a system, that any particular barrel of coal oil has or has not been inspected. If you mark the tank when you inspect it, and indicate the result of the inspection, then when that tank is emptied into barrels the proper officer could mark the barrels. It seems to me such a provision would afford better protection.

Mr. McCARTHY. What will happen to the man who buys a gallon ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am speaking of the process until you get to the retail dealer. Of course every gallon measure cannot be inspected. My hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) will see that an objection of that kind is absurd.

Mr. McCARTHY. My objection is not at all factious. I simply recall the fact that it is the consumer that causes all the trouble about the inferior oil.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am speaking of the inspection for the man who sells, and you must have marks of inspection on the packages so that the person who buys will have something to rely upon. It would be extremely difficult under the present system to prove that a single barrel of coal oil which bears no marks had been inspected.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is something in that, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) will see that he would have to follow it out down to the last gallon. The oil which is imported in tank cars or in tank ships does not always pass into barrels. There are large standing tanks in certain places into which it is passed, and then it is passed out again into other vessels. I am told that when oil is sold from a tank wagon which is the practice in western Ontario, a standard can is used which is of certified size and therefore there is protection as to quantity. However, the theory of the law is that any coal oil sold here shall not be unsafe. Of course if there is defective inspection as it has been suggested, that is another matter, but the theory of the law is that there shall be effective inspection in regard to what the law prescribes. If the oil be found on sale in Canada, the presumption is, in the absence of anything to the contrary, that it is safe and of the quality required by law; and I am afraid, though I can see the criticism which my hon. friend has applied to a particular case, that you have to risk the quality of the oil as you have that of any other article of sale, when it comes up to the requirements of the law as to the flash test and the specific gravity.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the minister if tank cars are allowed to come into every town in the province of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, at every port or out-port of entry in Canada.

Mr. BOYD. I would like to ask the minister, in case the report of his officers should be that the oil they have taken for inspection from the several merchants in Manitoba is good, whether he will take any action with regard to this matter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be within two weeks, the minister says, when that report will be before the House. If we were to-night to introduce a Bill to amend the Inland Revenue Act in that respect, we would not have it enacted within two weeks.

Mr. BOYD. That is not the question I asked at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Allow me. If the attention of the House be drawn to a defect in any law, the members of the government are bound to consider it and provide a remedy ; and while this analysis will be one element in the case, even if on other evidence it can be shown that the law is defective, the government will be bound to provide a remedy.

Mr. BOYD. The question I asked was whether any action would be taken if the report of the officers was that the oil was good.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is time enough to consider that when we have the evidence before us.

Mr. BOYD. The evidence given by the members from the North-west proves conclusively that bad oil was sold through that country. There is no question about it, and I have stated upon the floor of this House that the agent of the Standard Oil

Company himself admitted that the oil was bad, and that they were withdrawing it from sale ; and about a month or six weeks after that an order was issued by the Department of Inland Revenue instructing their officers to inspect oil offered for sale. They are not likely to find any thing wrong with the oil offered for sale now.

Mr. STEPHENS. I understand that the oil must come up to a certain test, whether it is in tanks or in barrels ; and if it comes up to this test, it makes no difference whether the stamp is on the barrel or not. It comes to a town in a car tank, and is pumped from that into a wagon tank carrying 200 or 300 gallons, and this is taken to the stores and is delivered to the dealers in 5-gallon or 10-gallon tanks belonging to them. I cannot see how the oil could get into the North-west without being properly inspected. It may have been that after crossing the border a dishonest dealer put water into it and then sold it to the farmers. I understand that the law to-day is as it always has been; but the usage is different, the oil being taken to the dealers in tank wagons instead of in barrels.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is not right in supposing that the oil is subject to any test on crossing the border. I have the tariff item before me, and in it no test is provided for. The Minister of Inland Revenue stated that the customs collector inspected the oil. There is no evidence of that in the tariff ; he only collects the duty on the number of gallons brought in.

Mr. STEPHENS. I may state that I myself have purchased oil on more than one occasion, and before I could get it delivered, it had to be inspected by the customs officer, and I got from him a certificate stating that the oil was equal to the flash and the gravity test required by law. He had an instrument to test the oil himself.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. In answer to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) I may say that according to section 16 of the Act, all imported oils must be inspected by the customs officer at the port of entry designated by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister give us a list of the ports in the province of Ontario that are so designated ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Every port where there is a customs officer.

Mr. BOYD. I would like the hon. minister to answer the question I put to him, whether he is going to take action on the report of his officers or on the evidence brought before this House by the members from the North-west ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not understand how it is possible to trace a quantity of oil which proves not to be up to the test, and which may cause loss of life—to trace it to the proper officer and punish him for his neglect in not making a proper test.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is that not an incident of the modern method of carrying on the oil business ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I dare say it may be, if you call this the modern method ; but I do not know that that is a very conclusive answer to what I am suggesting to the committee. I do not suppose that my hon. friend from Westmoreland, if he happened to be blown through the roof, and came down minus an arm or a leg, would imagine that that was a satisfactory answer when he brought an action against the inspector. Of course, my hon. friend is very philosophic in regard to others, but I desire to make a personal application of the matter to himself. It seems to me that if we have an inspection, we should have such safeguards as to enable us to fix the responsibility for non-inspection on the officers of this government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Granting that that is the question, is it not almost inevitable ? It would be the same if it were a case of inspection of food, a man having been poisoned. It would be no great comfort to him to know that there had been inspection, which had been evaded. Yet, the inspection of food is on the whole, a good thing; and so the inspection of oil, on the whole, is a good thing. Each, in the main, works out its purpose, but there may be instances of failure, as is alleged in this case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the hon. minister does not understand my point. When you had a system of compulsory inspection of fish in Nova Scotia—it is not compulsory now—when a dealer bought a barrel of fish, he had the stamp of the officer upon it. The person who bought it had a remedy against the officer, if the fish was not up to the standard. But that is a circumstance which seems wanting here. I am not prepared to say that it cannot be overcome, but I suggest that it is a difficulty that some effort ought to be made to overcome.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But, to carry that out, you would have to deal with barrels and even with smaller parcels. These would be useful checks if it is possible to carry them out, but it may not be possible. The main purpose of the change, not as regards inspection test or specific gravity, but as regards handling the oil, was that it could be more cheaply transported and the necessity of barrelling it would be avoided—allowing it to be carried in tank cars instead of in small parcels. It was supposed that adequate inspection at the port of entry for imported oil, and at the refinery for Canadian oil, would amply protect the public interest.

Mr. OSLER. Is oil admitted at every port in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At every warehousing port. At first, there was a list of ports, but it was afterwards enlarged so as to include all warehousing imports.

Mr. OSLER. As I understand it, there is an inspector at every port in Canada where coal oil is imported ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The inspection, I am informed is not a difficult matter. The officer has to weigh the oil, and an instrument is supplied for making the flash test.

Mr. OSLER. That is the case in every port of entry where oil comes into Canada now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So the officer of the department informs me.

Mr. OSLER. I am informed that Wallaceburg is a port of entry and that it receives oil, yet there is no one but the customs-house officer there, and there is no inspection.

Mr. STEPHENS. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) is wrong. That is not a customs port.

Mr. OSLER. I understand that oil is received there constantly.

Mr. STEPHENS. Not direct.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understand the Minister of Finance, oil is admitted at every port where there is a warehouse.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At every port which is known in the department as a warehousing port.

Mr. BLAIN. Is Brampton, Ontario, a warehousing port ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I could not say. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) himself is probably aware.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not ask the question of the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I beg your pardon.

Mr. BLAIN. I asked it of the minister of the department.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman's question. I have stated more than once that the customs officer has charge of the inspection of imported oil; my department has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister give the House a list of the warehousing ports in Ontario where oil is received by tank ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will ask the Minister of Customs to supply that.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. BLAIN. There is a dispute among some of the members with respect to this matter. I understand that Port Perry and Clinton, which were mentioned by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) are not included among these ports. I think I am correct in that. Brampton, I understand, is not in this list of warehousing ports, and oil comes to that place in barrels, as under the old Act. But I think it is only fair to the committee that we should be supplied with a list of the ports for Ontario or for the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will be brought down.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I suppose the hon. member (Mr. Blain) will take my word for it that tank wagons visit Port Perry ?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). As I understand, we have been talking about oil imported from the United States. It is not against the law to bring oil from the United States in barrels, and it is still brought in that way, as well as in tanks. Dealers bring it in tanks to avoid the cost of transportation and leakage. Oil in tanks would be inspected to see that it is all right. The dealer would be responsible if it were reduced by adulteration. On the other hand, if an importer brought oil in barrels, it would be the duty of the inspector to stamp the barrel. But it would be impossible to put a stamp on every gallon in a tank car. The tank car comes to a place where they have a large receiving tank, and, from this it is taken into the tank wagons and distributed throughout the country.

Mr. BLAIN. Is Port Perry a port of entry ?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). No, Whitby is our port.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman state where this wagon gets its supply to take to Port Perry ?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I think it comes from Toronto or from Whitby.

Mr. MONK. If the special test ordered by the minister of the oil from the North-west does not disclose the fact that the oil submitted to the test is faulty, then there will be no legislation, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I did not say that. We will deal with the matter when the report comes in.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) struck the nail upon the head. It is clear that a large quantity of petroleum was imported into the North-west which was not an illuminating oil. It is clear that that oil should not have entered this country for the purpose for which it was imported unless it could stand a certain test. It must be equally clear that the department passed that oil.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not at all.

Mr. BARKER. This is not a solitary case. This oil that would neither burn nor give light was distributed over a large territory. There is a clause in the old Act, and, I presume, of the new, that the oil shall be inspected when it enters the country. This oil was undoubtedly inspected by the officer of the department, yet, it is clear that it could not stand the test required of an illuminating oil. What does he do ? He puts on the package certain figures, a certain flash test, a specific gravity ; and he knows whether the figures show that it is good illuminating oil. But the public do not know, they only see certain figures there. The inspector may send forward to the public oil that, on the face of it, is bad, and yet the public, unless they could get the hon. member for West York to travel around with his little paper and define to them whether the figures show good oil or not, are in perfect ignorance. If that is the effect of the statute, it ought to be altered, so that an inspector shall not pass any oil that does not stand the test for a good illuminating oil.

Mr. OSLER. Regarding the statement I made just now, I am correct. Oil is brought into Wallaceburg in barrels and landed on the wharf without inspection. It pays customs duty, and is then free to be sent all over this country, no matter what the character of the oil may be. There is no inspection, there is no means of inspection. I understand the oil that is used in the North-west is almost entirely supplied in barrels and not in tanks. Now it is quite possible there may be many ports like Wallaceburg where oil is delivered by boat, not tank oil but barrel oil, brought into this country and simply dumped on the wharf, where it pays duty, and is passed. It is passed now without any brand on the barrel. I understand in this way it is quite possible that large quantities of very inferior oil may be delivered in Canada and find its way to the North-west. I do not know that that is the case, but it is quite possible, and exceedingly probable ; I think I am quite safe in saying that as regards this one port there is no inspection of oil delivered there in barrels.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman's statement is correct it needs investigation, and I shall call the attention of the Minister of Customs to it. It is not the intention of the law, and it should not happen. Since the hon. gentleman makes the statement as a matter coming within his knowledge, the Minister of Customs will be bound to look into it and see what is the answer, if there be one.

Mr. STEPHENS. The hon. member for Bothwell knows that Wallaceburg is not a port of entry, and that the oil supplied at Wallaceburg is either entered at some other port probably Chatham, or is smuggled in. If entered at any other port it is inspected the same as it would be if it were in tanks.

Mr. CLANCY. I am surprised that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Stephens) does not know that Wallaceburg is a port of entry. It is an astounding revelation to me. Wallaceburg has been a port of entry for more than 30 years, I venture to say for 40 years. There are several outports at Wallaceburg. The village of Sombra and the village of Port Lambton are outports, and Wallaceburg is just as much a port of entry as the city of Chatham. If it is anything to boast of, it is quite as great as Chatham. What has been stated by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) is perfectly true. I am not prepared to say whether instructions have been given the collector of customs there to make an inspection. But I have personal knowledge that oil is brought in from the United States, from Detroit and from little towns on the border, is entered with the collector of customs, and duty paid, and no attempt made at inspection. I am not now making a charge against the collector there, I do not know whether he had such instructions, but that has been the experience at that port, no doubt about it.

Mr. STEPHENS. What I meant to say was that Wallaceburg was not a warehousing port. As the inspection of oil comes under the Customs Department, it could not be inspected at Wallaceburg.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the minister if that regulation regarding stamps to go on the end of the barrel, has been abolished ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Then will the hon. gentleman state, when coal oil comes from the United States in small barrels, if it is tested, and by whom ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When it is imported in tanks, either in barrals or otherwise—I have already read the law—it must be inspected by the customs officer.

Mr. OLIVER. In order to relieve a part of the strain that appears to exist in regard to the regulations as to the inspection of oil from the United States, I beg to say that according to my best information the principal part of the oil of which complaint was made in the North-west, was Canadian oil ; it was brought in tank vessels to Port William, was placed in large tanks and barrelled there for distribution throughout Manitoba and the North-west.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman knowledge of that ? The hon. gentleman

has made a very serious charge against the refiners of oil in Canada. I may tell him that they would have to send it in by tank cars, probably to the town of Sarnia in the first place, for shipment, and then they would have to re-ship it in tank vessels. Unless the hon. gentleman has personal knowledge of the accuracy of that statement, it is unfair to the oil producers in Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no hesitation in taking the responsibility of stating that a large part of the oil complained of in the North-west during the past five months was sold as Canadian oil.

Mr. CLANCY. That is another thing.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not follow the oil from the well to the lamp. But I can assure the hon. member that it was Canadian oil, and for the information of other hon. members I may say that Canadian oil holds a very bad pre-eminence in reputation in the North-west. It is not considered to be as good as American oil. As a matter of fact, however, the oil brought to Fort William was there placed in large tanks and there barrelled for distribution throughout the North-west. That is the history of the greater part of the oil trade of the west.

Mr. CLANCY. I can tell the hon. gentleman that his information is entirely wrong. There is not a tank vessel owned by a single individual in Canada. When the hon. gentleman states that it has a bad reputation, I am afraid that it is owing entirely to his conduct in the past. He and his party decried Canadian oil for the purpose of making capital out of it as against American oil. The hon. gentleman, I am afraid, has given it a bad reputation and circulated the reputation throughout the country. I want to say to him that it is utterly unfair for the hon. gentleman to make the statement in this House that Canadian oil is sent in tank vessels to the upper lakes and then reshipped to the North-west. I think the hon. gentleman is utterly without a tittle of foundation for his statement, and I hope that he will soon acquire the necessary information and make the correction.

Mr. OLIVER. I will take the responsibility of stating here in this House, and now, that from Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean, now and heretofore, the reputation of Canadian oil is absolutely inferior to that of American oil.

Mr. BOYD. In regard to the matter that has been referred to by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), I have this to say, that Mr. Sharpe, the present manager of the Standard Oil Company, certainly stated in his interview in the paper, as may be seen in the 'Telegram' of about the 20th of November, and I heard his son on a public platform assert, that it was American oil. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is rather amusing to listen to the flippant remarks of some hon. members from Ontario referring to us as being in the dark. We certainly were in the dark in 1896, and previously, regarding the party and the government that have had charge of the coal oil legislation for the past few years. I would like that my hon. friend had been with the premier when he traversed that country from the Red River to the Rocky Mountains, as no doubt the member for Alberta was, and had seen the placards on every wall where he spoke, and where he bewailed the position of the people of that country with regard to the coal oil tax, that he promised to wipe out immediately, and which he has so enormously reduced by one cent a gallon. Then certain arrangements were made whereby the Standard Oil Company was permitted to come into this country and get control of the market, as has been shown by members from both sides of the House, and that, Mr. Chairman, after the government was warned from this side of the House, warned, if I mistake not, by the late member for West York (Mr. Wallace), that what has happened would happen.

To provide for extra duty pay at large distilleries and other factories, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This vote is the same as last year, and for three or four years preceding.

Mr. CLANCY. How much of that vote of last year was spent ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Last year, out of that vote of $6,000, we expended $5,701.02.

Salaries of officers, inspectors and assistant inspectors of weights and measures, $55,100.

Mr. CLANCY. I think it is time now that we should have some explanation from the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue as to the conduct of his officers, because I fear, from the results we have had, that they have disobeyed the orders sent out by the department. Either the inspectors have been remiss in their duty or the hon. gentleman has modified the instructions that I am informed were sent to the inspectors throughout the country in regard to the use of what is known as the grain tester. I understand that a deputation waited on the hon. gentleman from the grain section of the board of trade of the city of Toronto and remonstrated against what they called a departmental regulation, but which, of course, was a statute instead of a departmental regulation. The hon. gentleman has not, apparently, taken great trouble to see that his officers have discharged their duty. I would like some declaration on the hon. gentleman's part making it perfectly plain, either that he is, as minister, utterly helpless to enforce the law by reason of the inspectors being remiss in their duty, or that the hon. gentleman is disposed to give a willing ear

to those who are contending against the operation of such a law. I shall await the hon. gentleman's explanation of what is to me and to the whole country a very extraordinary state of affairs, namely, that there has been a law on the statute-book for something over five years, that the inspector who was instructed to enforce that law has not done so, and that so far as the inspection is concerned, it is absolutely and utterly a dead letter. I never knew a case where the law has been so completely ignored and I am sure the committee and the country will be delighted to know what are the underlying reasons for such an extraordinary state of affairs.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think I had better, in order that the committee may be in a position to discuss the matter more fully and with perfect knowledge, give a short history in regard to the question referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). Grain testers were admitted to verification by Order in Council of August 20th, 1881. See circular No. 238. The Department of Justice decided in 1889 that grain testers were liable to inspection under the Weights and Measures Act. See circular G, 306, and copy of opinion of Department of Justice attached. In the spring of 1890, the department decided owing to the pressure from all points, to ask for the repeal of the Order in Council, permitting their verification. The farmers, on the one hand, urged that verification be not permitted, while boards of trade desired them to be admitted to inspection. By an Order in Council of June 7th, 1890, the previous order admitting grain testers to verification was repealed. See circular G 324. By 61 Vic., chap. 30, section 6, subsection 2, it was provided that 'no weighing machine used for weighing or determining the weights of any of the articles mentioned in section 16 of the Weights and Measures Act shall be of less certified capacity than one bushel.' See circular G 588, calling attention to the above quoted amendment and directing inspectors to acquaint persons who are using those measures, of the penalties attached for not complying with the law.

A circular was again issued by the department in September, 1901, calling attention, a further time, to the provisions of the Act 61 Vic., chap. 30. See circular G 623. The grain tester is used only to determine the weight of grain per bushel, not the actual weight of a given quantity offered for sale. It is, in fact, a test of quality, not of quantity, the grain so tested as to quality having subsequently to be weighed on verified scales when bought and sold. Until the amendment of 1898, the department took the stand that, as the grain, in respect of which the quality is determined by the tester, is sold by actual weight on legalized scales it had no right to interfere with the use of the tester, as the seller can decline to accept the tester as an arbiter. It thus being an unrecognized weighing machine no contract could be determined by it, but that nothing could prevent millers and others using it for their own information.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman state that the law does not interfere with any persons attempting to make a test in any vessels of less than one bushel certified capacity ? The reading of the statute is just what the hon. gentleman said, but the hon. gentleman has expressed some view outside of the statute that I am not quite clear about.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Until the amendment of 1898, the department took the stand that as the grain in respect of which the quality is determined by the tester is sold by actual weight on legalized scales it had no right to interfere with the use of the tester as the seller can decline to accept the tester as an arbiter.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand that to be a departmental regulation ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. How does the hon. gentleman arrive at the conclusion that since the grain is sold subject to being weighed on legalized scales the department could not prevent the use of the tester under such circumstances, because the seller might decline to have it tested. I want to say that there is no complaint against the test. The complaint is against the use of a tester of less certified capacity than one bushel. I do not understand that there has been any amendment of the Act of 1898 affecting that part of it :

> No weighing machine used for weighing or determining the weights of any of the articles mentioned in section 16 of the Weights and Measures Act shall be of less certified capacity than one bushel.

The test is made so as to see that the wheat is standard, and if the wheat is below standard there is a scale fixed by which an arbitrary reduction is made on the price of each bushel. Whether grain is bought or sold, the person has absolutely no right to make a test with any tester of less certified capacity than one bushel. Judging by the remarks of the minister, I can well understand why the law has been absolutely ignored.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Grain testers are used by the buyers to test the quality, and the seller is not bound to accept the decision of the buyer even after that test.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, he is. At every mill door and warehouse door he had to accept it or turn his team back and take it home. In theory the minister is right, but as a matter of practice he is wrong.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I was always of the opinion, and I still hold the same opinion, that the least we intervene in private business the better.

Mr. CLANCY. Now, the country will understand for the first time the position of the minister.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. These tests were not the exact measure by which the quality or quantity was to be returned. I cannot understand why the seller would be bound to accept the terms of the buyer even if he had to take his grain home.

Mr. CLANCY. Quite so; no hardship in that.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not understand how trade is conducted in the province of Ontario, but I know something of that matter in the province of Quebec. We use what we call a half bushel. If a farmer has 500 or 600 bushels of oats or peas for sale, he goes to the buyer and he says to him: I am ready to sell you 500 bushels of oats to be delivered within a month or two. When he has delivered the oats or peas the value is determined, not by the bushel, but by the weight according to law. That is the rule in the province of Quebec, and it is not to my knowledge that any lawsuit was ever instituted because there was a misunderstanding between the parties. If the facts are as represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) I suppose it remains that we should change the law.

Mr. CLANCY. No. Enforce it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Perhaps it would be in order that a Bill should be introduced so that we may test the sentiment of the House and of the country.

Mr. CLANCY. The people who complain do not ask that the law should be altered, but they ask that it should be enforced. The minister proposes now to submit a Bill to the House to test public opinion on the question as to whether the present law should be enforced or not. I cannot understand what the hon. gentleman means. I tell the minister that there is absolutely no complaint against the law, which is efficient; but there is a complaint that the law is not enforced. The minister says that he does not care to interfere with private transactions, but I tell him that this is a public transaction. So far as my knowledge goes, there is no such a thing as grain tests in the United States or in any other province of the Dominion except Ontario. I am not opposed to the test. If I were engaged in the grain business I think I should want to determine the value of grain by a tester. What I am asking is that if a grain tester is to be used at all, and I do not say it should not, that grain tester shall not be of a less capacity than one certified bushel. We simply ask the minister to have backbone enough to enforce the law. When he suggests a change in the law I am afraid that he is giving a willing ear to the deputation that thundered at the door of his office recently asking that the law should be repealed. If the minister wants to tinker with the law now, it is only for the purpose of crippling it so that it may be of no use to the farmer. I hope that I have made myself clear as to the views of the farmers of Ontario generally on this question.

Mr. STEPHENS. In the town I come from, most of the grain buyers if not all of them, are using bushel measures to test the grain.

Mr. CLANCY. When did the hon. gentleman get that information?

Mr. STEPHENS. My firm has made a good many good dozens of these measures for the grain buyers, for at least the last year.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman will wire to the principal buyers in this town I venture to say he will find that is not the case. I have it from the farmers themselves.

Mr. STEPHENS. Well, whether the hon. member (Mr. Clancy) says it is the case or not, that will not alter the fact. I say that when the farmer sells his grain he brings it to the buyer, and the buyer tests with the bushel measure as I have seen myself, and our firm have made that measure, and we have been selling it for the last year. The farmer can make his bargain in selling his grain just as he does in selling his cattle. He can say to the buyer: I will sell you a thousand bushels of wheat, but you are to take this wheat at its actual weight; you are to use no tester. If the man says he wants it tested the farmer can say that he will not have it, and so the farmer can make a bargain when selling his grain the same as he can when selling his stock or any product of the farm.

Mr. CLANCY. I hear some hon. gentlemen cheering, and they seem to make it their business behind there to chatter out 'Hear, Hear,' on every occasion. I do not wish to be offensive to these gentlemen, but I wish to say to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Stephens) that notwithstanding he makes his measures, and sells them, the fact remains that gentlemen of quite as reputable character as his—and his character is a good one—have stated to me within the last two months that the tester was being used as formerly. If the hon. gentleman denies that, he casts a reflection on the statement made to me by most reputable farmers. I am sure that if the farmers in his constituency read his state-

ment in the press to-morrow that for the last year nothing but the bushel test has been used, it will be a great surprise to them. I have not seen the small tester used, but I have scarcely been a day in the city of Chatham, that farmers of reputation and truth and respectability have not told me within the last two or three months, that the old tester of one-sixteenth of a bushel is being used. I have no hesitation in accepting the statement of gentlemen who are just as respectable and just as truthful as any member in this House.

Mr. STEPHENS. I have sold grain myself during the last year, and it was not tested.

Mr. CLANCY. That might be.

Mr. STEPHENS. There was no bargain as to test when I sold the grain. They weighed it in and gave me so much per bushel on that weight. I have been among the farmers probably as much as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has been, and I have yet to hear one recent complaint that the small tester is being used in the city of Chatham.

Mr. CLANCY. I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that, and I hope it will appear in the newspapers to-morrow.

Mr. McEWEN. I happen to be a grain merchant, and I know that in our locality the inspector sent a circular to the grain men and also to the millers forbidding them to use the tester, and since then I have put away mine. I do not know how many others have done the same thing. The grain inspector also said, that if he came around and found any in use he would confiscate them. I believe they are done away with in our section. At all events they are forbidden and liable to be confiscated.

Mr. CLANCY. I am very glad to hear that statement, and I hope it will apply generally, but my information is that it does not. I am aware that the minister has sent out a circular, but the annoying part of it is that in some localities at least there has been no attention paid to it. I am told that in my own town the small tester is in use still.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. member for Kent what material is used in the manufacture of those bushel measures ?

Mr. STEPHENS. Light steel.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they stamped ?

Mr. STEPHENS. Yes, by the government inspector.

Mr. BLAIN. What kind of a bottom ?

Mr. STEPHENS. Wood or iron, or any other material, so long as it is of the right size.

Mr. McEWEN. I consider this bushel measure a great mistake. On a cold winter day, when half a dozen or more teams are waiting to be unloaded, you have to take a bushel and fill it out of every man's sleigh, and weigh it. I can assure you it is a very great hardship. The majority of grain men would rather trust their eyes than go to that trouble. The men who find the most fault with these small grain testers are those with light grain ; these are the men who make the loudest noise. The grain tester is a good thing for both the grain men and the grain merchant, and I think that is the proper thing to use.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). As a grain producer and seller, I can say that it is the small measure which was used in Cardwell, Charleston, Caledon East, Mono Road and Bolton last fall.

Mr. CLANCY. Before we vote the salaries for these inspectors, I think we might now ask for some declaration on the part of the minister as to whether he still adheres to the statement he made a moment ago that he did not care to interfere, as he thought it would be an interference with trade. We might reasonably expect a statement from the hon. gentleman that he will see that the Act is enforced rather than propose any amendments to it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I may say to my hon. friend that in order to have the law carried out, and perhaps at his own instance, we issued on the 10th of September, 1901, the following circular :

Department of Inland Revenue.

Sir,—Complaint has been made to the department that notwithstanding the provision of subsection 2 of section 6 of 61 Victoria, chapter 30, the law is being contravened (already brought to your notice by circular sheet 588 of March 9, 1900.) This section reads as follows :

'No weighing machine used for weighing or determining the weights of any of the articles mentioned in section 16 of the Weights and Measures Act shall be of less capacity than one bushel.'

Therefore, any use made of any weighing machine (having a less capacity than one bushel) for the purpose of charging for or ascertaining the amount or price to be paid for any of the articles referred to in section 16, is illegal. It is the duty of all inspectors and assistant inspectors of weights and measures to so advise all persons offending, and to notify them that the further illegal use of such weighing machines shall lead to their confiscation and to the institution of proceedings for the collection of the penalties fixed by section 29 of said Act.

This is the circular that was issued last year. I may add that I was not in a position to judge of the merits or demerits of that grain tester. Some of the dealers are in favour of using it, and I cannot perceive now why, in face of the law and our circular, a farmer should be bound to sell his grain to a man who uses a grain tester. On the one hand, we have the representation of the hon. member for Bothwell, who may be sustained by the opinion of some other gentlemen ; but, on the other hand,

we have the boards of trade, representing the buyers and shippers, who want us to maintain the use of the grain tester.

Mr. CLANCY. The small one ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes. I may say to my hon. friend, en passant, that I was never approached by any deputation. We have received resolutions passed by the boards of trade in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, and perhaps some other places ; but, without entering into the merits of the use of the grain tester, would my hon. friend say that it would be in the interest of the farmers of Manitoba ?

Mr. CLANCY. They are not interfered with at all, because it is not used there. They have their grain standards, which are fixed by persons whose business it is to establish the qualities of the grain. There is no such thing as this small grain tester used anywhere in Canada outside of the province of Ontario.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. What is the hon. gentleman asking us to do ? We have issued a circular according to the law as amended in 1901, and we have told our officers that they should inform people using those testers that if they continue doing so the penalties enacted by the law will be imposed. The hon. gentleman now wants us to take legal proceedings ; but if that grain tester is not illegal, how can we succeed ?

Mr. CLANCY. Has any one contended that it is a legal measure ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It cannot be legal, because the clause of the Act which I have already read says that no measure less than a bushel shall be used. Suppose we were to take an action, what would be the result of it ? The man would say. 'I may use a grain tester or any other kind of measure.' It is not the fact that the little instrument bears the name of grain tester that makes it legal. You can use any other vessel.

Mr. CLANCY. That law declares that any other cannot be used.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, but that it is a matter of private bargain between the buyer and seller.

Mr. CLANCY. No.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, because they agree upon a certain measure not to determine the weight or the quality, but to form a basis for arranging the price. That is a matter of private bargain.

Mr. CLANCY. It is not often that we find a minister of the Crown declaring his utter helplessness to enforce the law. Any tester less than a bushel is false weight or measure—it is a false instrument for the purpose under the law, and it is the duty of the hon. minister, at any cost, to see that the law is enforced in this case as in any other. The hon. gentleman need not enter into any question of testing it in the courts. He has only to say to his officers to see to it that there are none of these instruments in use, and that any that are found in use shall be confiscated and any who use them fined. Would the hon. gentleman have the farmer bring before the courts a man whom he found using one of these instruments, entering upon a lawsuit that would probably cost him his farm in fighting a great corporation like the Millers' Association ? Or is he prepared to take the course, the only course that is open to a minister, particularly when he has asked the House to vote money to pay the officers to enforce the law, and that is to enforce that law fairly. There is no need to bandy words about it. It is as plain as anything could be made that there is a law in the statute-book which forbids the use of such an instrument. I will do the hon. minister the credit of saying that he is making laudable efforts to carry out the law. But he tells us that they are fruitless, and that seems to end his inclination to carry out the law. It is not a matter of private bargain, because there is no bargain made. Suppose that the hon. minister is a grain buyer. I go to his warehouse with a load of grain. I make no bargain, except to sell for 75 cents a bushel, subject to a test which may either increase or lower the price. This is not a matter of private bargain, but an appeal to the law where there is no bargain, and where no bargain need to be made. If I said I would sell my grain at 75 cents per bushel, regardless of what the tester might make it, whether above or below the standard, that might fairly be called a matter of bargain. But where the price may be varied according to the results shown by the tester under the rules of the Millers' Association, that is a different matter. I repeat what I have often said, that I do not object to the grain-buyer having a means of testing the grain he is buying from the farmer. But I venture to repeat that it is clear that it is not for the minister to inquire whether the farmer has made a bargain or not where this tester has been used. The fact is a false weight or measure prohibited by the law has been used, and it is the duty of the officers to take cognizance of that fact. I would ask the hon. minister if he is preparing to follow up the efforts he has made for the enforcement of the present law ? I had some information that the inspectors are not sent out especially for this business as a rule. I do not know whether they are sent out specially in any case or not, but, no doubt the minister will be able to inform us. I understand that the inspection is not made oftener than once a year. If no inspector is sent out, I can understand that the law will be ignored, because this matter will never come under the notice of the inspec-

tors whose special duty it is to inspect weights and measures, but whose additional duty it is to look after this tester. I think the hon. minister has made a laudable effort. I think he took the only step that could be taken by a minister—he tried to enforce the law. I think I ought to have some declaration from him whether he will, if necessary, send out inspectors especially to see to this matter and enforce the law. Anything short of that means that the law will not be enforced.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the minister answers my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) I would like to ask both the minister and my hon. friend how the law would be enforced in such a case ? I have been in the grain business for thirty years. This tester, as my hon. friend calls it, was purchased by the grain-buyers some years ago, when we dealt largely in barley to export to the United States. If, according to the tester, that barley weighed forty-six pounds a bushel, it was worth so much; if it weighed forty-eight or 50 pounds, it would be worth so much more. In order to be able to get our barley graded we invested in these American weighing machines.

Mr. CLANCY. They are not American.

Mr. TAYLOR. I bought mine in the United States. The instrument consisted of a funnel, and the grain filtered down into a two-quart measure that hung on a scale. When it was filled through the funnel, you struck it off level with a ruler, and you were then able to see what the barley weighed per bushel. The farmers, of course, objected, that if they filled the bushel measure and then struck the side of the measure, it would contain more and show a greater weight per bushel. This raised a cry against these machines, and this regulation was adopted. I have one of those machines in my warehouse. A man comes to me with a load of grain, and we bargain as to the price. What is to prevent me taking a sample of that grain into my office to examine it and ascertain its value. I fill my two-quart measure and come to the conclusion that the grain is worth 70 cents per bushel. I offer that price to the farmer, and he is free to take it or not, as he pleases. I deny the right of the government or anybody else to take that instrument, which is my property, out of my warehouse and smash it. I am not buying or selling by it. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the grain is bought on an examination of a sample held in the hand. But, sometimes a case arises when we want to know the weight per bushel, and that is what the tester is used for. It is not used as a test between buyer and seller, but it is used by the buyer as a means of ascertaining what the grain is worth.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, why does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) object to this ?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is my property, and I am not using it in any illegal way. Therefore, I deny the right of this government or anybody else to take it from me.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has convicted himself. He says he does not buy or sell by this instrument. Yet he says also that he uses this test before he tells the farmers what he will give them for the grain. Now, there is no gentleman would dare to assume the responsibility of defending a measure that is found to be false. I am not accusing the grain men of endeavouring to cheat. But if the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to go to the Department of Inland Revenue when the test was made by the minister and deputy minister with wheat weighing 62¾ pounds per bushel, he would have seen that after the test had been made of a bushel by the small tester, that there was still ten and one-half ounces left. Why? Because it was dribbled through that little funnel, the air was allowed to get in, and the vessel was too small, and it turned out to be a false test. What was that test, as it would have operated on the farmer ? There were only five out of sixteen tests that went to 62 pounds, although it was 62¾ pounds by actual weight in a bushel tester, and in a bushel measure. Now, eleven of those farmers would have to take 61 pounds out of the sixteen tests. I think that my hon. friend, although a very just man, has been on one side of the question all his life. He had better read again what the law declares. The section reads :

> No weighing machine used for weighing or determining the weight of any articles mentioned in section 16 of the Weights and Measures Act, shall be of less certified capacity than one bushel.

The hon. gentleman uses one-sixteenth of a bushel. Now it has been found by actual experience—and I make no charge against those who use it—that it is so small that it is not a fair tester. The farmers do not ask that the men who purchase their grain should be deprived of the means of ascertaining the value of that grain by putting it into the test of a bushel. We all concede that it is not so convenient ; but it cannot be urged that on the ground of convenience a measure should be used that is not fair to the farmer.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand that the only measure that can be used in the province of Ontario between the buyer and seller of grain is a one-bushel measure ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The legal measure, the law says so.

Mr. BLAIN. And only a bushel measure?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Suppose a farmer went into his neighbour's granary and purchased 30 bushels of wheat, would he be compelled to

use a one-bushel measure to measure that wheat ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. They are bound to use it. They have always to go to the legal weight. I mentioned the practice in Quebec. There we use the term bushel in speaking of 400 bushels, 500 bushels, 600 bushels or any other quantity. But when we come to deliver the grain it is always by weight according to the agreement between seller and buyer. The buyer will say, I will give you 25 cents, or 30 cents, for 32, 34 or 36 pounds of oats. That is the condition of sale, always understood.

Mr. MONK. Not always in Montreal, for weight.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. They may change it in Montreal. Sometimes they say 40 pounds or 42 pounds. It depends on the weight of the oats, which is not always the same. In some years the oats are heavier than in other years. But I cannot understand, in face of the law as it is to-day, how far we can go, and I call the attention of the legal profession here to that point.

Mr. CLANCY. Cannot the hon. gentleman see that the instructions are carried out ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, but then we will be face to face with the argument used by the hon member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) : Can you deprive me of my measure ? The government has no business to interfere.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not use this tester in buying grain by any means. I have a two-quart measure, I fill that two-quart measure, and I set it on the scales to see how much it will weigh. That is what a grain man does. One load of oats may weigh 40 pounds to the bushel, another load 32 pounds ; that which weighs 40 pounds is worth more than that which weighs but 32 pounds, and this instrument will indicate it to me.

Mr. CLANCY. Why not use a bushel ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Because it is not so convenient. Ninety-nine loads out of 100 are bought by the purchaser merely looking at the grain in his hand. There is not a grain man in Ontario but has one of these instruments in his warehouse.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says he does not set the law at defiance. The hon. member for Leeds says he just uses it when he likes. If he uses it at all the law declares it shall be a bushel. He is not obliged to use it, but the farmer ought to be protected when he does use it, and know that it has a certified capacity of one bushel. Yet the hon. gentleman declares that he cannot be prevented from using a tester. Unless the tester is of the certified capacity of one bushel he is using it illegally, because the measure is his own it gives him no right to use it. The hon. gentleman is not obliged to use a tester, but if he does use one, the law steps in and says, for the protection of the farmer, that it must be one bushel.

Mr. TAYLOR. And that is all right. My hon. friend comes to me and says, I want to sell you 500 bushels of pease, or wheat, and if your wheat weighs 60 pounds a bushel I will give you 80 cents a bushel. He comes in with his wheat and I must then take a bushel measure and put it on the scales and test it. But if he comes in with his load of grain and says : How much will you give me for that load of grain, without saying anything about the weight, I look at it, and if I am not satisfied as to what it will weigh, I take two quarts of it and weigh it and make the calculation to see how much a bushel will weigh, and I pay for it accordingly. But if I buy from a man and he guarantees me that his oats will weigh 34 pounds a bushel, I must, by the law, use a one-bushel measure.

Mr. CLANCY. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. I say yes. You come to me to sell me 500 bushels of oats, and I say I will give you 30 cents a bushel if they weigh 34 pounds to the bushel. Then I must weigh a bushel. But if I am buying these from you and nothing said about the quantity, or the quality, I look at the oats, and I may be deceived, I may think these oats will not weigh over 30 pounds. I will take two quarts and test them for my satisfaction, and the result will tell me whether they will weigh 30 or 32 or 34 pounds to the bushel. That is all we use it for. But if I buy oats at a price of so much per bushel provided they weigh 34 pounds, I must weigh one bushel to see how much they will weigh. But in the case of every load of grain that comes in after we make the bargain, it is put on the platform scales and the quantity is thus determined.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon, gentleman need not try to confuse the question. A man brings in a load of grain. The hon. gentleman wants to be sure that it is up to a certain standard, and he takes his two quart measure and by that he makes the test. The complaint of the farmer is not that he takes grain without a test, because he will be glad to sell it and to take so much for his grain to be weighed on the scale and no test. But the buyer insists upon the test, he asks that it shall be made in a vessel, namely, a bushel measure, and it has been demonstrated time and again that nothing else than that is fair. Now, I want to ask the hon. minister to declare to the House whether he intends to continue in his efforts to enforce the Act as it now stands.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS. It seems to me this question resolves itself into ascertaining whether the minister has power or not to take these vessels away from the grain buyers. I myself have made some inquiry, and I believe he has not that power, and that the grain buyer can use this tester to satisfy himself the same as he can use his eyes to satisfy himself. He does not use it for the purpose of buying grain from the farmer, but to satisfy himself as to its value. I believe that a tester is a good thing, but it should be a bushel measure. I think if the minister has the power he should do away with the smaller measure altogether, but I do not believe that he has power to do that. I believe that the buyer can use the tester the same as he can use his eyes.

Mr. McGOWAN. As I understand the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) he proposes that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue should destroy all the testing machines of less than one bushel capacity.

Mr. CLANCY. No.

Mr. McGOWAN. I thought the hon. gentleman said that. If the minister were to do that it would inflict a very great hardship on a great many people. I buy a carload of flax seed, for instance, and I test it with a machine very much smaller than one bushel capacity. We have to ascertain how much dirt there is in that flax, and it is understood in the trade that it shall be sold subject to that test. It would be a very great hardship to adopt a bushel measure for this purpose. I hope the hon. member will not destroy all of these machines that are of a less capacity than one bushel.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend (Mr. McGowan) misunderstands me. I can assure him that I am not so belligerent as he suspects. All I ask the hon. gentleman to do is to put that machine aside and buy a new one of a bushel capacity.

Mr. McGOWAN. Well, I will not do that.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not hear what the hon. member said in response to my question a moment ago.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I said that I would endeavour to have the law carried out.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman any special inspection for this purpose ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, except that the officers will have to comply with the circular that I have already read.

Mr. CLANCY. I had a promise from the hon. gentleman's department that inspectors at least within a limited area would go out for this purpose, I want to ask the hon. gentleman if this promise has been carried out.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That was done.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). The grievance that the farmer feels against the use of a smaller measure than one bushel is this : You go in with your load of grain and the merchant tells you he will give you so much if it comes up to such a test and he shows you a sample of grain which is sent to him as a standard to go by. The farmer thinks that the grain should be tested in a larger vessel than is used so that the balance would have to be counted upon when weighing because it always takes something to balance the beam in weighing a quantity short of a bushel. I think it would be fairer that there should be one bushel weighed because the merchant has an advantage in weighing a little at a time instead of a whole bushel. We all know very well that it takes something to balance the beam always and whilst you weigh oftener it will count that when you come up to the amount of a bushel. I do not know whether the department will be able to confiscate these small machines or not. I believe there is no use in attempting it unless it can compel each buyer to test the grain in a bushel measure.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, there is a matter I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue with the object of getting his views upon it. It is the matter of the weighing of grain coming through threshing machines. I do not know whether this question has reached the attention of the hon. minister or not, but it is a matter of a great deal of importance to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. According to the way in which the Weights and Measures Act has been interpreted I understand that the owners of grain have to pay for their threshing by the bushel measure. Most of the threshing machines in Manitoba and the North-west Territories have bushellers that put the grain into a bag and the bags are counted, or they have automatic weighers that weigh the grain as it is threshed, and passed up through an elevator. I am told by men engaged in the business that they have a great deal of trouble with some dishonest people in collecting the amount of their threshing bills, because, after threshing has been done, in some cases, they have refused to pay for it, claiming that, according to the regulation of the Department of Inland Revenue, they are not called upon to pay for any grain which is not measured through a bushel measure. If that is the correct interpretation of the Act, I think it is decidedly a great hardship to the men engaged in the threshing business. I understand there have been some cases before the courts in the province of Manitoba and that decisions such as I have referred to against the grain threshers have been given in the manner which I have mentioned. I would

like to have the opinion of the hon. minister in regard to it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have already had a reference of the matter to the department. There were complaints that a dispute had arisen between the proprietors of these threshing machines and some farmers, but this is one of those cases with which we cannot interfere. Our answer was that we were not prepared to devise a machine by which an apparatus might be provided to be attached to a threshing machine for the purpose of weighing grain. Let the farmers and the men who manage these machines agree upon some kind of a measure or weighing machine which we can inspect. All we can do is to inspect that measure or weighing machine. The manufacturer of these machines cannot expect the department to devise a means by which an apparatus can be attached to a machine such as a weighing machine or some kind of a measure. That is not our business. I cannot understand why the owners of threshing machines and the farmers cannot agree as to that. We have, in the province of Quebec, threshing machines, perhaps not so powerful as these, and I never heard that there was any dispute in regard to the payment to the owners of those machines. This is a question that they must settle for themselves. We cannot inspect unless we are called upon to inspect a measure.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. minister states that he does not see any reason why the threshers and the farmers cannot have some measure that they can mutually agree upon. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has referred to the fact that by some decisions of the courts they cannot do this. I am in receipt of some communications from threshers, amongst them is one from the secretary of the Threshers Protective Association in which they state they are not permitted to do that. I will read one letter I have received :

> I beg leave to call your attention to the bearing the Weights and Measures Act has on threshermen. According to a late decision a thresherman cannot collect unless he uses a standard measure which must be stricken, a thing it is almost impossible to do. As a thresher does not buy grain but only bestows a certain amount of labour upon it in preparing it for market he should be allowed to contract by bag or any way that will be mutally agreeable the same as any other labourers who take part in its production. Mr. Sifton was interviewed at Brandon, and promised to look into the matter and we would ask you to give your aid and assistance when it comes up.

The hon. gentleman will see that the secretary of the Threshers Protective Association is under the impression that they cannot enter into an agreement that will be mutually satisfactory on account of this decision.

Mr. BOYD.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Let these men agree among themselves on a measure and we are ready to inspect that measure. But, we cannot go further. They want us to devise some means by way of an apparatus attached to the threshing machine. We cannot do that. It is only our duty to inspect weights or measures under the law.

Mr. BOYD. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that they will not inspect this measure that is on the machine ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No. We cannot inspect a measure attached to the threshing machine unless it comes under the terms of the law. If it does, then of course we are bound to inspect it. Any machine which falls under the terms of the law we are bound to inspect.

Mr. BOYD. I think that would be a contradiction of the judgment which has been given by the courts if I understand it aright. I want to point out the hardship that these men are labouring under. These machines thresh from 2,000 up to 2,700 bushels in a day. How is it possible for wheat in quantities like that to be handled in any other way than the way in which it is now handled, either through a bagger, or through an automatic weigher ? We think the government should test these automatic weighing machines, or that some means should be devised whereby these men would be able to collect their charges for threshing grain.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I have not heard any explanation from the hon. minister as to why this increase of 10 per cent over the vote for last year is asked for. Is it caused by an increase in the number of officers or, have the salaries been increased ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will give the information to my hon. friend. There is an increase of $4,950, made up as follows : It is in the first place to provide for the inspection of weights and measures in the Yukon, where we have no inspection now, and there is pressure brought to bear that we should appoint an officer, which I think we should do.

Mr. CLANCY. Will he do his duty ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I expect so. To appoint an inspector in St. Hyacinthe, $800; to appoint Thomas Parker, assistant inspector, British Columbia mainland, $600; to provide an assistant inspector, Nova Scotia, $800; to appoint F. H. Prefontaine, assistant inspector, Quebec, $500; to appoint J. E. Bernier, assistant inspector, St. John, N.B., $600—I may say he is no relation of mine—increase to officers, $450; to transfer W. J. Labelle from inside service to outside service, $1,100, making $6,350, less $1,400, leaving $4,950.

Metrical instruments, $500.

Mr. TAYLOR. I had an application from the head master of the Gananoque High School a few days ago, for one of those metrical systems. I interviewed the minister in reference to the matter, and he told me that he had given a great many out to schools and that he had none on hand. The letter sent to me by the master of the Gananoque school says that this would be very useful to the pupils. In view of this, I believe that the minister should make provision in the supplementary estimates to secure a supply for the high schools of the Dominion. There are only one or two in each county. The government do very little for our schools, and I do not think they could spend money better than in furnishing all the high schools with these metrical charts.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. As soon as the metric systems which have been ordered from France arrive here, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) will receive one for the academy for which he has applied. Since 1897-98 we have expended $1,750 for these metric systems. We have already given out 167 and we have application for 43 more. Formerly we kept no record, but for two years we have a record giving the name of each institution to which they have been sent, and since I have been in the department they have been distributed to colleges, seminaries, convents, normal schools and high schools. It is the intention of the department to order some more to satisfy the demands.

Salaries of inspectors of gas and electric light, $21,450.

Mr. BLAIN. Do these inspectors travel through country towns for the purpose of inspecting the electric light systems ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The increase of $750 is for what may be called statutory increases, $400, and to appoint an inspector in Charlottetown, $300. The inspection of electricity in done by the gas inspector in the town or locality when there is such an officer, and when there is no such officer in the town the inspector of the next town makes the inspection.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the duty of one of these inspectors to visit a country town where they have an electric light system at certain intervals during the year ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Whenever they are called for. The Act of last session provides that after the meters are fixed they remain untouched for five years except there is a disagreement between the user and the company. In that case the inspector is called in to examine the meter and he must do it in the presence of the owner or user. If there is no inspector in the locality, the parties interested or the company may call upon the officer in charge of the inspection in that district.

Mr. BLAIN. I refer more particularly to the towns in which there are no meters in use.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We inspect meters and not electric plant.

Mr. BLAIN. This item speaks of electric light inspectors.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is the general term.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand that there is no electric light inspection in towns where no meters are used ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. They have to register in the department, and that is all.

Mr. MONK. This amount is considerable, and I do not want to refer to the discussion in respect to coal oil, which has occupied the greater part of the evening.

Mr. TALBOT. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. It seems to be the particular function of the hon. member for Bellechasse to cry out 'hear, hear.' We are voting this evening over $600,000, a large part of which is for the inspection of gas and electric light. There is no doubt that a much larger proportion of the population use coal oil than use either of these illuminants. There have been complaints in the west and there have been great complaints around Montreal as to the quality of the coal oil sold. I believe the minister was right when he stated that as a matter of fact there is no inspection of coal oil, but I believe that he was wrong when he stated that the law does not authorize his department to inspect the illuminating power of coal oil. We have had a divergence of views on that. We have had the Minister of Finance say that the law did authorize the inspection, but I did not understand from the Minister of Justice that the law did authorize that inspection. My own idea, looking at the Act as I find it, is that your department has the power to make regulations which would enable you to inspect coal oil in the way we desire it should be inspected. Here is a company that has an immense sale of oil in Canada; it is a monopoly that carries out of the country over $2,000,000 a year in unfair profits, to my mind. It seems to me that we are entitled to know what the policy of the government is before we close this question. Is it the intention of the government to provide for such an inspection of coal oil as will ensure us a satisfactory quality ? If the government refuse to tell us what they are going to do in that respect, it is a proof that that gigantic company has even greater influence than we imagine it has.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not think so, and I do not think that my hon. friend is convinced of what he has said, that the company may have some power over the government or over myself. What I have said is that I will see how we

can remidy the evils complained of in Manitoba, the North-west or any other part of the Dominion ; and before proposing any change in the law, I will ascertain through the Department of Justice how far we can go under the law as it now stands. My hon. friend and myself might discuss the interpretation of the law, but that would have no practical result. What I have stated, and what I repeat, is that as soon as the report from Manitoba reaches us, which will be within two weeks, I shall have the whole question examined, to see what we can do to protect the public. I cannot say any more.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the result of the test of the first sample of coal oil brought from Manitoba ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The result was that it was good oil.

Mr. JOHNSTON (West Lambton). Before this discussion is closed, I would like to say a few words. It seems to me that the mere presence of coal oil on the market is an indication that it has passed inspection by the government.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is the assumption.

Mr. JOHNSTON (West Lambton). To thoroughly get over the difference it would be necessary to examine specimens of coal oil under the Adulteration of Food Act. There is no doubt whatever that it passes inspection in the first place, and if any manipulation takes place, it is while it is in transit to the retail dealer, or at all events before it reaches the consumer. As to Canadian oil being inferior to American oil, the suggestion is perfectly absurd. The best coal oil made on the continent to-day is Canadian oil. That is borne out by every possible test. Canadian water white oil is the best and most economical oil made. Its specific gravity is greater than that of American oil, it has less volatile matter, it burns as clearly, and lasts longer.

Mr. BOYD. We certainly did not have that kind of oil in Manitoba last fall.

Mr. JOHNSTON (West Lambton). You said it was American oil.

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. gentleman's statement be correct, it is very strange that the consumers in the province of Ontario will pay from two to five cents a gallon more for American oil than for Canadian oil.

Mr. JOHNSTON (West Lambton). It is beyond dispute that a great deal of Canadian water white oil is sold in Ontario as American oil.

Mr. BLAIN. If that is true, do you not think it requires some inspection ?

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. Friday.

Hon. Mr. BERNIER.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 14, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk) presented the second report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of the House during the present session as follows :

Friday, March 14, 1902.

The select committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of this House during the present session beg leave to present the following as their second report : Your committee recommend that Mr. Wilfrid Gascon, who has been employed in a temporary capacity on the staff of translators of the official report of the debates from the beginning of the present session, be appointed to the position on the said staff rendered vacant by the death of the late Emile Tremblay, and that his appointment and remuneration, viz., $1,000 per session date from the 13th ult.

All which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) JOHN CHARLTON,
Chairman, pro tem.

He moved :

That the second report of the select committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of this House during the present session be now concurred in.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I must raise the objection that I did before to the adoption of reports the same day as they are presented.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the objection is quite proper and this will be considered a notice of motion.

Motion allowed to stand.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Strait of Canso Bridge Company.—Mr. McLennan.

Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No 48) to incorporate the Montreal and St. Lawrence Bridge Company.—Mr. Madore.

Bill (No. 49) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of John Westren.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company. —Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Dyment Banking, Loan and Savings Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. U. WILSON (Lennox). Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to inquire from the government when I may expect that return in reference to immigration ?

An order of the House was passed on the 19th of last month and I do not see why the return has not been brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I shall have inquiries made at once, and give the information to my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). In the absence of the Minister of Railways, the acting minister promised us some time ago that Mr. Maclean's report on freight rates would be brought down. Is the report ready ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). There are two reports and they are now being printed. I hope to be able to bring them down perhaps some day next week.

REGINA LAW LIBRARY.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved second reading of Bill (No. 19) respecting the Regina Law Library.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). What is this Bill about ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The law library at Regina was created by the government for the use of the judges of the North-west Territories. The territories have now sufficiently developed to have a Bar Association of their own. The intention of the Bill is to relieve the government of any further obligation with reference to the maintenance of that library and to hand it over to the Bar Association. This is done at the request of the association itself.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are you going to get anything for the library ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. The library has been maintained up to the present at the expense of the government, and this Bill is passed with a view that it shall hereafter be maintained at the expense of the Law Association.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You take power for the Governor in Council to hand over the library absolutely upon such terms as they may see fit. I thought perhaps the terms include some payment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It would be useless to do that, because, if we did maintain the library the Bar would have it for nothing. It is thought better to let the Bar have it and be done with it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It would be foolish to try to get anything out of the lawyers at any rate.

Bill considered in committee, reported, read a third time and passed.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE COMPANIES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved second reading of Bill (No. 28) respecting Telegraph and Telephone Companies.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When I introduced this Bill I stated that the intention was to have it referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. I now move that the Bill be referred to that committee.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Very good.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—DUTY ON HORSES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House, and more particularly the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and Minister of Customs to the law that we think is working most unfairly against the horse breeders of Manitoba and the North-west particularly, and also against the interest of the horse breeders throughout western Canada. I refer to the very low rate of the customs valuation at which horses are permitted to come into this country. The minimum value at which a horse may be imported is $15 and at the rate of 20 per cent the duty amounts only to the $3 which is practically nothing. In consequence a very inferior breed of horses has been admitted into the North-west Territories and Manitoba. This practice has a most injurious effect upon the breed of horses. The horse breeders of Manitoba and the North-west Territories have gone to enormous expense in introducing from England, from Scotland, from Ireland and from the United States some of the very best blood to be procured in these countries. The effect has been to produce animals that are a credit to any country. But this has been seriously interfered with during the past few years by permitting cheap, low grade animals to come in at a valuation of $15, or on payment of a duty of $3 per animal. The House will see the injurious effect that this must have on the breeding of horses in Canada. I understand that the evil has reached Ontario, and that car loads and even train loads of horses of this very inferior quality have been brought into that province during the last year or two.

Now, Sir, if there is anything that Canada is capable of producing within its own borders, it certainly is horses, because they will winter out in Manitoba and the North-west Territories and do exceedingly well. I think

it is only necessary to draw the attention of the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) to this matter to show him that it is really in the interest of the horse breeders and agriculturists of Canada that a stop should be put to this practice. Indian ponies, some of the most miserable scrubs to be found anywhere, are being imported, and nearly all the disease that has broken out in Manitoba and the North-west, such as glanders and a low kind of fever, has been traceable to these inferior animals. The Horse Breeders' Association of the Territories and the Horse Breeders' Association of Manitoba have passed very strong resolutions on this subject. I believe the general sentiment is that the valuation of imported horses should be increased to at least $75 or $100. A horse that is not worth that much should not be permitted to come into the country. Any man who has had any practical experience of horse breeding knows that he always falls short of producing what he expects and hopes for—that for every animal that comes up to his expectations there will be nine or ten that will fail to do so. So that we are always able to procure within our own bounds sufficient of the inferior grades of animals; and what we need is a larger number of the higher grade. Therefore, I trust that the government, having had an expression from those who are interested in this matter, not alone in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, but in Ontario, will see their way clear to meet their wishes by raising the valuation to a reasonable rate, which I think should be between $75 and $100.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, I have heard a great many complaints in Western Ontario from those engaged in the breeding of horses and in farming operations about the evil which my hon. friend complains of. The introduction of this miserable class of cayuses, as they are termed—western ponies—which cost practically nothing, will have the effect of greatly deteriorating the quality of the stock in the country if it is not speedily put an end to. It is really a calamity to the agricultural classes of Canada that this trade is permitted, and I beg to ask the government to take the matter into their serious consideration. I think they will find, upon investigation, that it would be a public benefit to prevent the introduction of this class of horses into the country, either by the imposition of high duties or by some effective regulation. We have a good reputation for the character of the horses raised in Canada; and, though that business has been to some degree depressed for a number of years past, it is again becoming a prosperous one. Our horses, especially our fast trotting and our carriage horses, are in good demand in the United States, and our farmers should be encouraged in the production of high grade animals. I can only add my protest to that of the hon. member who has spoken as to the impropriety of permitting this trade in cayuses to continue.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (Western Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, in support of the case which has been presented by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), I do not know that I can do better than read to the House an extract from the last report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Territories, which is as follows :—

> Although the territories, particularly the western portion thereof, are plentifully supplied with native horses of a very low standard of excellence, for which it is practically an impossibility to find a market, the importation of scrub horses is still going on, thus materially aggravating the unfavourable market conditions for the above mentioned class of horses. The United States supplied us with some 6,000 horses during the past year at an average value per head of about $20. Representations have in the past been made to the Dominion government by agricultural societies in the territories, the Western Stock Growers' Association and the Horse Breeders' Association of Manitoba with a view to having the valuation of horses brought in from the United States placed on a reasonable basis. At the present time the minimum valuation is placed at $15. It would appear that no hardship would be inflicted upon dealers and purchasers if this amount were raised to $40 or $50. It may safely be taken for granted that any horse worth less than $50 is not required in this country, either for breeding purposes or for actual use.

I may say that it is not from the point of view of a protectionist in the ordinary tariff sense that I support the plea of my hon. friend. We ask that the change be made for the purpose of protecting the country from the importation of an undesirable class of horses. Nor do the Horse Breeders' Association make the request in the usual protectionist spirit. In a document issued some time ago by that Association, I find the following, written by the secretary. After stating the matter, he goes on to say :

> In submitting the above I am directed by my Executive Committee to point out as emphatically as lies in my power, that the object territorial horse breeders have in view in agitating for the imposition of a minimum valuation on importations of horses, somewhat in keeping with the necessities of the case, is not to secure the benefits of a protective tariff, which such a restriction would naturally amount to were the supply of horses now in the west insufficient to fill the local requirements and the value inflated. What the territorial breeders particularly ask protection against is the importation of inferior stock, which must inevitably lower the standard of horses in this country, already much too low, and consequently the reputation of the territories as a horse producing country.

The idea which I think should prevail in this matter is something similar to that which prevails in regard to the importation of pernicious literature. I do not know

that I would wish to go farther than the association; I do not know that I would wish to go as far as my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), who asks that the valuation be raised to $75 or $100. At the last meeting of the association held in Calgary, a little less than a year ago, a motion was proposed to ask the government to make the valuation $40. An amendment was submitted asking that the valuation be made $35, and an amendment to the amendment was proposed and adopted asking for the fixing of the amount at $50. That is what the association asks, and that is as far as I would ask the government to go.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is pretty good protection.

Mr. SCOTT. That would, I think, fairly and satisfactorily protect the country from animals which may be termed 'scrubs.' I might quote further from a letter which I received from the secretary of the association :

> Our members, who represent every portion of the west, have no desire for protection, as the word is generally applied.
>
> The general idea of urging upon the authorities to have the change in question made is, that in the opinion of the association, horses worth less than $50 each, are not required in this country either for breeding purposes or for actual use.

I hope the government will find that a clear enough case has been made out to warrant their acceding to the request of the association.

Mr. JAMES GILMOUR (East Middlesex). I am glad this matter has been brought up as I myself had intended to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to it. I am personally convinced that there is a great deal of need for raising the valuation of horses brought into this country. There is no doubt that there is considerable disease among the poorer class of horses now brought in from the other side of the line, and some steps should be taken to put a stop to the evil. Dealers bring those small horses in droves north through Alberta up towards Edmonton, selling as they go, and spreading them over the country. I have here the report of Mr. Perry, Commissioner of the North-west Mounted Police, from which I take the following :

> There is one subject that demands attention, and that is the importation of a worthless class of horses, half-breeds and Indians. They go south of the line and acquire a certain number of ponies which they smuggle into the territories. Apart from these being an undesirable class of animal, they are not inspected by any veterinary surgeon, and as a consequence the glanders or other infectious or contagious diseases can be introduced.

It would appear further that even when the smugglers referred to in this report are caught, they are not punished and thus are encouraged to carry on their nefarious traffic. Here is what Mr. Perry says on this point :

> During the past years several seizures of such stock have been made, and in every case the owners have been allowed to regain possession of their horses on paying duty and expenses. In one case where the horses had been brought in by half-breeds some had actually been sold, still they were allowed to pay the duty and go scot free. Until more severe measures are taken Indians and half-breeds will continue to smuggle in horses and take their chances of being caught. If they are caught, it means just paying duty and if not caught they are that much ahead.

These worthless horses range the southern country in large numbers, and but little attention is paid to disease among them. They are extensively smuggled across, and disease is thus spread broadcast throughout our country. I hope that the Ministers of Agriculture and Customs will do something to put a stop to this evil.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I wish we could invent some word that would mean protection, as we all want it, and yet would not spell it, because every man in this country wants protection, but a great many want it under some other name. Some want it so that they may be on equal terms with their opponents, but disclaim the word 'protection.' I heard a ship builder say : We want to be put on as favourable terms as our opponents so that they will not be able to sell ships cheaper to Canada than we can build them for. Our hon. friends in the west disclaim wanting protection, but they want a horse which is worth $5 in the states valued at $50 here, and have the duty charged on that extra value. But, of course, they don't want protection. Well, it is a protection that will suit us.

Mr. POPE. Make it $100.

Mr. OSLER. That would be better and carry out protection to its full extent. I speak as a western man, interested for many years in horse breeding in the North-west, in which business unfortunately I have lost a good many hundreds and thousands of dollars. We imported high class animals from Scotland, and for fifteen or more years have been breeding stock, and our experience is that the low grade stock which comes into the North-west competes with our high grade stock. In connection with my own case, we suffered to such an extent from that competition that we went out of business last year. As an instance of the extent of that competition I may mention that near Edmonton, three years ago, I saw a band of least 500 horses which had been driven across from Wyoming, about a thousand miles distant. Those horses were being sold, from the boundary up to Edmonton, as low, some of them, as $5 a head. It would have been

better for Canada to have paid the value of these horses and shot them as they crossed the border. It is a great temptation to the farmers, who have great difficulty in getting ready money, to buy horses at $10 or $20 a piece, although in a few years time they realize that they have done themselves great injury. If a farmer can get a horse for $10 or $20, he is strongly tempted to buy it, trusting that no matter how poor and miserable it is, it will be able to do the work for a year or two. It is a great pity that the government should allow that class of horses to come into the country. I do not know whether they are inspected as they come over the border or not, but there is no doubt that the evil effects of allowing such poor stock to come in will be felt twenty years hence, and the thanks of the House are due to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) for having brought this matter to our attention.

Mr. ROBERT HOLMES (West Huron). The amusing candor of the hon. members representing the North-west Territories is shown in the fact that they are so exceedingly anxious to have the lowest possible duty on agricultural implements and things pertaining thereto, but the highest possible duty on horses and other animals that are raised there. It shows the insincerity of the protectionist, who changes his attitude according to the interest he considers.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. We raise horses, but we do not make agricultural implements.

Mr. HOLMES. I happen to represent a county in the province of Ontario that claims to raise the best horses in the Dominion, and I have not heard from the consumers of horses, if I may use the term, any special protest against these American horses coming in, the number which is comparatively small. I think that if a party wants to buy a cheap horse, he ought to be allowed to do so. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) gives away the whole case in the admission he makes that the introduction of these horses to the North-west is a serious temptation to the farmer there. The farmer is struggling against the difficulties that he encounters in the North-west, and it may be that he feels like buying a low-price horse. Of course, you do not put on a duty to increase the price, but you put some sort of hindrance in his way, so that this farmer struggling in adversity may not buy the cheap horse, but will be compelled to buy the higher-priced animal. The moment you admit the spirit of paternalism you cannot deal with one interest alone, but must consider the effect upon industry generally. It seems to me that the wise course is, while we have regard to Canadian interests as far as possible—and I am glad to see the development of all Canadian interests—to leave this industry as free from embarrassing conditions as possible.

Mr. OSLER.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). There is a great tendency in the House to run from special cases to generalities. It is impossible to bring up any question, let it be great or small, but forthwith the general politics of the country must be tagged on to it on one side or the other. This question of a proposed minimum valuation of horses certainly has two sides. It is brought up by those who are interested in breeding horses, as distinguished from those who are using horses. It is a question for the House to consider whether the interests of the country at large are to be best served by conforming to the idea of the rearer of horses or of the user of horses. We cannot be on both sides—at least all of us cannot be on both sides of every question all the time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Speak for yourselves, please. We cannot be on both sides of this question at once, but must take sides either with the rearers of horses or the users of horses. Now, as representing probably the largest and most populous agricultural constituency in this Dominion, I have no hesitation on this occasion, in taking sides with the rearers of horses as against the users of inferior horses. Hon. gentlemen who have seen fit to tag on an argument of free trade or protection to this question, who think they have rather struck oil in making an attack on those who are attempting to forward a particular interest of this great country, let me suggest that, while we ask that a minimum valuation be placed upon horses, we are not only willing but we are anxious that horses above a certain valuation shall be admitted free. I think every horse rearer in the country will agree to that proposition. Those who framed the tariff which is in force at the present time saw fit to admit certain valuable horses free, and everybody who is interested in the horse business in this country, agrees that that is a sound business proposition. Then, just as it is reasonable and desirable to admit certain superior classes of horses free of duty into this country, it is reasonable and desirable to exclude, as far as possible, certain inferior classes of horses from this country. Every practical agriculturist thoroughly understands that a good horse is good for the country and a poor horse is bad for the country. The less we have of the poorer class of horses the better. If we are going to great expense, as we are in all parts of the country, individually, municipally, provincially and nationally, to improve our stock of horses; and if we recognize, as we do, the great necessity of that improvement to the highest degree all over the country, then I ask hon. gentlemen, is it common sense to leave the bars down, to allow these efforts that we are making to improve our horses to be destroyed by the influx of an undesirable class of horses? It

has been pointed out that it is this class of horses of low valuation, which, because they are of low valuation do not receive the attention that is given to horses of greater value, that are really the cause of the introduction of diseases of various kinds into our country. These are the horses which frustrate the efforts which we are making to improve our stock both directly and indirectly. I repeat, it is not a question of improving the horse stock of this country by a simple manipulation of the tariff; it is a question of taking such means as may be reasonable and as are necessary to prevent the deterioration of our horse stock by certain means within our knowledge under our control. The suggestion is made that one way of doing this would be to place a minimum valuation on horses brought in from the United States. Any other means that will gain the same end will be entirely acceptable. If any better means can be suggested by any hon. member, I am safe in saying that those who are interested will be glad to accept them. We are not particularly anxious that the improvement shall be brought about by a minimum valuation. That seems a ready and easy means of arriving at this necessary result, to save the pasture of our prairie for valuable stock, to conserve the efforts we are making to improve our horses, to place the horse-raising industry of this country upon the highest level of the whole world, which is what we ought to endeavour to achieve, and what we can achieve, I believe, if reasonable measures are taken. It is quite possible that the country may prosper, and that the horse industry may prosper, whether the present minimum valuation increased or not. But we take the liberty of placing before this House of Commons the facts of the case as practical men, representing a practical question, and we ask for practical action by the House with regard to mere theories.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). I rise to express my sympathy with the efforts that our western friends are putting forth to increase the quality of the Canadian horse. I do not object at all to the attitude they have taken. I believe the precautions that they desire are in the interests of the country. I rise for the purpose of drawing to the attention of the House an exactly similar state of affairs that happens to exist in Ontario. Last week the carriage makers of the Dominion of Canada came down here in a very strong deputation representing nearly $5,000,000 in capital, and they told the government that they were being subjected to unfair competition from the United States. They said, with the excellency of our work we have completely captured the Canadian carriage, cutter and buggy trade. The importations from the outside world are only $39,000 worth, only enough carriages to employ 25 men in their production. We can compete against the United States in their own market, we are willing to put down the bars and let American carriages come in if they will take down the bars and let Canadian carriages go in. We can beat them in neutral markets, we can beat them in their own markets, we can beat them in Canadian markets, because we make a first-class carriage, out of the best material, of the best workmanship, and durable to a high degree. But what troubles us now is, not the importation of a high grade of American carriages, or horses, as our friends from the west might say, but an inferior class of slop work that is being made in the United States, where a factory in Michigan is turning out about 70,000 carriages per annum, made from the refuse of other factories, against which the Canadian manufacturer cannot compete. We say therefore, as our friends say, that we don't want you to raise the duty. The duty is high enough. We can fight against fair competition, but we cannot compete against the scrub horses or shoddy carriages. What we want you to do is to raise the minimum price of a carriage to $50, just as these gentlemen want the minimum price of a horse raised to $50 to keep out the scrub horses. Keep out this American slop work, and allow Canadians to have first-class carriages. Now, we are anxious to keep up the high quality of our horses in Canada. So are we also anxious to keep up the quality of our carriages, so that when a gentleman takes his lady out, or when a more reverend senior goes to church, he can travel in safety without fear of breaking down through being the owner of a slop made buggy. I approve the efforts our friends are making, I hope the government will listen to their request, and that when they raise the scale of horses to $50, they will also raise the scale of scrub carriages to $50.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I hope the House will not think we are all protectionists in the North-west Territories because several hon. gentlemen from that country have advocated the raising of the valuation of a horse coming in from the other side of the line. One of the arguments used has been that we want to improve the stock. I do not understand how raising the valuation of a horse from $15 to $50 is going to have any effect in improving the stock in the North-west Territories, more particularly as we have thousands of the very same class of horses running all over the plains, belonging to the Blood Indians and other tribes. So I do not think that is any argument. Now, with reference to the horses that are coming in. I understand the Territorial Horse Breeders' Association have passed resolutions, which they have sent to every member from the North-west Territories, asking to have the valuation raised. My hon. friend from Toronto, who a moment ago said that he was interested in the horse raising business up there, admitted that there was a certain amount of benefit to the poorer clas-

ses of the community in the North-west by letting these same horses come in at the price they were coming in to-day. He said that farmers going in without much money would be able to buy a cheap team of horses. We know that we are getting into that country at the present time a good class of settlers, and I am pleased to say a great many of them are a better class of people, and are bringing in a better class of horses with them. Still there are parties coming in that cannot afford to buy expensive horses ; and if they need to be able to buy a cheap team of horses to do their work, I think they should be considered just as much as the Territorial Horse Breeders' Association, or the ranchers.

Mr. POPE. Can you break sod with one of these ?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. If you cannot break sod with one of them, you can break sod with three of them, if not with three, with four. Then again, as has been pointed out, you want horses for other purposes besides breaking sod. We have creameries in the North-west Territories, and people who live at a distance from them and who want to take their cream to a factory, cannot take a team of heavy Clydesdales for that purpose ; they have to have driving horses, and they get these horses very cheap. I think the government should make haste slowly in raising the valuation of horses, more particularly as I do not see that it is going to have the effect of improving the stock in the Territories, inasmuch as we have the same class of horses up there ourselves. It is a well known fact that in Alberta to-day you can buy horses for $3 a piece, and they are not imported from the United States, they are raised by Indians up there. I may say it would not be a bad thing if the Indian Department were to take some action with reference to horses running round through the west, belonging to the Indians. It would have a better effect than raising the valuation of the few horses that are brought in from the United States.

Now, with reference to the remarks of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Heyd). I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to go into a budget debate, or to deal with questions outside the one that is before the Chair. But I must say that when my hon. friend talks about a duty on buggies and that sort of thing, I want him to understand that so far as I am concerned, I have not gone back on the faith at all. We do not manufacture anything at all in the North-west Territories, we have to buy our produce from the outside, and we get no benefit from protection at all ; though we are quite willing to bear our share of the heat and burden of the day and to pay a reasonable amount so long as it is a duty for revenue. But when any person commences to talk about imposing taxes, or doing anything else for the purpose of protecting any industry, whether a horse industry, or a cow industry, or any other industry, then I shall certainly oppose it at every opportunity.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) There is one view of this subject that I think is entirely wrong, and that is to place a fictitious value upon anything coming into this country, greater than the article has in the country from which it is exported. I think that principle is wrong from the very outset. I would suggest that those who want to keep these scrub horses out of the Dominion should adopt the American tariff, because no horses are admitted into the United States, so far as I can ascertain, at less than 30 per cent. If you put a specific duty on these horses you would get clear of the trouble.

Mr. R. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Mr. Speaker, as a producer of horses in the province of Ontario, I may say that the farmers in my part of the country feel very keenly the injury that is being inflicted upon them by the importation of scrub horses from the United States. These horses are taking the place of our own horses and greatly lessening the demand for good horses. You can get these imported horses in droves, yet, the hon. gentleman who spoke last tried to make out that the people of Canada wanted to import horses from the United States although there are thousands of Canadian horses running on the prairies of the west. These inferior horses, which are brought into the country and which are useless for all ordinary purposes, displace a great many of our own animals. On the same principle as those who are asking for protection in horses and carriages, we, as farmers, want a tax put on corn, because the free corn imported from the United States displaces a great deal of our Ontario coarse grains. When they want protection for their horses, we want protection for our grain, and I do not care whether they call it tariff, or whether they put a fraudulent valuation on their horses ; as long as they put a high duty on these scrub horses it will satisfy the farmers in Ontario. If the western people are not satisfied with the tariff let them put a fraudulent value on their horses and let the duty be collected accordingly. I am very much pleased that this important question has been brought to the attention of the hon. members of this House. I think, without taking politics into consideration at all, that it will be only fair on the part of the government to impose a higher tariff on the horses which are shipped across the line and which are selling in towns all over the country all the way from $11 up to $30, and which are taking the places of home bred horses that we have gone to such expense to produce. I am glad to hear hon. members of this House calling for protection, or fraudulent valuation, I care not which it may be.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to say a word——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) has already spoken.

Mr. POPE. I think it is in order that some harness maker should speak. We have the horse and buggy but we have no harness.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Barrie, wharfs—reconstruction and repairs, $3,000.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) if he has received a recommendation yet as to where this dock is to be placed in Barrie, and if so, whose recommendation and on what site does he intend to build it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). The chief engineer tells me that it will be at the foot of Bayfield street, although I am not quite sure. We have not carried out the work so far because we have no deed of the wharf property. This is a new one.

Mr. TAYLOR. This item is for reconstruction and repairs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that the word be 'construction' instead of 'reconstruction and repairs.'

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have fixed the place where the wharf is to be built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is to be in the place the hon. minister says ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Bayfield—extension of south pier, $3,600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract and this sum is to complete the work.

Mr. INGRAM. Who recommended this expenditure in the first place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was, I think, the late lamented Mr. McMillan. The work is under contract, the contractor being Mr. Clark, of Goderich.

Mr. OSLER. Is that the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this work approved by the present representative of South Huron (Mr. McEwen) ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not ask his approval. I had no need to do it because the work was under contract.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to know whether the hon. member for South Huron approves of this work. It seems to me that it is an unnecessary work and a useless waste of money. I can see no object in spending this sum of money at Bayfield at all. Perhaps the hon. member for South Huron could give us some information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is now under contract. It is a work that has been in existence for years and one on which the late administration have spent over $70,000. There is nothing new in it. We are simply extending and repairing an old work.

Mr. INGRAM. Years ago, when money was expended on Bayfield harbour, it was really necessary to have a harbour there, but the hon. gentleman has not discovered that the circumstances have changed since then, and I would like to know what use will be made of this harbour. Would boats come in there, or is there a railway that runs to that place ? Is it for the accommodation of a few fishing boats ? I doubt very much whether there are any fishing boats at that port.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never knew that it was necessary to have a railway running to a wharf to make a work of this kind necessary. Very far from it. When there is no railway people are more in need of harbour accommodation.

Mr. INGRAM. What about the boats ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not own any boat there.

Mr. HOLMES. Bayfield has been a port for a considerable length of time, and the hon. member (Mr. Ingram) knows it as well as I do. There is not a great deal of shipping done there now but there is a great deal of fishing, and boats call there just the same.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to hear from the hon. gentleman for South Huron who is well posted as to this work, and he knows that what I say is perfectly true.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) want ? This work was constructed years ago and it cost the late government $70,000. I am not going to remove that work, am I ? This vote is simply to keep it in repair and to extend it a little.

Mr. INGRAM. I will tell the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) what I want. We have a large number of public works in this country on which it is necessary to expend public money, and there are other works on which public money was expended in the past because it was necessary to do so, but on which it is not necessary to expend any more money. In the case of this harbour circumstances have changed, and it is not

necessary now to spend public money on it. What good is there to be gained if there are no boats going to the harbour. It is simply a useless waste of money. Does it follow because a useless expenditure of money has been made one year, that the government is going to continue that useless expenditure for ever. I say we should call a halt in cases like this. I am in favour of spending public money on public works which are necessary, but when it is shown that public works are not necessary I am opposed to spending money on them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot believe that the late government would have spent $70,000 on this work if there was no use for it. Last year I was authorized by this parliament to let the contract and the money was voted. I think objection should have been taken then.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year this item escaped without any discussion, but inquiries have since shown that this is a useless waste of money and I would be negligent in my duty if I did not draw attention to it. I agree with the minister that the expenditure of $70,000 in days gone by was justifiable, but the time has now arrived when a further expenditure on that harbour is not justifiable.

Mr. McEWEN. If hon. gentlemen on the other side object to this work they should have done so last year when the vote was taken. This is not the time to raise a row about this small item. The money was voted last year and the contract let, and this is simply a revote. It is true that money was expended on this harbour years ago, but it must be remembered that large boats called there and that not so long ago either. I remember that the 'Asia' and 'Sovereign' used to call there some years ago, and there is no good reason why when that harbour is finished large steamers will not call there again. Bayfield has no railway and there is consequently all the more necessity for boats calling there. Besides that fact, there is a large number of fishermen at Bayfield, We see that in the lower provinces they build harbours for their fishing fleets, and there is no good reason why Bayfield should not have the same treatment. During the Conservative regime the harbour was allowed to get out of repair ; the sand drifted across a break, and the fishermen could not get in or out. This was not fair. The late government spent money on that harbour on two occasions and the work was swept away. The work done by the present government remains there and is in good shape and what money is being expended now will make the harbour useful.

Mr. CLANCY. It is curious to know the guiding principle of the Minister of Public Works in these expenditures. The hon. gentleman has told us frankly that the late government spent $70,000 on the harbour and that they would not do so if it was not a useful expenditure. It is pertinent to ask the Minister of Public Works now if he ever uses his own judgment. Has he any knowleedge of the present utility of the work. He is not asking money for repairs but to make an extension of an old work and he should produce some report from his engineers as to the necessity for this new work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was represented to me by the late Mr. McMillan, the respected member for that riding, whom we are all sorry is not sitting in his seat in this House—that this was a work of some importance. I find from the records that the late government were so impressed with this, that they bought that work from private owners and spent $70,000 on it. Before reaching a conclusion on this matter I naturally asked for a report from Major Gray, the resident engineer, and in his report dated 27th of April, 1900, he states that he consulted several vessel men of the port with regard to the extension of the pier and they were all of opinion, that the north pier running so much in a southerly direction nearly closes the mouth of the harbour, and that if vessels by any chance miss the southern pier they are at once on shore. Major Gray states that he has himself seen two vessels ashore on that account. It was reported to me officially by an able engineer that the extension of one of the piers was necessary to protect life and property. I do not understand why my hon. friends on the other side from Ontario, object so much to a work for which their own government paid $70,000, and which I am only improving. I cannot understand the position they take unless of course they are acting as they have a right to do—well for political motives, which is not after all very wrong. However, the country will judge of the facts. Here was a work on which $70,000 had been spent by our predecessors, having been bought from private owners, and I cannot understand why there is so much opposition to this vote, especially when a sum of money was voted last year.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the last public money spent on this wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not all the dates here.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Perhaps I can give the House the explanation of the matter. This work is in a constituency which I once had the honour to represent, and I recollect tolerably well the circumstances under which, even when I was in opposition, and when I was not much of a favourite of the government, the late government did spend some money there. The coast of Lake Huron, as most hon. gentlemen who have ever crossed that lake know, is an exceedingly dangerous coast, and very scantily provided with harbours. I think that from Goderich to

Sarnia there are hardly any natural harbours. The consequence is that any vessels, small or large, that miss Goderich in a gale, find it very difficult to get any shelter. The late government thought that it was desirable to establish a small harbour of refuge at Bayfield. That was the reason they gave for the expenditure they entered into. That harbour had, I think, very little trade proper, but it was supposed by the late government, and also by the vessel owners of Goderich, to be of use as a harbour of refuge under certain conditions. The sum demanded by my hon. friend, $3,600, for the extension of the south pier is, I understand, to ensure the harbour being useful for the purpose for which the original expenditure was incurred. These are the circumstances, and they appear to perfectly justify my hon. friend in asking for this vote.

Mr. INGRAM. If the water were deep enough and it were possible for vessels in distress to go into the harbour, there would be some justification for the argument of the hon. gentleman; but there is not a sufficient depth of water, even with the extension of the pier, and that is why I say that this is a useless expenditure. The hon. gentleman knows very well the vessel trade to-day at this point is very different to what it was years ago, when the pier was first built. At that time there were a large number of small vessels, but there are very few to-day.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps I might read a word or two from the debate which took place when this matter was up in 1891. Here is what was said by Mr. Cameron, who then represented that county :

> The hon. gentleman knows that $50,000 has been expended by the government at Bayfield, and I tell him that money has been practically thrown away.

If the expenditure was wrong under the late government, surely at this advanced time it cannot be proper not only to repair the wharf, but to extend it. Perhaps the minister will be good enough to say what is the population of that place to-day, as compared with ten years ago ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I really cannot say what the population is.

Mr. HOLMES. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) is wrong in saying that Mr. Cameron represented that constituency at that time. He did not represent it in 1891.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, he did.

Mr. HOLMES. Well, I will accept that. Bayfield is a small incorporated village. It is true, the trade of the place is not very large, but I think it is necessary that a certain amount of money should be spent there in order to retain the work already done. To dredge out the harbour and make it an absolutely safe harbour of refuge would require the expenditure of several thousand dollars. The money now being spent will, I understand, make it a harbour of refuge for smaller vessels. During the last few years the place has come into prominence as a summer resort, and even many Americans come there.

Mr. McEWEN. The reason this harbour went out of use was because it was out of repair for a number of years, the lake having washed away a part of the pier and covered it with sand. For this reason the vessels could not get in, and the trade fell off. The present government has repaired the pier, and it is now fit for vessels to come in, and consequently the trade will come back.

Mr. BLAIN. Did I understand the hon. member for West Huron to say that the population was now about 1,000 ?

Mr. HOLMES. No, I said the place was an incorporated village, which I understood required 1,000 to be incorporated. I do not know what the population is now.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman lives within a few miles of the place. What is its population ?

Mr. HOLMES. I suppose the population is 800 or 900.

Mr. BLAIN. The fact is that its population is less than it was ten years ago It stands now at 559.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not the fault of the wharf.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the minister intend to dredge this harbour this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think we have yet made up our minds to dredge it. I will look into the question carefully, to see whether it is necessary to have dredging done; but to-day I am only applying for money to extend the pier.

Mr. INGRAM. But the hon. gentleman must see that it is a useless expenditure of money, because even with the extension of the pier the water is not deep enough. If the hon. gentleman is expending the money for the purpose of benefiting the fishermen, half this sum is sufficient, because it would not be necessary to extend the pier, but only to repair it. But, outside of that, this expenditure is a pure waste of money.

Mr. SHERRITT. Who has charge of this work, superintending it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Jonas Marks, who has been recommended by my hon. friend, will have charge of the work.

Blind river—wharf, $6,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where is this Blind river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the north channel of the lake leading to Georgian Bay. It is in the district of Algoma, on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is a lumbering village, situated eight miles west of Algoma, and about eighty miles east of Sault Ste. Marie. The business consists principaly of lumbering. There are two large mills. This is a very thriving farming community. The population at the last census was 600. We have chosen a site, but the deeds are not yet in our possession. The plans are ready and tenders will be called for.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Eleven thousand dollars.

Mr. BLAIN. How much for the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not purchased a site yet, and that is why we have not asked for tenders.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I may be misinformed, but I understand that this is purely a wharf for some American lumbering company who have mills there—that it is solely for their convenience.

Mr. DYMENT. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways has been altogether misinformed. Some years ago there was an old wharf in use there by the Blind River Lumber Company, but that company went out of existence and a new American concern bought out the property, and fitted up this old wharf for their own use. They will not allow other people's boats to tie up at it. Their refusal to allow steamboats from Owen Sound and Collingwood to tie up there obliges the merchants to have their goods landed at Algoma Mills, some seven or eight miles east of Blind river, and thence tranship them at considerable expense by the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is a very good agricultural and farming country back of Blind river—one of the many places in my county which have a very bright future indeed. I can assure the House that this work is absolutely necessary.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why did not private individuals build the wharf ?

Mr. DYMENT. I do not know that there is anybody there really able to build it.

Mr. BLAIN. On whose property is the money to be expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A site is being selected but not bought. There are two sites, and we have chosen one.

Mr. TAYLOR. From whom ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not bought it yet. We have made our choice, as far as the engineer is concerned. We approve that site because it is one on which the work will cost the least.

Mr. CLANCY. It might be fitting for me to call attention to an expenditure that appears on page V—218 of the Auditor General's Report relating to the Sarnia dredging. I asked the hon. gentleman to lay the progress estimates, the advertisements for tenders, and the tenders themselves, on the Table. Can the hon. gentleman now give me the information ? In the meantime, I would like to ask him what the nature of that work is, who owns the dredging plant, if the property on which the work is being done is private property or belongs to the government, the extent of the work, and if the sum expended exceeds the amount first contemplated ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When my hon. friend spoke privately to me, I thought he was referring to the dredging done at Point Edward, but I see now that I did not understand him. My engineer informs me that the work to which he alludes was let by public tender to Mr. O'Leary, and is completed. It was a piece of dredging which was given two years ago. I was away when that piece of work was given out. When my hon. friend spoke to me a day or two ago, I thought he was alluding to the new work carried out at Point Edward. If he wants more information, as to the particular work he now asks about, I will bring it down with pleasure. I will bring down the whole cost.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the hon. gentleman make any inquiry as to whether the work was done on private property or on property which belongs to the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief engineer says that the dredging was done in the channel of the river, as far as he can remember. He will take note of what my hon. friend wants and furnish the information required.

Mr. CLANCY. Another thing I would like him to take note of is this : My information is that this work was done entirely on the property of some American mill owners. I am not finding fault because they are Americans, for we all welcome American capital as we do any other capital, but the minister would be entirely without justification in spending public money on private property. My information is that it has been spent entirely on private property, and that the owners of the property were doing the work with their own dredges—American dredges and American workmen—when Mr. O'Leary stepped in to be rewarded for party services and got the contract and used the dredge belonging to an American company. The dredge is owned by the mill owners who were doing the work themselves before the hon. gentleman stepped in to give Mr. O'Leary some little solace for his disappointment in not getting a certain office. Perhaps

the hon. gentleman can explain whether the plant belongs to Mr. O'Leary, and if not, to whom ? Also, whether the dredging was not being done before by the mill owners, in whose interests this work is being done now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can only repeat what I said a minute ago. The work was given by public tender to Mr. O'Leary, who was the successful tenderer. As to whether the dredge was an American dredge or not, I cannot say now. I was not in the country when that work was awarded. I shall inquire and give the hon. gentleman the information he desires. Perhaps I may be allowed to state that on two or three occasions, if not more, during last year, I was obliged to have recourse to American dredges, because I could not secure Canadian ones. The question was whether an elevator was to be built on Canadian soil or American soil at Port Huron, and we had to make up our minds pretty quick. The Grand Trunk people came to see me, and also the interested parties. The member for the riding represented that the elevator was to be located on the American side unless we did the dredging. We could not secure a Canadian dredge for love or money, so I engaged an American dredge.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose the hon. minister is not giving this as a justification in the case I referred to.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In that case, I was not here, and knew nothing about it personally.

Mr. CLANCY. I hope the hon. gentleman will inform himself and give us the facts later on.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With pleasure.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the work in the River Sydenham completed ? There is no item in the estimate this year. How much of the vote of last year was expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman will repeat his question when the items for dredging are before us I shall be glad to give him information.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the minister to say that a site had been selected at Blind river, but not purchased. On whose recommendation was it selected, and who owns the property ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was selected on the recommendation of the chief engineer.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimate placed upon the site by the engineer is $250.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister select the site and afterwards fix a price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We make a survey with a view to choosing a site, and when we have ascertained the best site, we try to buy it. What else can we do ? We have confidential reports from the engineer, and we do not make public where we wish to buy.

Mr. BLAIN. Who owns the property selected ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I really do not remember.

Bronte—harbour improvements, $3,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Last year $7,000 was voted for this work. Would the minister please state how much of that has been expended, also whether this $3,000 now asked for is likely to complete the work. I might say that it is very desirable that this work should be completed—not only the docks but the dredging. The people are hoping for this, and they expect it. I trust the work will be fully completed during the coming summer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Out of the $7,000 voted last session, $6,209 was spent. The balance will be spent as soon as the season opens. I am glad to say that the $3,000 that I am now asking for will complete the work, and the work will be finished during the present year.

Burlington channel—repairs to pier, $50,000.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). There was a large vote for this purpose last year. How much of it was expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We did not spend very much, because the contractor has only been gathering materials, so far, and has not done much work. We have not given the estimates. The amount spent up to the 15th of December was $1,122.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). That would be for material, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). On which side of the channel is the work to be done ? Is the entire pier to be rebuilt ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are rebuilding the pier on the south side. At first we were not very successful, and had to take the work from the contractor. We are renovating the pier, making it 991 feet long.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What is the amount of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is $96,000.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Are there to be any repairs on the north side of the channel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Will this complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What time has the contractor for the completion of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract is to be completed on the 10th of April, 1903. Practically, this means that it will have to be completed next fall.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Who has the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. James Clarke, of Goderich, the lowest tenderer.

Collingwood—harbour improvements, $40,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister will please give us a full statement of the expenditure there, the depth of water in the harbour, the time when he expects to complete the work and the estimated total cost. I suppose he has had some marine surveyors to survey the channel and will be able to give us all necessary information. I do not object to an expenditure on Collingwood. I think that, perhaps, it is one of the harbours on the lakes that ought to be made a good harbour. When I was in office there was a report in the marine department from Commander Bolton, who had made a survey of the Georgian Bay, and who reported that it would be almost impossible to make a harbour out of Collingwood. He gave a detail of the harbour and his reasons for the conclusions he had reached. What is the width of the channel that the hon. minister is making leading into the harbour

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have dredged a channel 110 feet wide, giving a depth of 20 feet for the whole length from open water to the inside harbour.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the length of the trench, or whatever you call it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The length of channel that we have dredged so far is 2,350 feet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. To complete it, how much will it require ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We want to give it a width of 110 feet and a length of 200 feet. The mouth of that channel is not wide enough. My hon. friend knows that Collingwood, since we have given it that accommodation, has grown a good deal. There is a large ship yard in which two large ships have already been built ; a large saw-mill has been erected during the last year or two, there is a large packing factory, in fact, Collingwood is one of the most thriving towns on the Georgian Bay. Collingwood, Midland, Owen Sound, Meaford, all these towns are getting along very nicely indeed. The width of the channel is not sufficient, because boats navigating those waters are being built of a larger size constantly. A large trade is being done there, and it will be necessary to enlarge that channel. But we do not intend to do a large amount of additional work all at once. This money is especially to enlarge the entrance to the harbour. I have heard about the same statement that my hon. friend has heard, namely, that Collingwood is a difficult port to make. But the fact that there is already a large fleet of steamers visiting that port proves that after all it is not so bad as other ports. I am sorry to add that perhaps there is a little jealousy among certain harbours. But there is no reason for jealousy, because there is trade for them all.

Mr. BLAIN. If that be correct, I would like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that some few years ago an application was made from Port Credit for an expenditure of money to repair and keep up the present pier and dock. At that time it was not definitely promised, but the minister promised the deputation, or the hon. gentleman representing the county at the time, that he would give it his favourable consideration. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could now tell the House, as he has already stated there is plenty for all, that we will come in under that general term.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must say that the word 'all' does not cover what my hon. friend has just suggested. I do not remember at all the fact he has referred to about Port Credit.

Mr. HENDERSON. No doubt the hon. gentleman remembered it pretty well a few years ago, when that county chanced to be represented by an hon. member who supported the present government. He tells us that this harbour does not come under the designation of 'all.' I assume it is because circumstances have changed, and that the county, instead of being represented by a supporter of the government, as it was at the time the deputation waited upon the Minister of Public Works, is now represented by an hon. member sitting on the side of the opposition. I listened to the remarks of the Minister of Public Works, and it certainly struck me in his definite statement that this harbour did not come under the designation that he referred to, and that he intends to perpetuate the policy of assisting only those counties that give the government support. That seems to be the fixed policy of the government ; otherwise I think the hon. gentleman would

meet the wishes of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) as fairly as he promised he would meet the wishes of the former representative of that riding.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not intend in my remarks to convey any such meaning as my hon. friend gathered from them. What I meant to say by the word 'all' was that I did not remember the harbour to which my hon. friend referred. The best evidence that I am not as wicked as my hon. friend thinks, is that I am at this moment carrying on a public work in his own riding.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is just what I was finding fault with. The hon. gentleman is adopting one policy in one riding and another policy in another. Now I do not suppose that it is through any friendliness towards myself that the hon. gentleman is expending public money in my riding. I assume that he has some other motive, that he must consider the work a necessary work. Surely nothing else would induce him to spend public money in a riding that for the last ten or twelve years has been represented by a member opposed politically to him. I have found no fault whatever with the expenditure that he has made in my riding; I thank him very kindly for it. I know that it was not on account of my request alone that he spent that money. Requests came from other sources as well and as long as the money was spent there I have certainly accorded my hearty support to the Minister of Public Works, so far as that item was concerned. I feel grateful to him, and I hope that work will not be the last. The fact is that the Liberal party, or the party represented by the hon. gentleman, has expended more money in the riding I represent than was ever spent by the party that I have the honour to belong to. But I do not know why they should not apply the same principle to the riding of my neighbour, the hon. member for Peel. Why should I get any preference? Have I treated the government with more leniency? Have I failed to criticise the minister in his administration of the department as strongly as my hon. friend has done? I do not know why he should make fish of one and flesh of another. These are both fishing stations, and if Bronte is entitled to an expenditure of $17,000, I think Port Credit is fairly entitled to some consideration as well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not said that I would never pay any attention to Port Credit. During the last two days I have received I suppose 25 or 30 petitions for work that I have not been able to accede to, and my hon. friend must not be surprised if, on the spur of the moment, I am not prepared to say that I will do any work at Port Credit.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. minister will promise the House to put something in the supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is the council, I have no right to go ahead of my colleagues.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. My hon. friend has as good as a promise from the Minister of Public Works that the matter is under his consideration, and probably there will be an item in the supplementary estimates for him. However, in reference to Collingwood harbour, if I understand the minister aright, he intends to expend this $40,000 which he is asking us for now, to widen the prism from 110 to 200 feet. A great part of it is for that purpose. I quite concede the necessity of the work. Fancy a vessel coming into the port of Collingwood with a side wind, passing down 2,300 feet, as the hon. gentleman says this canal is in length, and keeping in a channel 110 feet wide! It would be a pretty difficult thing to do in day time, especially when a vessel was passing out, but at night I do not see how it is possible even with a breadth of channel of 200 feet. I suppose the hon. gentleman has the whole channel lighted with electricity from the commencement to the end, so that ships would be able to use the channel at night.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That does not come under my charge. There is already at Collingwood a large fleet of steamers. The Great Northern Navigation Company have a large fleet, and all their boats call at Collingwood. Collingwood is one of the most important points on the Georgian bay now.

Mr. OSLER. Collingwood is a very prosperous town. A very large fleet of boats is now laid up there for the winter, and Collingwood is probably one of the largest grain shipping points on the lake. Nature never intended it for such a port, because, I suppose it is about as difficult and bad a harbour as we could find on the lakes; yet, the business has grown up there and shipping has made that a port to an extent not equalled by any other port on the lakes. I suppose, that being the case, the government must go on spending money, but it is going to cost a million dollars before they can make it a port such as it ought to be to accommodate the trade. Increased shipping must come there if the shipping continues to increase on the great lakes as it has done during the last three years. An enormous amount of money must be expended, because this is probably the most important shipping point on the great lakes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report of the engineer, after a very careful examination into the matter, is to the effect that with $120,000 of an expenditure we will be able to give a width to the whole channel of 200 feet.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year there was $202,000 expended on the Collingwood harbour, there was $25,000 in the ordinary estimates

and $8,000 in the supplementary estimates besides $40,000 this year which would make a total of $275,000 expended on the Collingwood harbour. Would the hon. gentleman tell us if these figures are correct, how much more he will require to complete Collingwood harbour and also what success the shipyard is meeting with there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just stated in discussing the position with my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) that the estimate of the engineer of the department, after a careful examination, is that with $120,000 we would be able to provide a channel 200 feet wide and 20 feet deep in Collingwood harbour. Besides this $40,000, if we want to go on with the widening of the channel, we will have to ask parliament to vote an additional sum of $80,000 to complete the channel to a width of 200 feet.

Depot Harbour—breakwater, $65,000.

Mr. INGRAM. There was an item last year for Depot harbour which the hon. minister will see, if he will look at page V—209, of the Auditor General's Report. I notice that for advertising, $629.61 was expended, and on King's Printer's account, $49.72. The money we are asked for here is for work to be done at Depot harbour. How was this money expended for advertising ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Tenders were asked for the work, and the reason why the money was paid is that when tenders are asked for works of that importance, we, of course, advertise in more papers than we do when calling for tenders for smaller works. Tenders were asked and received, the lowest being that of Mr. J. T. Davis for $157,500. After the tenders were received, we discovered that soundings and borings had not been taken in a sufficient manner. Perhaps the committee will understand me better if I am able to show a plan of the harbour. If some of the hon. gentlemen who take an interest in this work will come to the Table, they may have a look at the plan. Here is the harbour and here is Mr. Booth's elevator. Here is an island. Mr. Booth has built all of that harbour with his own money. He is about the only man in the country who has built a harbour with his own cash, his own money and credit.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where do you intend to spend the money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Here is the island. The entrance to the harbour is not sufficiently protected and it is intended to build this breakwater here.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will it cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The lowest tender put in was for $157,500, but my engineers, taking for granted that the examination and survey made by Mr. Booth's engineer were right, did not make the borings here, which they should have made. My hon. friend has been in the department and he knows what takes place often. When the tenders were received, I was warned by somebody that borings should be made. I went up myself with a boat, I had borings made and I find that instead of there being hard material in the bottom of the harbour such as we had supposed, there was silt carried in by the water. We had provided for only four feet of settling in the crib-work, but instead of four feet, we discovered that the settling would be about fifteen feet. But, before discovering that, thinking that there would be only a few feet of settling, I had agreed with the contractor to give him so much per cubic yard to throw stone into the cribwork there, but I found out afterwards that it would settle fifteen feet and then I stopped the whole thing because the additional work necessary to make it safe would cost about $30,000. The whole matter is now before my colleagues.

Mr. KEMP. Did Mr. Booth build a dock there at all ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, he has built the whole thing himself. Mr. Booth spent $750,000 of his own money, and we thought it was about time that the government should do its share of the work.

Goderich harbour—dredging, $10,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Let us hear about Goderich harbour. We have not heard of it before.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Goderich harbour is one of the most important harbours on Lake Huron. There is a large trade at that point. There are two elevators, and a new one has been built during the last two years. Unfortunately that harbour is one of those on the lakes that fills. The piers were in a very bad condition, we had to repair them, and we had to dredge a good deal. If we were going to listen to all the demands made upon us, we would have built a large breakwater. It may have to come later on if the trade develops. For the time being we are bound to give a little more accommodation by dredging.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was there not a plan adopted by your department some time ago, by which this silting of the sand would be prevented. There will be an eternal expenditure if you are going to dredge every time after a storm.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have received a petition which states that if there was a breakwater it would prevent the silting, but I doubt that very much. It would cost a large amount of money and I have not yet made up my mind to grant the petition.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand there was a plan recommended in regard to Port Dover and Goderich and a harbour in Prince Edward Island, in which the sand silts in a similar manner.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Toronto harbour is in the very same position. This silting of the sand is one of the most difficult problems we have to solve.

Mr. INGRAM. Are Martin & Co. doing the dredging there ? How are they getting on ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. They are getting on very well.

Mr. INGRAM. Were they the only contractors ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Did Mr. McGillicudy have anything to do with that work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. McGillicudy had nothing to do with the dredging to my knowledge. He was the lowest tenderer on another contract and my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) might get work to-morrow if he does me the pleasure of tendering, and if he is the lowest tenderer.

Mr. INGRAM. If the minister's statement is correct, he cannot refer to the original contract.

Mr. HOLMES. That was a newspaper mistake. Mr. McGillicudy never got a contract for dredging although the papers said he did. He had a contract for the breakwater.

Mr. INGRAM. I never heard the report contradicted that he got a dredging contract.

Mr. HOLMES. It was contradicted in this House.

Mr. INGRAM. This work is done at the rate of $8 an hour. Have they taken out the number of yards required ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer explains that in certain parts of the work there was rock and hard pan, and of course they could not take out the 600 yards a day in that kind of work.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is this the usual way of letting dredging contracts ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope the time is not distant when the department will have enough dredges to do its own work. Dredging is now paid for at the rate of $8 an hour, 600 yards a day, making 13⅓ cents a yard, and we have found no means of doing it cheaper unless we do it ourselves with modern dredges. That is the reason why I ask parliament for money to build dredges because they will do cheaper and quicker work.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the minister explain why he is paying 13⅓ cents a yard here, when he is getting it done in Sarnia at 9½ cents a yard ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer explains that the work to which my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) objects——

Mr. CLANCY. The minister had better not put words in my mouth. I am simply asking for information and he has no right to say that I am objecting.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very glad my hon. friend does not object to the work. I was not here when that contract was given. There is dredging which costs less, but it all depends on the material which is dredged.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister has not yet explained why he paid 9½ cents a yard in Sarnia and a larger sum at other places.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer explains that that was a lump sum contract and it worked out in that way.

Mr. CLANCY. I hope the minister will lay on the Table after dinner the papers I asked for, namely. the contract, the tenders, the progress estimates, and so on.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That cannot be done to-day.

Mr. CLANCY. Then you had better let the item stand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am asking $75,000 for general dredging and we will discuss it on that vote. I pledge myself to bring down the papers. It is nearly six o'clock now and the employees have left their offices. I cannot get the papers to-night. I will bring them down with pleasure on Monday.

Mr. CLANCY. This item does not come under the vote for general dredging. There was a specific sum voted for it last year, and it has appeared in the estimates many years. The hon. gentleman had not the courage of his convictions, to spend the money until after the elections ; but as he repented and spent it some time, I am not disposed to raise objections to the work. I simply inquired whether it was to be continued.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not understand what my hon. friend wanted. I pledge myself to bring down the papers on Monday, and lay them on the Table of the House.

Mr. KEMP. I notice that the principle of paying $8 an hour for dredging is in vogue in different parts of the country. I would like to ask the minister if the dredges which are paid at that rate are of the same capacity, and is there an officer of the government on the dredges to check the time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All the dredges are not of the same capacity, but we exact from them 600 yards a day. There is an officer on board each dredge, and at the end of the month we make up the figures, and we only pay according to that rate.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). It seems to me the work would be done much more cheaply if the contract were at so much a yard. I can understand that a dredge working by the hour, even if there were a government officer around, would do less work than if working by the yard. What is the objection to doing it by the yard ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because we have tried it, and it has always cost more. I hope the House will agree with me that it is time for us to do our own dredging at a cheap rate. With a modern dredge you can always be sure to do the work for three or four cents a yard. We are now paying thirteen cents a yard. I am proud to say that we are doing it at much less than other departments, although I do not find any fault with them.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman ever expect to have dredges enough at his disposal to go from one end of Canada to the other and do these small parcels of work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I expect, within two years, at the beginning of the season following the coming season, to be able to carry on our work in Ontario, or most of it. We are building at Sorel one large dredge, and we are beginning to build another one. We have in British Columbia a small suction dredge, which dredges about 12,000 yards a day, and I am building one for Ontario on the same lines. There is a vast difference between that and the small dredges which do only 600 yards a day.

Mr. KAULBACH. Will the hon. minister inform me how many dredges the government claims to own ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers tell me that we own nineteen.

Mr. KAULBACH. How many more does he think the government will require in order to meet the calls on his department for dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The number would be sufficient, in my opinion, if all the dredges were up to date. For instance, the large dredge which we are building at Sorel for the maritime provinces will alone do more work than all the dredges we have in those provinces at present.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. gentleman has frequently told me that he has been unable for the want of dredges to complete some work I have applied for time and again in my county. Will the hon. minister come under a contract with me to employ dredges which I will build, and pay me the same amount of money that he is now paying to other parties for doing that service ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. member were unwise enough to enter into such a contract, he would lose his seat, and I would not like to see him leave the House.

Mr. KAULBACH. I would run that risk.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman might adopt the plan followed by a member of parliament who owns a dredge on the Georgian bay, but keeps it in the name of some friends.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not do anything of the kind.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. I did not say he did it. He knows the case I refer to, because it is notorious.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a bad case if it is true.

Kingsville—repairs to wharf and breakwater piers and extension of western piers, $15,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Explain this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is composed of a revote of $5,000 and a new vote of $10,000 to complete the work. Kingsville is in Essex county. Governments past and present have spent a pretty large sum of money on this harbour. The total expenditure up to the 31st December last was $85,951. I spent up to the 31st December, $7,836, and I expect to spend up to the 30th June, $7,000 additional, to complete the work, that is, to extend one pier, to make repairs to the piers, and to dredge a little.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman give us an idea of the number of boats that run in and out there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have in my hand a note to this effect, that this harbour is much resorted to for shelter by vessels of small tonnage and light draught. There is a regular line of steamers running between Windsor and Pelee Island, which calls at that place.

Meaford Harbour, Ont.—dredging and pile works, $30,000.

Mr. SPROULE. In what condition is the dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contractor, Mr. Piggott, is going on fairly well now—better than in the past—and we expect the work to be completed shortly. There is not only dredging but an extension of the pier and some sheet piling work. The work will be completed, I hope, in the month of September.

Mr. SPROULE. About how much dredging remains to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About half the dredging has been done.

Mr. SPROULE. Has there been any application made for piling on the west side of the harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember, but no doubt some applications will be made. I remember now that there has been a verbal application.

Mr. SPROULE. How far was the breakwater extended out ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Three hundred feet.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the dredging along the wharf and the elevator finished.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dredging has been carried out the whole way in deep water. Meaford is one of the harbours in which I have great confidence indeed. There is a large trade there, and the Grand Trunk Railway is encouraging them to build a large elevator.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad to know that the hon. minister hopes to finish this work at an early date. Some more important work will still be needed on the west side, but the work so far as it has gone, has given great satisfaction. The dredging done so far enables the largest vessels to reach the elevator. And although the dredging was only completed late in the fall, over a million and a half bushels of grain were handled in that elevator last fall. And as the road from there to Collingwood is very level, it is one of the points where the Grand Trunk railway can handle grain very easily. There is deep enough water close to the end of the dock to float the largest vessels that sail on the lake. What is most urgently needed now is dredging, and the people are grateful for what the hon. minister has done so far.

Midland Harbour--dredging, $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. How much was expended last year and what was paid for the dredging per hour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not got that information under my hand, but will bring it down Monday.

Mr. BENNETT. In what part of the bay was the money expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have deepened the channel just at the entrance, as my hon. friend knows, leading to the large smelting mill. I have spent the money where the Grand Trunk Railway and the smelting people asked me to spend it, and tried to guide my action by the requirements of the large interests concerned in Midland. Midland, like Collingwood, is one of the most thriving ports on the Georgian Bay, and if the Grand Trunk Railway do what I understand some of their people intend doing, we may have pretty large results there. If the Grand Trunk Railway make up their minds to double their track from Midland to the city of Montreal, we will have a large amount of traffic at that port.

Mr. BENNETT. I have no objection to the expenditure on dredging last year, but the dredging has not been done in what is known as the harbour proper. The harbour is one and a half mile wide, and some years ago docks were built there by the Grand Trunk Railway, but the receding waters necessitated dredging in front of these docks. I think that considerable of the money has been expended in that way.

We have from time to time vessels carrying a quarter of a million bushels of grain and even of greater capacity, so that a very considerable depth of water is required. As to the money expended at the smelter, that expenditure is a commendable one. That concern is one of very considerable proportions, with a pay roll of $13,000 a month. These docks were not built in sufficiently deep water, and the money was spent last year in dredging opposite the smelter, so as to give two or three feet more water and accommodate larger vessels.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Grand Trunk is asking us to give a depth of 20 feet.

Mr. BENNETT. That is necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Up to the 30th November last we spent during the last two years $15,000 in dredging. I am just now giving more attention to this port in view of the statements made to me by the railway companies, and I cannot say what will be the result of the information that is conveyed to me. I cannot say what we may do in the supplementary estimates, but I must state once more my firm hope that we will not lose sight of the necessity of doing everything to improve our St. Lawrence route. If the railway companies want to work with us from a Canadian standpoint, I have no doubt that the government and the House of Commons will understand the position and do the right thing at the right time.

Mr. BENNETT. I think that the proposed expenditure during the coming season will commend itself to the citizens of the town. These two large elevators had originally twenty feet of water. But within the last ten years, the waters of the Georgian Bay have receded three or four feet. I think it is quite right to restore the depth of twenty feet, as proposed.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Is it possible that Midland requires $8,000 for dredging ? I always understood that there was plenty of water there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To do the dredging that ought to be done there would require about $50,000.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Perhaps it would be as well for the minister to tell us where Midland is. I have heard a great deal about it but never saw it. It is proposed to expend $8,000, but the minister says it will require $50,000. If this harbour is necessary and the expenditure is necessary to the harbour, by all means do the work well while you are at it.

Mr. DYMENT. Where is Midland ?

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). That is what I want to know. I will get there if I live.

Oakville—repairs to east pier, &c., $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the work.

Owen Sound Harbour—dredging and pile protection to works, $24,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is under contract.

Port Hope—repairs to piers, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the work.

Presqu'Isle—purchase of wharf and repairs, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that that item be struck out.

Mr. HALLIDAY. There was a grant last year of $5,000 for Presqu'Isle harbour. Was any of that spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. And I am moving to strike out this item.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why was the item put in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because I thought it could be used. I went to negotiate for the purchase, but the price was too high, so I made up my mind not to do it at all.

Motion agreed to.

River Ottawa—improvement of narrows at Petewawa, above Pembroke, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is an old contract which was in existence when we took office. It is a work of dredging in the Ottawa, by Mr. Poupore.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Poupore is the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, Mr. George Poupore.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How much has been expended, and for what object ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have paid no money. It is a bulk contract for $7,000. It is not completed, and we have not paid a cent. The work is going on now. I saw it when I was up there last year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What navigation can there be on the Petawawa ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is certainly navigation there. I passed there in a steamer last season.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We should concentrate our efforts upon the Ottawa river and the Georgian Bay canal and not upon these smaller streams.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is mistaken. This is for the removal of shoal in the Ottawa river. The contract was given in 1895. But, on account of a mistake which Mr. Poupore said he made, he found that, instead of sand, he had to take out stone and hard-pan. So you can see he is not going very fast.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This, then, is for the improvement of the navigation of the Ottawa opposite the entrance of the Petawawa ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the improvement of this particular portion come in useful if we build the Georgian Bay canal ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no doubt about it being built, is there ?

Mr. INGRAM. If I may be permitted, I would like to ask a question concerning the item about Presqu'Isle. Would the hon. minister tell us why no money has been spent and the item is now dropped ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far, not a cent has been spent, I believe.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year, when the hon. minister asked for this sum of money he said that hundreds of Liberals and Conservatives had sought to have this work done. He said this was a very fine country and the work was really necessary. Why did he drop it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I tried to purchase the work but they asked too much. Is the hon. gentleman displeased that I did not buy it ? He was displeased last year when I proposed to buy it, and now I understand he is displeased that I have decided not to buy it. I do not know exactly what I am to do to satisfy the hon. gentleman.

Mr. INGRAM. Instead of being displeased I am very much pleased, and I commend the course the hon. minister has taken. This is in accordance with what I told him, that when he is right I am ready to stand up and declare my approval, just as I am ready to condemn him when he deserves it. I do not seek to make party capital out of this matter—there are plenty of chances beside this.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to call the attention of the hon. minister to a promise he made last summer in the riding of East

Simcoe. I would like to read an item from a newspaper, and after he has heard it read, I hope he will devote the money he at first intended for Presqu'Isle to this dock which he promised at Orillia. The Orillia 'News Letter' says :

You will remember the beautiful summer evening last July when the Hon. J. Israel Tarte stopped off here for an hour or so, and incidentally took a jaunt down to Couchiching Beach along with the mayor and some of the councillors. The band was at the park on this particular evening, as were also about 1,500 townspeople composed mostly of Orillia's gayly dressed fair sex. It was just the usual Friday night at the park, but to the minister the scene was a revelation. In fact, so enchanting was it he immediately promised us, as he stood on the shore and waved his hand along the beach, a new $3,000 wharf right away. 'I make this bequest on account of the many beautiful ladies,' said the Honourable Israel. This was very gallant, indeed, and the ladies all appreciated it, as did also the rest of the townspeople as we thought the long-felt want would be at last fulfilled. We failed to write it on a card and attach the same to his person so he has forgotten. And to think he would go back on the ladies ! Barrie is to get $3,000 for its new wharf. Oh! Israel.

In view of the solemn and gallant promise made to the ladies, I hope the hon. minister will put in the supplementary estimates the money he intended for Presqu'Isle, and devote it to the wharf at Orillia.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On a beautiful evening in the month of August last I had the pleasure of calling at Orillia. It is a fine town, with a beautiful park, and I must confess——

An hon. MEMBER. You were seduced.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was seduced by the beauty of the ladies of that town, by their elegance, and by the great kindness they showed to a poor little French Canadian Minister who was travelling into those parts of the country. Well, I did not make a formal promise, but I went pretty far. I spoke of $3,000—yes, I think I mentioned the figure. I said if a vote of $3,000 will build a wharf, I will ask my colleagues to allow me to do so. There were splendid yachts on the lake. Really, it is one of the most beautiful lakes, one of the most beautiful places, in the country. I expect to fulfil my promise. I try not to go back on the ladies. I have never been accused of that so far.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the British Columbia and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Riley.

Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Mr. Emmerson.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

River St. Lawrence—dredging steamboat channel through shoal at foot of Wolf Island, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The object of this work is to dredge a channel at the foot of Wolf Island to allow steamers to call at Kingston, and then go over to the American waters. I have made a complete survey of the whole work. It is to allow American boats to take supplies at Canadian ports.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this cover the whole of the dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At the foot of the island, yes.

Sault Ste. Marie—harbour improvements, including dredging of approaches, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Every one knows that we have not enough water to allow Canadian boats to go to our wharfs. Canadian boats passing through the Canadian, Sault Ste. Marie canal, are obliged to go to the American side to load and unload. I am going to give an additional depth of water so as to allow them to go to the wharfs on the Canadian side.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount which will be required to finish the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $50,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has this been let by contract, and if so, who has the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not given any contract as yet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have not expended any money as yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well then, I want a promise from the hon. minister that he will let it by contract unless he has a dredge of his own.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very well, I have no objection to do that.

I am perfectly ready to ask for tenders. If my hon. friend will allow me, perhaps, I will make a promise that is not in the right direction. I have had a long experience in the House. I will ask for tenders and make a test. It is quite possible that the man who will be the lowest tenderer will not have the plant necessary to perform the work. I will make a test of it. It has happened before, often and often since I have been in office, that a man who has put in the lowest tender has not the equipment necessary to do the work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We must insist that the Order in Council shall be carried out which provides that where there is an expenditure over a certain amount, tenders shall be asked for and the contract given to the lowest tenderer. If the hon. minister has a dredge of his own which he can use for the purpose it is all right, but if not, we must insist upon tenders being asked for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a perfect right to do otherwise, but I will ask for tenders in this case just to make a test of it. Let us not discuss the Order in Council now; I will make a test of it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Suppose it costs a higher amount, it is better in the public interest and it is better in the interests of public morality that a contract should be given although it costs a higher amount unless the department has a dredge available for the purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will do it this time.

Mr. SPROULE. There seem to be conflicting rumors as to the depth of water in the Sault Ste. Marie canal. I would like to ask the hon. minister what is the depth of water in the Soo canal on the mitre sill, and how much money would be required to complete the dredging sufficient to give a uniform depth of water. It was put at 19 or 20 feet before.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot speak as to the depth of water in the canal myself. That is not in my charge, and I do not like to speak of a matter in another department. I speak only of the dredging in the harbour itself. When my hon. colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) is in his seat, if the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) renews his question, I am sure he will get the information he desires.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister of Public Works is asking for authority to spend money in the harbour, and the approaches to the Soo canal so as to improve them for the purposes of navigation. He should have some plans before him showing the depth of water there, and how much dredging is required to give the uniform depth of water that he requires for navigation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a plan and a survey of the work I am going to carry out, but I must ask the hon. gentleman not to say that I should give information in regard to a matter that does not belong to me. My hon. friend is asking me to give him the depth of water on the mitre sill of the canal. The canal is not under my control; it is under the control of my colleague the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. As to the harbour it is of an unequal depth. There are spots where there are 15 feet of water and there are other places where there are 18 feet. We are going to give a uniform depth of 20 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. At the approaches as well as in the canal?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The canal I do not want to speak of. My colleague the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals knows more about it than I do.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The depth of water on the mitre sill of the lock of the Sault Ste. Marie canal is the same as that of the canal on the American side, namely, 20 feet. In order to have a 20 foot navigation you want to dredge the approaches to the wharfs and to the locks and to provide more than 20 feet of water. You require to provide for a 21 foot navigation.

Mr. SPROULE. In the canal, I take it, there is 20 feet of water, and the hon. Minister of Public Works will endeavour to have a uniform depth of 20 feet in the harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You want to go one foot deeper.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer reminds me that when I say 20 feet, I mean 20 feet clear. If I am not mistaken we have only 19½ feet on the mitre sill of the Canadian canal.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there only 19½ feet on the mitre sill ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is only my information; it is not in my department.

Mr. SPROULE. We want to settle this question. The member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says the depth is 20 feet, but I have heard it emphatically denied that it is 20 feet. We ought to have a statement from somebody who is able to state authoritatively what the depth is.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My colleague, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, has in his estimates an item for dredging the approaches to the canal,

and when that item is under consideration the hon. member for East Grey can get an answer to that question. I do not want him to insist upon me giving an answer in regard to a matter which belongs to another department.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is this dredging to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in the harbour; it is not in the canal at all.

Mr. SPROULE. It says 'dredging of approaches.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It does not mean the approaches to the canal. The harbours are under my care and the canals and their approaches are under the control of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Except from Nipissing to the Georgian Bay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not a canal. The improvement of rivers is not under the care of the Department of Railways and Canals although they have done a good deal in the past which they had no right to do. The lakes are not under the charge of the Railway Department. There is no doubt as to that. I have secured legal opinion upon that point, but in this case the question does not arise because it is purely and simply a harbour work.

Mr. SPROULE. I misunderstood that. I thought it meant the approaches to the canal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The control of the rivers, or the deepening of them, depends entirely on whether the hon. minister is able to impress his individuality on the rest of the government or not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think it depends on that at all, because the law is perfectly clear. The rivers and lakes are under the Public Works Department, but I may say that in the past the individuality of the Minister of Railways and Canals impressed itself a little too much. I certainly would not allow that now for this excellent reason that the Railways and Canals constitute one department and the Public Works another department. I feel quite able to carry out the work that is under my care, as my colleague, I have no doubt, feels quite able to carry out the work under his care.

Southampton—improvement of harbour, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is going to be done here ? For how many years will we find this item appearing in the estimates before it is used ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The item is only here for one year, and that is not so long. We are preparing the contract now. Southampton is an important port especially in view of the fact that Mr. Clergue is going to build the Algoma Central Railway, and Southampton is expected to be one of its terminals. The contract is under way. It is an extension of the landing pier so as to stop the filling up of the harbour. When that extension is made, a little dredging will make it a very good harbour indeed.

Mr. SPROULE. What dredging has been done this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not dredged this year in that part of the harbour. We have dredged in the river.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of an improvement is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is an extension of the pier so as to form a kind of closed harbour with an entrance. We will dredge inside the harbour when that extension is completed, and it will not fill up again.

Mr. SPROULE. How much will this work cost when finished ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The whole thing, extension and dredging, will cost in the neighbourhood of $50,000.

Mr. SPROULE. And you are commencing an undertaking here which means $50,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Which may mean $50,000.

Mr. SPROULE. But the minister must have some definite data to justify him in asking this vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When completed the work will cost in the neighbourhood of $50,000.

Mr. SPROULE. It will be let by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HALLIDAY. Before this vote is adopted, I would like to ask the minister a question or two. This is the harbour to which Mr. Clergue is building his railroad, but there is before the government a petition asking that certain improvements should be made in Tobermory harbour. Tobermory is one of the most important harbours on the lake, and I think myself that it is probably the best harbour on Lake Huron. At times you will find fifteen or twenty vessels in that harbour. They have no dock to tie up to and the government has never expended any money there. It would be of very great public utility if improvements were made at Tobermory harbour to facilitate the shipping on the lake.

I trust that when the supplementary estimates come down the minister will see fit to include an appropriation for the building of a dock at Tobermory harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have received a request for harbour works at that place. The chief engineer tells me that we have given instructions that a complete survey shall be made. When that survey has been completed I will be in a position to say more than I can now in reference to Tobermory harbour.

Mr. BENNETT. In addition to what my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. Halliday) has said, I would point out that Tobermory, or 'the Tub,' as it is familiarly called, is one of the most wonderful harbours to be found on the continent. It would seem as though nature herself had planted it there as a refuge for sailors in stress of weather. I have never understood that there was particular necessity for docks there, but there is certainly a great necessity for having proper iron hooks and things of that kind placed in the rocks so that boats may be tied up. I would not say that docks are not necessary, and my hon. friend (Mr. Halliday) can speak with very great authority on that point. Those who are conversant with the shipping on the lakes know that Tobermory harbour is a perfect Godsend to mariners, and the department could not do better than direct its attention to improving that place.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The next time I go up there I will see that harbour.

St. Joseph, Lake Huron—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. SHERRITT. Might I ask the Minister of Public Works what will be the total cost of that wharf when it is completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Even if no question had been asked, I would have given some explanation as to that work. St. Joseph is on Lake Huron, between Goderich and Bayfield. Two years ago, two deputations came to see me, one from Montreal and one from the county of Huron. It was represented to me that French Canadians had been induced to come from Chicago and settle there in large numbers. Mr. Cantin and the priest headed that deputation. They represented to me that they had organized a plan of immigration, that there was a saw-mill to be established, and that there was a brick yard with a large trade.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is the saw-mill there at present ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, there is a small saw-mill and a brick yard there also, though not a very large one. I will place myself in the hands of the House and state the case fully. That argument was advanced to me by the people who had already settled there. A gentleman by the name of Cantin was at the head of the whole thing. Mr. Macmillan, the then member for the riding, was favourable to the project. I had a preliminary survey made. Then a deputation came from Montreal. Mr. Vallee, who I am sorry is dead now, was at the head of that deputation. I knew him very well. He was a large hotel owner, and an enterprising man, and a man of substance. He represented to me that he had formed a company to build a large summer resort hotel. This was two years ago, and the hotel has been undertaken but not completed. I placed an amount in the estimates on these representations that I submitted to my colleagues. On the representations that were made in Chicago and which were, I suppose, the same as made to me, a certain number of families, I believe about twenty-five families, came from Chicago and settled there. The brick yard was started; the hotel was started, and so on. I may say that the village has not made a great deal of progress. I think there are about 150 people who have left Chicago to settle there, and the priest who lives there came to see me again three or four weeks ago. I did not know whether to ask my colleagues and the House to leave this item in the estimates or not. This gentleman with two or three others came to me and represented to me that if we did not discourage them, there would be a considerable immigration from Chicago and other American centres to that place. On the strength of these statements I have allowed the item to remain in the estimates. There is the whole thing in two words.

Mr. SHERRITT. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question, what is this harbour going to cost when finished ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not going to spend more than $8,000 there. There was $5,000 given already, and I ask for $3,000 more. My engineers have given special attention to that harbour, especially Mr. Roy, whom I sent there, and they state that $8,000 will be sufficient for the requirements of the work. They say that a small brick yard which is there at present will develop, and will do an export trade in brick to Chicago. Those people are settled there rightly or wrongly. I state the case as it has been represented to me, and I leave it in the hands of the House.

Mr. SHERRITT. What depth of water will this wharf give ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between eight and ten feet.

Mr. SHERRITT. Have you purchased the land ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I have not. I have not done anything yet, except survey the place carefully.

Mr. SPROULE. Who owns the land ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know. In point of fact, I have done nothing. There has been a stoppage of the whole thing. I think it is an interesting place. I believe there will be a large immigration there. We are paying large sums of money to bring people from Russia, Poland, and all parts of the world, and I thought it would be a good thing to bring a few dozen French Canadians to invade Ontario.

Mr. SHERRITT. How much will this work cost when completed ? What is the enterprise that will bring them there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just stated that there is a saw mill and a small brick yard.

Mr. SHERRITT. It seems to me that this is a very extraordinary state of affairs. While I have the honour to represent North Middlesex, I live in the county of Huron. I have lived from a boy in the township in which this work is going on, and know this place very well, and I can assure the House that this hotel, which the hon. gentleman says was not finished four years ago, is not finished to-day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I admit that.

Mr. SHERRITT. I cannot come to any other conclusion than that the hon. minister has been misled. I am not aware that there is any such immigration there as he speaks of. I live within a few miles of the place, and have been through it, and I would not like to say that there are twenty-five families there altogether. It is true, it has a post office and a saw-mill, and a dock would be necessary to enable the mill to get logs, because there is no timber in that part of the country to supply a saw-mill. It is an old and settled part of the country. There are a few French families there who came from Lower Canada.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From Chicago.

Mr. SHERRITT. I beg pardon. You can hardly find a family there that came from Chicago. There are French Canadians who came from Lower Canada forty or fifty years ago and settled in that part of the country. The gentleman whom the hon. minister has referred to came there a few years ago and started a hotel and built the saw-mill. There are a few respectable dwellings there, but most are not completed. I believe Mr. Cantin owns them. I can assure the hon. minister that the people of that section of the country do not look on an expenditure at this place as being a proper expenditure of public money. I have here a paper from which I might read a short extract. This paper is edited by a leading Reformer, who holds the position of county councillor, and who has always taken an active part in the affairs of the Liberal party. This is the 'Brussels Post.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is Brussels far from that place ?

Mr. SHERRITT. It is in the county of Huron. I do not know exactly how far it is.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. About thirty miles.

Mr. SHERRITT. Perhaps it is. This paper says :

> We notice that a delegation of big and little politicians recently visited St. Joseph, on the shores of Lake Huron, with the intent of the expenditure of money for harbour or dock purposes. St. Joseph's needs a harbour as badly as a goose requires side pockets, and any such expenditure is just that much money thrown away as far as serving the public. A harbour is not required there, nor is there any probability of it ever being used if it were there. Surely there has been money enough squandered by both political parties in the past in breakwaters, docks, harbours, &c., without continuing this nonsensical work any longer. No person can object to legitimate expenditure in necessary public works, but why members do not protest against the misuse of moneys that should be applied to other purposes, we fail to make out. If 'wilful waste makes woeful want' then it is about time that somebody called a halt, and the 'Post' for one says somebody should be brought sharply to time if this kind of work is continued. We could mention so-called harbours on which thousands of dollars were spent and they are in worse shape to-day than 10 years ago, and do not nor never did even begin to pay a tithe of the interest on the money foolishly spent, nor serve any practical purpose.

Now, this is what a friend of the government has said. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not in his place to-night ; for he had the honour at one time as he stated this afternoon, of representing the riding in which this place is situated, and he knows the extent of the public sentiment which the minister speaks of. He knows that it was from the province of Quebec that these gentlemen came. One thing I am pleased with is that the Chairman of this Committee (Mr. Macdonald, East Huron) is a member for the county where this work is going on. I am satisfied that the hon. members of this House are too conscientious to advocate expenditure of this kind, and I think the government should have some fixed principle on which to proceed in their expenditure of the public money, instead of doing, as they are in this item, voting an expenditure of $7,000 or $8,000, to favour some political friends.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see what there is in the plea that in this case we are giving money to friends. Why, there is scarcely an elector in the

place, so that there cannot be any political object in this vote. I have stated the facts, as I think very frankly. It was represented to me, when the item was placed in the estimates, that this was a good beginning of a settlement. And $5,000 is not a large amount of money. It makes one smile rather to see people like my hon. friend making a big mountain out of this expenditure of $5,000, when much larger expenditures in Ontario and the other provinces are voted by them without a word or the slightest hint of scandal. That is not the kind of conduct that is likely to impress me very much. The question is whether in this case we should go on with the expenditure or not. The government were right, and the House was right in placing this item in the estimates, but I must admit that our expectations have not yet materialized. And what I ask the House now is to vote the item, and I pledge myself to visit the place personally, and if I am not satisfied that there is justification for this expenditure, I will not make it. I pledge myself that if there is no public good to be served by this expenditure, it will not be made. In the meantime, I shall not spend a dollar before examining into the thing myself. I do not suppose that I can be asked to do more than that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a new idea of responsibility. The hon. minister asks the House to vote the amount and then tells us that if, after personal visit and examination, he finds it is not required, he pledges his honour not to spend it. But he should know the whole circumstances before asking for the money. That is the principle of ministerial responsibility. He has no right to ask us to vote the item after the statement he has just made. He should be frank enough now to tell the House that as he is not fully informed of the circumstances he will withdraw the item. For what purpose does he ask the vote? For the purpose of inducing settlement from Chicago into a section of country which has been settled in every part of it, for forty years. That was the reason given by him, and now that he admits it he was not fully informed, he ought to withdraw the item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot do that, for the excellent reason that I have taken every possible precaution against any unnecessary expenditure being made. I am fully prepared to take my share of the responsibility. I pledge myself to the House to go there personally and investigate the whole matter. My hon. friend says that I should know all the circumstances now. Well, I sent a special engineer up there, Mr. Roy, and he gave me the report I have stated. Of course I am now in a rather difficult position from a certain standpoint. Here is a French Canadian settlement, and I am a French Canadian minister, and I will be accused in the press of asking the House to vote a special sum in favour of a French settlement.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Nobody else but the hon. minister has mentioned anything of the kind.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is just as well to go straight to the point in a case like this. I have nothing to gain in this business. Do I understand hon. gentlemen opposite to say that I should withdraw the vote?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, from the statement the hon. minister has made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What statement?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. His statement that he pledged himself to the House to make inquiries afterwards.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Personal inquiries.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That he would make inquiries afterwards, and if he found the circumstances did not warrant the expenditure he would not make it. When a minister asks the House to vote an expenditure, he thereby assures the House that he has made thorough inquiries; but from the statement of the Minister of Public Works, he has not the necessary information to justify his asking the House to vote this money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Half of the votes placed in the estimates are placed there before there is even a survey made. In this case there has been a survey made and full examination, but in view of the fact that Mr. Cantin does not seem to have realized all the expectations he held out with regard to certain people, I shall not spend the money before making a personal visit myself. I have some other business to bring me there, and I shall be there in a month or so after the House adjourns, and I say that I will not spend a dollar of the money unless I find that there is a good scheme of immigration under way. If there is a scheme to have families come in from the United States or elsewhere to settle there on a pretty large scale, I shall ask my colleagues to allow me to spend the money, but if there is not I shall not. I think that that is a fair statement.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is not a constitutional manner of treating the question at all. Besides who was it raised the question of prejudice or of opposition to the vote on account of twenty-five French families being there? Why is it that in a little matter of this kind, the Minister of

Public Works should descend to racial prejudice ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not do it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is the only person who mentioned at all the fact of twenty-five French families being there, and he ascribed our opposition to the vote to that fact, and to his intention to induce other French families to emigrate into that section. Why does he make an appeal of that kind on a little question of voting a few thousand dollars for a harbour, which he can justify on no other ground ? It is the smallest kind of political manoeuvring that I ever witnessed in the House, and the Minister of Public Works will have to rise above that kind of tactics. He may appeal to racial prejudices on other questions, but it is perfectly absurd to appeal to them on a vote for a little harbour that no one in that section has heard of or requires. It is the smallest kind of parish politics that I ever heard introduced into this House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Parish politics is not the kind of politics that I resort to. I do not see that my hon. friend is in any way justified in talking as he has done. I have not a word to take back of what I said.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Make an apology, and do not do it again.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not a word to take back. I say that I shall not spend the money until I make myself personally acquainted with all the facts and circumstances, and we will see now whether or not I shall not be accused—I do not say that I will be accused here—I know that my hon. friend is above that kind of thing; I know him too well to believe for one moment that anything of the kind will come to his mind. Permit me to say that I have not the slightest intention of ascribing anything of the kind to him. I have been accused in the press about different affairs. This time, I must plead 'not guilty,' because there is no ground to commit anything of the kind.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Don't do it again.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot do it again, because I have not done it at all. I repeat that, when the amount was placed in the estimates last year, there was not a word of opposition. I have been told that, on account of that amount in the estimates, a certain number of families had settled there. I wish to ascertain whether that is true or not. If there is no genuine immigration. I shall not spend the money. Surely the House has enough confidence in any minister, whoever he may be, to grant him this amount under such circumstances.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister says that the fact of the item being in the estimates has induced some people to settle there, and that this is a reason for putting the item in the estimates this year. What then, induced the hon. gentleman to put it in in the first place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already stated that two deputations came to me, one of them from Montreal, composed of people I know very well. Unfortunately one of these gentlemen is dead. Mr. Vallee, who was a well known man among the members of parliament, and a man of means. They told me that they wished to establish a summer resort and build a hotel. The proof that such a scheme was a genuine one, is that the hotel has been started—a large structure. Unfortunately, as I have said, Mr. Vallee died. Among the gentlemen who accompanied him when he came to see me were a number of men of substance from Montreal, men I knew very well. Afterwards Mr. Cantin, the parish priest and half a dozen other people represented that they had organized an immigration scheme and that Chicago families were going to come in. These deputations induced us to place the item in the estimates. I simply ask to be allowed to investigate the case before doing anything more. If there is not an expectation of any large settlement there I will not spend the money.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister gives as his reason why this item should pass that there was no objection to it last year. On that basis of reasoning, why did he move to strike out an item—as he did just before six o'clock—which had passed last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already explained the case of Presqu'Isle.

Mr. INGRAM. Not satisfactorily to this opposition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend is not pleased, perhaps I could put the item back again in the estimates.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister said that it is the duty of the opposition to criticise these items.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not complain.

Mr. INGRAM. Now we feel that the hon. minister has not given us sufficient information to justify us in supporting this item. One of the reasons against it is that a paper published in the riding in which the money was to be expended has denounced it, and the editor of that paper is a supporter of this government. We also find that an hon. gentleman who represents part of the territory contained within Huron county, de-

nounced this item. And the minister himself gives us no good reason for supporting it, but tells us to pass the item and he will investigate the item. It would be better to investigate first and be ready to give information to the committee to justify them in passing the item. The hon. minister also sneered at the House on account of the French families living there. I wish to point out to him the delicate position we would be in if we accepted his advice. He says that there are twenty-five French families there. He has been accused as he says himself in the public press of favouring the French element in this country. If he goes to investigate the case, is it not the fact that they will expect more from him than they would from an English speaking minister, and might unduly influence him to expend this money, or perhaps, even a larger sum. If he does not want to be put in this position, all he has to do is to allow the item to stand, or withdraw it. He can then investigate. And, if the expenditure is justified, he can come and ask it from the House next session.

Mr. SPROULE. This is an extraordinary proposition that the hon. minister makes to us. I confess that I admire his sterling enterprise when he wishes to do a good thing. But I am afraid he sometimes shows the same zeal when he wishes to do a bad thing. And I am afraid he has stumbled upon something like that to-night. In the first place, the principle of asking the House to vote money without giving reasons for it, is wrong. To vote money first and investigate afterwards is hardly the way parliament should do business. The plea is raised that a certain enterprising gentleman, who, I believe, has a paper town to sell there, is bringing in immigration. For what purpose ? We are told that a mill is to be put up there. But, on the other hand, we hear that there is no timber to supply a mill. They are going to establish a brick yard, we are told, and there will be no possibility of vessels coming in to carry the brick to Chicago. But to start brickmaking in Canada, with a view to sending the product several hundreds of miles to Chicago and putting them on the market there against a heavy duty, and, in importing immigrants for that purpose—is that the object aimed at in building this breakwater ? The hon. gentleman can spend this amount of money much better in some other way. This is an old settled country—it has been settled for fifty years anyway. There is nothing there to start an enterprise. It is said it will become a summer resort. Why, there is not a decent grove there for a summer resort. You have to start it on a bare shore. It is said there is a hotel there. A hotel has been in the course of construction for several years, but it is not finished, because there has been no inducement to finish it; as lawyers sometimes say of their cases, it is in statu quo. The minister says : Vote this money, and I will go on and make inquiry. He thinks that is sufficient excuse for voting the money. I want to ask the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McEwen), who lives in that county, whether he advises the expenditure of this money ?

This is a proposition to throw so much money away, or else to help some person. The minister does not even know who owns the land upon which it is proposed to build this dock. So far as we are told, it is the same man who has tried to build up a summer resort, it is the same man who is trying to sell his lot, the same man who is trying to make the public believe that the place can be built up by means of a brickyard. The idea of starting a brickyard there to make bricks for export to Chicago seems to be the wildest scheme I ever heard proposed to this House. There is nothing to support a saw-mill. There are no manufacturing establishments, nothing to begin a village. There are a few families there. and that is all the information we have. I would like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, who knows the locality well, will you get up and defend it ? I would ask the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McEwen) if he will get up and defend it. Let this House know if they think it is desirable that that money should be spent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has not been one dollar spent yet. I am surprised that the members of the opposition become excited at this paltry sum of money. In the days of Sir John A. Macdonald I remember that we did not get excited at a little thing like that, we were looking for bigger things. Here is my position. I have not spent a dollar of that money, and my hon. friend talks as if I had pledged the country to an expenditure of a million dollars. I pledge myself not to spend one dollar before I look carefully and personally into that case. But on the faith of that vote, for which my hon. friends are just as responsible as I am, the people have settled there. Is it not a reasonable proposition ? I think that the standpoint taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite is altogether wrong. I have not spent one dollar, and do not propose to, unless I am convinced that it is useful, and unless my colleagues to whom I must appeal are convinced that it will be a wise expenditure of money. For it is a question of confidence, after all, whether this House will trust me with that small amount of money. If I am not going to be trusted for that amount of money, I might just as well pass to the other side.

Mr. SHERRITT. The hon. minister seems to look upon it as a very small amount, but I do not think that this country can afford to let a minister run round through the country with these small amounts. I do not

think it is fair that we should be asked to authorize him to do a work of that kind. But the matter may not be as small as it appears. I am not an expert in harbour building, but I may mention that it is a shallow beach, a person can easily wade out into it ten or twelve rods. The minister this afternoon told us about a sum of $70,000 spent in Bayfield for a harbour. But this is a much harder place in which to build a harbour than was Bayfield. I think that $5,000 or even $8,000 will not accomplish the end that he mentions here. Indeed I do not think there is anything at this place to warrant such an undertaking. I am of the same opinion as that gentleman who is in the county council, a leading Reformer, who stated in his paper that there was no use for the work. It is about ten miles from Bayfield, perhaps a little more. I have no idea that that dock will ever be used if it is built. It seems to me the minister is very easily convinced when he wants to construct a public work in any place. Even though it is a paltry amount of $5,000 or $8,000, he seems to be easily convinced that it is a proper expenditure, although the only argument he can make for it is that the town is a good place for a brickyard. We all know what a brickyard is. The place at present is only a little one horse affair. the brickyard will not develop it. It is a farming country, in fact one of the best in Ontario. We are told there will be a sawmill. It has been said that there was no timber there; perhaps that is rather a strong statement. I think nearly every farmer there has five or six acres of bush for his own use, that is all the timber there is for a saw mill. I may say to the minister that he will not be accused there of favouring the French people, because the French people there are as much opposed to this expenditure as anybody else. The French people in our part of the country are intelligent business men, and can easily see when money is being wasted. That French settlement I refer to is some ten miles long, and has been settled for forty or fifty years with French people from Lower Canada. I noticed this afternoon the minister, in referring to Bayfield, made comparisons. I do not object so much to the item for Bayfield, but the arguments that were brought forward to justify the present vote I think were very frivilous. He referred to the money spent in Bayfield thirty years ago. Well, those of us who knew that country thirty years ago know that there were no railroads when Bayfield harbour was built, and perhaps it was a proper expenditure. The grain in that portion of the country was all shipped from Bayfield, but to-day that Bayfield harbour is a dead letter. I am not objecting to this vote, because the place may become a summer resort, it is growing in popularity ; but I am objecting to the argument advanced by the minister for this vote when he refers to Bayfield, a work that has been useless for a number of years.

Mr. GANONG. One would suppose from listening to the hon. Minister of Public Works that he was really indignant. Well now, he would have some right to be indignant if any person in this country were filching his pocket book the way he is filching the pocket book of the country. We have had two or three samples of that this session. This is only a small affair, he said; it is only a small amount that is involved. It is not a matter of principle with this hon, gentleman at all. It is merely a question of the amount that it is proposed to expend. If the hon. gentleman is hunting for places to put money up for summer hotels, we can give him a job in the maritime provinces that will take him the rest of his life. If it has come to the point in this country that private enterprises are to be subsidized, as we have had them subsidized during the last few years by the hon. Minister of Public Works, I think it is time that the public called a halt. Brickyards, saw-mills, summer resorts ! A similar case came up the other night and how admirably the hon. minister parried the point as to who owned the Lovell seigneury when it was proposed to give $53,000 to a private enterprise in Gaspe county. Last session we had some concessions made to the maritime provinces. They were going to make a magnificent harbour on a magnificent lake but when they made it the lake drained dry. That is how these hon. gentlemen are making themselves solid in the country perhaps, but are frittering away the money of the people. These private enterprises, I have no doubt, will take notice from the hon. minister's action this year, and probably next year Ottawa will hardly be able to hold the huge delegations that will be up to interview the minister and endeavour to persuade him to assist in their enterprises. Perhaps the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) could give us a good deal of information in regard to this particular matter. He is surely here to represent that constituency. If he is here I am certain the committee would be very much gratified to hear him explain the matter.

Mr. OSLER. I think it is in one of Marryatt's novels that a discussion arises as to what we will call an item in dispute and the excuse given, which, I think, was accepted, was that it was a very little one. I dare say there are many hon. members present who will remember what that refers to. This item in dispute is a very little one compared to most of the expenditures and items in dispute in this department. If we leave it, as the hon. minister suggests, I would say that it would facilitate the business of the committee to pass the whole estimates under this head, amounting to

$354,100, if the hon. minister will give us his word that he will personally investigate each one of the works that it is proposed to expend this sum on in detail. It will take him a considerable time to do it, but if he will promise not to spend any money until he has first investigated all the items in this list, probably it would be better for us to pass them in a lump, taking the hon. minister's word that unless he finds there are brick-yards, town site exploiters or boomsters involved, or something that would justify the expenditure in each case, he will cancel the items and next year we will come here with a clean sheet and with no expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the hon. Minister of Public Works to say that we are accusing him of a crime because he proposes to spend this money in this way. I did not think that any one on this side of the House went so far as that, but we do pretend to say that he is committing a grave indiscretion. We do pretend to say that he is violating well understood principles of parliamentary government and asking the opposition to abandon the functions of an opposition, because he, himself, told us the other night that it was our duty, which we were expected to perform, to criticise every item according to the intelligence we possessed and the information we had, and to say whether it was right or wrong. We have accepted that invitation and we reply to him to-night that from our inquiry, our investigation and our information he is not justified in spending this money, nor are we justified in voting it. For that reason we oppose it. We also oppose it because we believe that a well understood principle of parliamentary government is that when a minister of the Crown asks the House to consider the advisability or otherwise of voting public money he is prepared to lay before it such information or data as he has acquired and collected with a statement to the House that will convince it that this expenditure should be made and therefore it will vote that it be made. But, he wants us to vote the money beforehand and give him a free hand to go and spend it after investigation if he likes, or to do the reverse. This is the most amusing proposition that I ever heard presented before this committee. It is the most Utopian proposition that I have ever heard presented to the committee for a long time. I am quite sure there is no hon. member of this committee who would more intensely oppose it than the hon. Minister of Public Works himself if he were in opposition. I know the hon. gentleman too well not to believe that he would be the first man to condemn it. He would show up, not the iniquity exactly, but the impropriety of parliament voting public money on such a ground. The defence that it is a small item is no excuse whatever. It is the principle involved in the matter; it is not the amount of money involved.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What principle?

Mr. SPROULE. The principle of asking parliament to vote money without having the data to justify it in voting that money. We are asking him for the verdict of his own friends but there is not a single hon. member of this House who will get up to say one word in defence of this proposition. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) was in the House when this discussion commenced. Where is he now? The hon. gentleman should tell the House what he thinks about it. He is not here to do it. He has found it convenient to get out of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He is there.

Mr. SPROULE. Is he there?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman is present he should make a statement and let the committee know what he thinks about it. For these reasons we oppose it. If the hon. minister is prepared to give me his ear, I am prepared to go on with the discussion. We oppose it on another principle, and it is this: We think the principle of spending money on private property is wrong. It is not a government dock; he told the committee that he does not know who owns the land, yet he makes that expenditure and after a while we will probably find out that we have to do as we have done in the past few years, when, after having spent money to enhance the value of private property we have been obliged to turn round and buy a dock for $10,000, or may be $20,000, the same as we had to do at Bruce Mines or in some other places. There is no public demand for this dock and there is no purpose in building it other than the booming of an imaginary townsite and the helping of a private individual to sell his land. That is the purpose. The brick yard business would be laughed at if you talked in the west about establishing a brick yard to export bricks to Chicago. And talk about building a harbour there. Why, only yesterday I happened to be in that section of the county, and met a gentleman who told me that he could roll up his pants and walk out twenty rods without wetting them. Yet the minister is going to give ten feet of water with an expenditure of $5,000. I have it on reliable authority that all that is moonshine. This gentleman whom I met said to me: The minister must have been very badly imposed upon; I admit that he is a man of a great deal of intelligence and if he was on the shore and looked at the exposed and shallow beach he would not require to be there fifteen seconds until he saw

the folly of trying to build a dock there to accommodate, what he says, are the needs of the country. The minister promises that he will go up and see that place, but what we object to is the principle of voting money upon such flimsy excuses. It is our duty here to vote away public money only when it is absolutely needed, and only when the minister convinces the House that there is sufficient trade in the locality to justify the expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The late John McMillan was a much respected member of this parliament. He was a farmer ; he was an old man and had been for twenty-five years a member of the House. In the month of May and in the month of September, 1900, he transmitted to the department with his approval letters and petitions asking that a wharf be built there.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps if I ask the hon. minister how long it was before the general elections, it may explain the whole thing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, that is a horse of another colour. I will not deviate from my argument. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says that I have no ground to ask this parliament to vote this money, and I refer him to the authority of a member of parliament of twenty-five years' standing, who represented that riding, and who asked that a wharf should be built there. Of course, I take the full responsibility for what has been done in this matter, but I was away in 1900, and in my absence my colleagues ordered a survey and an examination. It was on the representation of a much-respected member of the Liberal party and of the House of Commons that this little enterprise was started. There were very great hopes then that a settlement would be made in that place. I have heard with surprise the statement of several members on the other side that there are no lands available for settlement there, because I understand that there is a large tract of land available and that already at least twenty-five families have settled there who were not there two years ago. We expected more. I repeat that a deputation of the Montreal business men and capitalists represented to me that they wanted to build a large hotel. The hotel has been started and there is the beginning of a settlement. What mistake have I committed in the face of all these statements ?

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister allow me to ask him if he is aware of the fact, that the very respectable member who recommended that and got him to put the item in the estimates, was defeated at the elections ? Will the minister also tell me, if he does not know that this very thing helped to defeat Mr. Macmillan ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Without one word of opposition from the other side, this small amount was voted in the estimates, and on the faith of that vote I am told that a pretty large settlement has taken place there. All that I am asking is that the House shall not ask me to withdraw this amount from the estimates. I have not spent a dollar and I shall not spend a dollar until I have investigated the matter more fully. It is the privilege of gentlemen opposite to criticise this vote; and I have never complained of their criticism. I fully recognize the importance of being criticized, and I fully recognize the right of the opposition to do so. At the same time I believe that I am within my right and duty in insisting that the item should pass.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister told us that he sent an engineer to get a report on this work. Will he be good enough to place that report on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend moves for that report he will get it with pleasure.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Public Works seems anxious to avoid the peculiar position he has placed himself in. He tells us that he will not expend this money until he inquires whether the expenditure is justifiable or not. I misunderstand the duties of a minister, responsible to this parliament and under a responsible government, if such a plea should prevail. The hon. gentleman must see the ridiculous position he is in. He asks the House to have perfect confidence in him; he tells us that he may not make the expenditure, but he wants us to vote a sum of money without his being able to justify the expenditure. What an extraordinary and absurd position ? I venture to say that such an exhibition was never made by a minister before. Under responsible government, the minister cannot ask a vote from this House without first being convinced himself of the absolute necessity of the expenditure; then he must convince his colleagues that the vote should be submitted to the House, and then he must have the approval of the Governor General on the ground that the expenditure is in the public interest. But the minister now asks us that the money shall be granted to him in trust, and he pledges his honour to the House that if the expenditure is not justifiable he will not make it. Why do we not vote all appropriations in the same manner ? Why do we not give a lump sum to the minister and trust to his honour and judgment as to the expediency of the expenditure ? That is not our form of government at all; that is not ministerial responsibility. That is the position of the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not the position.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is exactly the position of the Minister of Public Works. A more absurd and ridiculous position a

minister never occupied in this House at all. Why does he not come out manfully and say, I am responsible for the expenditure, and I ask this House to vote the money, instead of asking us to trust to his honour and his knowledge and experience, to decide whether the expenditure is justifiable or not. I will venture to say that such a request was never presented to a constitutional assembly before this evening.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is the use of my hon. friend trying to lecture me on constitutional law, which I know just as well as he does, if not better? The amount was placed in the estimates when my hon. friend was in the House, and he did not object to it or say one word against it. If it were a new vote altogether, my position would not be as clear as it is; but it is not a new vote; the amount has been in the estimates for years, and I simply ask that it be allowed to remain there until I get further information. My hon. friend's lecture is not in the right direction. I do not profess to be infallible on constitutional law, but in this case I do not believe I am making a mistake, in taking the position that this amount having been placed in the estimates, I do not want to withdraw it without more information. I think that is a fair position, and if our hon. friends opposite cannot agree with us, I am very sorry.

Mr. OSLER. It seems to me that the minister has not improved his position at all. He says this is partly a revote. That shows that he has had a year or two to ascertain whether it is a proper vote or not; but he does not know now any more than he did twelve months ago whether there is any necessity for a harbour at this place. That being the case, there is no need of putting this vote through to-night, and it may continue to rest in the imagination of the hon. minister without doing any harm to anybody. I do not think the minister's statement that it was voted before is any reason why he should revote it. Surely when it comes before parliament it is a new vote, and should be considered without regard to the past, if the work has not been commenced. Evidently it is a useless expenditure, or the minister would be able to give some reason why the money was not expended. The opposition know more of the matter now than they did when the item was in the estimates last year, and they know that it is one that should not pass the House.

Mr. HEYD. Our friends on the other side have been so exceedingly good to the hon. Minister of Public Works in allowing so many items to pass that they appear to have arranged a little tilt to-night in order to have a little amusement. I am not familar with this particular work. I have obtained my information of it from what has been said to-night by the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. gentlemen on the other side; and if I were on the other side, animated with a desire to make a little political capital out of this matter, I could convince myself that our friends over there are probably adopting the right course; but if we look at it as a business proposition, I think the attitude of the minister is quite reasonable. He says that on the representations of an influential committee of gentlemen from Montreal, and also at the request of a number of people who live in the district, and under the advice of the late Mr. McMillan, a gentleman whom we all respected, he was induced to place a sum in the estimates for this work. This year renewed pressure was brought upon him to go on with this work, and in good faith he puts the item in the estimates. He is not to suppose that conditions have changed; he expects that the matter will be treated as a business proposition; and for the first time he hears objections to the scheme which he was not aware of before. He is not satisfied, however, and I am not satisfied, that all the statements made on the other side of the House are correct. We hear so many statements emanating from that source that on subsequent investigation we find to be inaccurate that we feel quite justified sometimes in taking the statements that are made by our hon. friends opposite with a little grain of suspicion. I am on this occasion with the minister. I say that he was justified, upon the information he had, in putting this item in the estimates, and he is not willing to withdraw it upon the statements made by our friends on the other side. But at the same time they have created enough suspicion in his mind to induce him to satisfy himself as to their accuracy, and if he finds them to be true, he is willing that this particular sum shall not be expended. That is quite sufficient for me as a supporter of the hon. minister, and I am quite willing, if the opposition insist on that item standing, to support the minister with my vote. I have learned, after four or five years experience in this House, not to believe everything that emanates from the other side of the Speaker.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down is no doubt very much in touch with the Minister of Public Works, because the Minister of Public Works announces himself to be an out-and-out protectionist; and in these days, when my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) is losing so much sleep looking after the interests of his political sponsors, the Massey-Harris Company, and asking for additional protection for them, I can readily understand why he rushes to the help of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. HEYD. That is not in his department.

Mr. BENNETT. No, but my hon. friend from South Brant will acknowledge the great prestige and power which the hon. Minister of Public Works possesses in the Cabinet. Now, what is the first statement made by the hon. member for South Brant to justify his position? He says that a deputation from Montreal waited on the Minister of Public Works and asked that this work be proceeded with. Now, who were the gentlemen who waited on the Minister of Public Works? It was a gentleman who was building a summer hotel, and wanted a dock to lead up to it. Surely my hon. friend does not contend that the money of this country should be used to build docks for people who wish to build summer hotels? My hon. friend from South Brant poses as a business man in this House, and yet he stands up and says that if a gentleman desires to build a summer hotel at any point in the Dominion, all he needs to do, in his opinion, is to apply to the people of this country for a wharf to be built at the public expense, to be used in conjunction with his hotel. I am surprised that my hon. friend is not asking the Minister of Public Works to build a livery stable for some gentleman who wishes to start one and hire out horses. Surely, if it is right to build a wharf to accommodate a man who is building a summer hotel, it is equally right to build a livery stable for any one who wants to engage in that business. Now, there are two principles involved in this matter, and it is immaterial whether the vote is $5,000 or $50,000. What did we have in this House the other night? The Minister of Public Works made the statement that the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell), having a large timber tract in the county of Gaspé, desired to establish mills there, and in order to save expenditure in connection with his mill, he wanted the government of the country, or the people—because it is the people's money—to build a $50,000 dock for him. Nobody disputed that that was the case, and the hon. gentleman stated that the building of a saw-mill was contingent on the government building the dock. The hon. member for South Brant, if in the House, I presume, acquiesced in that. The hon. gentleman now attacks the statements made by my hon. friend from North Middlesex (Mr. Sherritt). I think he is very unfair to my hon. friend, who does not obtrude himself very much on the House; and when he makes statements of fact in this House, living as he does a few miles from the place, it is bad grace on the part of the hon. member for South Brant to suggest that those statements are not true. I will be bound to say that every statement the hon. member for North Middlesex makes is true.

The gentleman who represents the riding where this work is to be done left the chamber as soon as it was mentioned. That cannot be denied. He was sitting in the House immediately before this item was called and then left the chamber. Why did he leave? Because he knew he could not make any statement of facts that would at all justify it. The statement of the Minister of Public Works itself makes out a case, which could not be possibly stronger, for any one attacking this expenditure. He said that the demand for this work came first from a gentleman who owned the land, that this gentleman intended constructing a summer hotel at that point, and that there is a saw-mill there. No one denies these facts, but the mill has no connection with the dock because it is not even built on the water's edge. It is a small mill intended to cut up logs that are now standing timber in that part of the country. It is not built near the water edge at all. Then as regards the brickyard, it is absurd to talk of building a dock in order that brick may be exported to the United States. Every one knows that brick is not exported to the United States from this country. But in order to get this vote through, the minister makes this novel pledge, which has been commented on by my hon. friends from North Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and West Toronto (Mr. Osler). He gives the House his word that if on inquiry he finds that the circumstances do not justify the expenditure, the money will not be spent. Well, he need not have waited to make a personal visit for he could have got all the information he required from the hon. member in whose riding this work is to be done. And the fact that that hon. gentleman deliberately went out of the chamber as soon as the item was called is pretty clear evidence that there is no justification for it. Or the hon. minister could have called on Mr. Deputy Speaker, who might have left the Chair, and attempted some justification of this vote. But neither of these two gentlemen ventured to defend it.

I was surprised to find the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) rising to support this vote. I thought at first that this was the last straw breaking the camel's back, and that the hon. gentleman was really rising in his place in protest. Then there is the hon. member for South Perth, who went out against the government on the Yukon deal. That was a question of principle with the hon. gentleman. Is he going to stulify the reputation for independence which he made on that occasion? Is he going to sit here and vote for a proposition, which the minister himself says he is not now in a position to justify. Is he going to vote for expenditure on a work which is of no public utility at all, but which, as the Minister of Public of Works has himself

said, was taken up by the government on the request of a private individual, who asked to have his private property improved at the expense of the public.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have seen a good many tempests in a teapot, but this is the smallest kind of a tempest and the smallest kind of a pot I ever saw. Whether the hon. gentleman who represents one of the Hurons is or is not in the House or whether our Chairman did not leave the Chair in order to address the House, does not affect the case. Why should the Minister of Public Works or of any other department withdraw an item at the dictation of the opposition? This item was placed in the estimates, with the consent of the House, and because two or three of my hon. friends on the other side have thought proper to rise in their might and tell me that I am not to be trusted with this wonderful sum of money, I am forsooth to drop the item. They threaten us with a vote. Well, if we have nothing more to fear than a division on a question like this, we will be very long on this side of the House. I repeat that this item was placed in the estimates with the consent of hon. gentlemen opposite. Circumstances justified the government in placing it in the estimates, and because I do not now eat humble pie, because I do not make up my mind to be lectured by my hon. friend's opposite, we are going to have a vote. We have had votes in the past and have not been killed by them, and I do not think we stand much danger of being slaughtered on this occasion. We will see whether the country will support hon. gentlemen opposite in their demands that I should withdraw this item without being given the chance of looking into it myself. This is a most unreasonable position for the opposition to take. I hope that my hon. friends have no other motive than to vindicate constitutional law, and the country will judge whether it is any such high motive which animates them on this occasion. I have nothing more to add except to call the attention of my hon. friend who has just sat down, to the unfairness of his statement. I do not suppose that he meant to be unfair but what is the use of his saying that the sum was placed in the estimates at the exclusive demand of gentlemen from Montreal.

Mr. BENNETT. I understood the hon. minister to say that Mr. Cantin and another gentleman had asked for the grant in the first instance.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have devoted a good deal of time to this item, and if we are to take a vote, we might as well take it now. I do not think anything more can be said which would throw any additional light on this subject. The position is this. A couple of years ago a sum was placed in the estimates for the building of a wharf at the place in question. There was some business representations made to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Public Works, on behalf of this expenditure, and he acceded. This appears this year to have shocked the sense of my hon. friend from Simcoe in particular among others. But he ought not to be so very particular. Why, this very afternoon he asked the hon. Minister of Public Works to put an item in the estimates of $3,000 for an expenditure at Orillia, and for no other reason than that the Minister of Public Works had paid a visit to Orillia last summer, and that on that occasion my hon. friend had brought all the pretty girls of that town in a deputation to ask him to have a wharf built there. There were no business reasons, but simply this appeal to my hon. colleague who, having French blood in his veins, is very susceptible and could not resist the blandishments of the fair sex of that charming little town. But my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) and the opposition had no fault to find with my hon. colleague for his susceptibility on that occasion. On the contrary they invited the Minister of Public Works to accede to that appeal of the fair maidens of Orillia. I do not think therefore that it lies in the mouth of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) to blame the Minister of Public Works for following this precedent.

Mr. SPROULE. The tenor of the hon. minister's defence is simply this, that the item was put in last year and the opposition did not object. But at the time there did not happen to be among hon. members on this side any one who knew the locality well enough to express an intelligent opinion on the expenditure, and we accepted it on the strength of the statement of the Minister of Public Works that it was needed. But, this year, we tell him we have the information and that he is not justified in asking for this vote. The only defence he has is that we did not object last year. It may have been wrong, he tells us, but the fact that we did it last year is the reason why we should do it this year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a reason for looking into the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Two wrongs do not make a right. Though, for want of information, we let it pass last year, yet now that we have acquired information we tell him it is wrong. That is a reason why he should refrain from pushing it. He said that an hon. member in this House, who is not now in the House, recommended this vote. And that gentleman went to the country two months afterwards and was defeated. That was not a very strong argument in favour of the expenditure. The hon. gentleman

says that he sent an engineer and got a report. If that report justifies the expenditure, why not give it to the House and convince the House that the money should be voted ? The hon. gentleman keeps back the report and tells us to move for it, and it will be brought down. That is, vote the money first and see the report afterwards. We want that report now, so that we may know whether it justifies us in voting this money or not. The very fact that he says he will not spend a dollar of this money until he sends another engineer to report discredits the engineer he sent in the first place.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). The Minister of Public Works tells us that he was recommended by the late member for the county to build the dock. He laid great stress upon that. I would ask him if he has asked the opinion of the hon. gentleman now representing the county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Does not the hon. gentleman think that the hon. member who now represents the county, now that this thing has been noised abroad, would be able to give valuable suggestions ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman who represents the county never asked me to withdraw the item. I will act in this case as I acted in the Presqu'Isle case. I looked into that matter carefully, and this year I asked to withdraw the vote. If, on investigating this matter, I find that I have been misinformed, I will do what I did in the Presqu'Isle case. More than that, I must not be asked to; more than that, I will not do.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Has the present member for the county never made any suggestion on the point ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). If I do not mistake, I see the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McCreary) standing in the entrance to this chamber. Perhaps he will come in and give his opinion upon this matter.

Mr. GANONG. We have heard from the minister several times that we are as much responsible as are the occupants of the government benches for some of these items. I can only say that if the minister will be frank with us when he attempts to fly his kite, we will acknowledge our responsibility. But a case arose the other night. Last year he had flown a small kite of $15,000; this year he comes with the tail to the kite in the form of an additional $38,000. If the minister wants us to be responsible, let him give us the absolute facts when these items come before us, so that we may know whether we are going to spend $5,000 or $100,000. A vote of $15,000 last year hardly justified him in making a contract for $53,000. But that is what he did. Then he comes to us and says I have thrown this little sop to a supporter of the government, and we want you to ladle out the rest of the money so as to keep this gentleman quiet. The sooner the members of the opposition and the people of the country generally understand this system, the better it will be for all. The hon. minister has been remarkably considerate of one of his friends in the cabinet, the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock). You will remember that the Postmaster General issued a circular, and not only that, but he issued it when the hon. Minister of Public Works was in Europe. This is one of these ill-omened birds that sometimes come home to roost. I have no doubt that the minister has on file the application for this vote. Probably those who made it gave as one of their reasons for making it this circular of the Postmaster General. Perhaps there are other applications of a similar nature on file, and it might be well for the minister to bring them down. It would be interesting to know how many applications have arisen from that circular of the Postmaster General. That circular probably had about as much good effect as the Labour Bureau that we are paying for. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) gave a wonderful justification of this vote. That justification was that the hon. member said so, and that was enough. The Postmaster General's circular led to the asking for it, the Minister of Public Works granted it, and the hon. member for South Brant is willing to support it. There has been a considerable exhibition this evening of a sort of weakness of the knees. I have noticed it several times in the case of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes). He was in a back seat and he partly rose, but dropped back again—his heart failed him. He has come down a seat or two and has tried to get on his feet. I hope he will have strength enough to get up and either defend this vote, or do as he ought to do, move that it would be struck out.

Mr. HOLMES. It is not in my riding.

Mr. INGRAM. I think we need no further evidence than the refusal of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) to see that this item is not a good one. I wish to point out the dangerous character of the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Public Works when he says that the opposition, by consenting to this item last year, gave up their right to object to it this year. If that is followed up to its logical conclusion, then, every new item that is placed in the estimates should be objected to by the opposition whether they have any knowledge in the

matter or not, whether they believe the item to be reasonable or not. As a member of the opposition, I object to taking that stand. I do not think it would be in the interest of the country or in the interest of the members of this House. The course the opposition is taking on this occasion is, in my judgment, the only proper course to take, namely, that if they know of no reasonable objection to an item, then the item should be allowed to pass the House. But if they find there are objections to an item, then they would be neglectful of their duty if they did not rise and object to it. I want to tell the Minister of Public Works that so far as I am concerned, I care not when an item appears in the estimates, if it is ten years hence, and I should be then a member of this House, and it was again submitted to the House, I would take the opportunity of rising in my place and objecting to it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I wish to say a few words with reference to the statement of the Minister of Public Works as to a duty of the opposition in criticising items which appear in the estimates. I would not have paid much attention to it were it not that I notice that the same argument was used by the Minister of Finance when addressing the electors in one of the Ontario constituencies. He argued that because the opposition had not challenged an item in the estimates by their vote, that therefore they consented to it. A more absurd statement was never made by any minister. Let the Minister of Public Works read the statement of the hon. Joseph Chamberlain when he was criticised in the same direction. He said the government was responsible for every item that was put in the estimates, and that the duty of the opposition was confined to fair criticism. Their duty is, not to divide the House upon an estimate they object to, but to state their objections and leave it there. And yet we are told by the Minister of Finance of this country that because the opposition did not divide the House on an estimate, therefore they consented to it. Let him read the speech of Mr. Chamberlain where he shows the absurdity of such an argument, let him read the speeches of leading statesmen in England on the same subject, and he will find that they hold the principle that the duty of an opposition is merely criticism, not to divide the House on an item, but to leave the entire responsibility with the government who propose it. If we do not divide the House upon it, that is no reason why we should be accused of supporting the vote. The Prime Minister says we may as well have a division at once upon the subject. Let me answer that we do not divide the House in committee where the votes are not registered.

The PRIME MINISTER. One of the hon. gentleman's friends has just moved to have the vote struck out.

Mr. INGRAM.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have not heard anything of the kind.

The PRIME MINISTER. The member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) just moved it.

Mr. GANONG. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg his pardon then, I misunderstood him.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We do not divide the House where the votes are not registered, as it would be useless to do so. Our opposition is not so much for the purpose of influencing the government as for the purpose of influencing the country, because we know we are in a minority in this House, and when we divide the House we want our votes to appear to the public throughout the Dominion to show whether we support an item or not. The Minister of Public Works taunts the opposition with having made no objection to the vote last year. The position we ocupy as a party is that for every item in the estimates the government of the day are responsible, and that our functions are confined to criticising an item we object to. That is the principle laid down by English statesmen, as I have just mentioned.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I fully agree with the constitutional views which the hon. member for Lanark has just expressed. Let the hon. gentleman understand me well. I stated that last year there was no opposition to this item, but in saying that I did not mean to argue that our friends opposite have no right to oppose the item this year. But I say that having raised no opposition last year, it is too late for them to expect that I will withdraw the item now when, for the first time they raise an opposition.

Mr. INGRAM. You have not spent a dollar yet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let our friends opposite understand me well. They did not oppose this item last year, and they have not since then shown sufficient reason to induce me to withdraw it this year. I quite understand that the opposition have every right to criticise the items in the estimates, whether they were placed there last year or this year. When the Minister of Finance argued in the country that the opposition consented to votes by not dividing the House upon them, he meant to convey the idea, which is a true one, that the opposition are every day asking us to spend money for public works in their ridings; still, when they discuss the Budget, either in the House or in the country, they complain that we are spending too much. I claim that they are not fair, and that the Minister of Finance was perfectly right in saying what he did.

Mr. SHERRITT. I am perfectly satisfied that if the minister will go down and look

over this place as he has promised to do, he will be convinced that the proposed expenditure is not a proper one to make. I understood him to say there was a lot of land available that could be got for settlers. That is true in a sense, but the country is an old settled country. I think land there is worth $40 an acre. There is no wild land there available for settlers. I wish the Chairman was in a position to rise and give us his opinion upon this proposition. The country has been settled ever since I was a boy. The farmers own, perhaps, five or six acres of timber each. I am perfectly satisfied that if the minister goes down there and examines the situation he will be convinced that he has been misled, and he will not spend this money, because I think the hon. gentleman will not break faith with the House nor go back on his promise. I wish to say now, in answer to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd), that I think he was a little too harsh in accusing me of making statements that are not absolutely correct. I feel that my actions in the House do not justify him in making such a statement as that about me. I have not taken up very much of the time of the House.

Mr. HEYD. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sherritt) thinks that I made a reflection upon anything he said, I can assure him that such was very far from my intention. I have not the slightest doubt but that everything he said was true in connection with this matter.

Mr. SHERRITT. I am glad to accept that apology, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that I am in a position to know a little of what I am talking about. There are some questions in reference to this matter, particularly as to the number of people there, that I do not feel inclined to answer, but I make this statement that a few years ago this locality was an open field used for farming purposes. A gentleman came there and started a summer hotel, and commenced the erection of some other buildings. There are a number of proposed buildings with nothing but the foundations completed. This gentleman undertook to make a city, but he failed in that effort and the hotel stands there to-day unfinished. There is no business man in that part of the country but considers that the time is coming when the hotel will be torn down and the brick used for the erection of bank barns. It is an agricultural country. There is not a tree near the place to provide the shade necessary for a summer resort. It has been suggested that this gentleman is going to bring trees there and make a grove. This man has failed to do as he contemplated, and he comes with a deputation to the minister. I know if the hon. minister goes down there and examines the place for himself he will return to this House and say that he will not go on with this expenditure. The late Mr. McMillan has been referred to, a gentleman that I knew for many years, and one in whom I have had every confidence. If it is in accordance with the rules of the House, I would like the hon. Minister of Public Works to bring down the letter which he says he received from the late Mr. McMillan and show it to the House because, having every confidence in the late Mr. McMillan, I cannot believe that he ever considered this a proper place in which to spend money for the making of a harbour. I hope, if it is not contrary to the rules of the House, the hon. minister will have that letter brought down that we may have an opportunity of reading it.

Toronto harbour—works at eastern entrance, &c., $8,090.

Mr. OSLER. The vote in the estimates for Toronto harbour is rather infinitesimal when we consider the amount we have just been discussing. We have had a vote of $5,000 for a village supposed to contain twenty-five families. Estimating that each of these families contains ten members apiece that would be 250 people, the proportionate vote would be about $5,000,000 for Toronto containing about 250,000 people. While I am a strong objector to spending public money except judiciously, and where it will result for the general good of the community, I do think that the amount the hon. Minister of Public Works and the government have been devoting to the most important harbour in Canada, practically, a harbour where there has been more business done than in any other harbour in the Dominion, is so absurd that there can be only one explanation for it and this explanation appears to be, that, do what they can, the government cannot get supporters of their own returned for Toronto. Perhaps it is unfortunate that Toronto should be such a Conservative city, but the fact remains that practically no public money is being expended on the most important harbour in Canada. I agree, I must say, with the position that the hon. Minister of Public Works has taken in connection with the main expenditure on the harbour that the government should not expend money there until the city of Toronto takes charge of its own drainage. I agree with the hon. minister there entirely. In regard to the question of the straightening of the Don, or preventing the silt which comes down from the Don and is filling up the harbour, it is entirely another matter, and it is one which should be taken charge of by the government. The government should take charge of the silt which comes down from that river and should prevent the harbour from being filled up as it has been with this silt. The money that is voted for the improvement of Toronto harbour is simply absurd.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) will allow me, I will not enter into a discussion of the question from the standpoint that he has just adopted. This small amount of money is applied for to pay the balance of the contract which is going on. I must have the money to pay it and to erect three groynes that were asked from me the last time I had the pleasure of being in Toronto. As to the larger question it will be discussed in the supplementary estimates. The main estimates contain nothing at all for new works.

Mr. OSLER. All right.

Mr. KEMP. There will be an appropriation in the supplementary estimates for the diversion of the Don river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the supplementary estimates come down my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) will find whether there is an amount or not. I am not free to say now. I have never given any definite answer to any member of parliament no matter to which side he might belong. The supplementary estimates have not yet been decided upon.

Mr. KEMP. The hour is late, and I do not wish to have the discussion just now, but I want to let the hon. minister know that on the supplementary estimates we desire to have a full discussion of the Toronto harbour and the diversion of the Don.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be no trouble about that.

Mr. BARKER. On this question of the supplementary estimates, I wish to say a word or two in regard to this particular vote. It seems to me very objectionable that estimates should be brought down piecemeal when the minister knows there are going to be supplementary estimates. I think that when a supplementary estimate is intended by the minister the main vote should be postponed until the supplementary estimate is brought down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has never been done in that way here.

Mr. BARKER. It may not have been. I do not understand how a body of men can intelligently decide upon whether they will vote any sum whatever when they know a further sum is going to be asked for. The fact that a further sum is likely to be asked for might influence the minds of hon. gentlemen as to whether they would grant any sum at all.

Manitoba—general repairs and improvements to harbour, river and bridge works, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the usual vote.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he has done anything since last session to improve the mouth of the Mossey river ? He will remember that last session I drew his attention to the fact that there was a bar across the mouth of that river, and that he promised to send an officer to look into the matter. He had a dredge on Lake Manitoba and he proposed to send it up there to do this work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer tells me that he has instructed our resident engineer in Manitoba to make a survey, but he is not sure whether he has received his report or not. We will look into the question, if my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) will be good enough to call at the office we will show him the report if it is there.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Where is this particular vote to be expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a general vote to be expended all over the province.

Columbia river—improvements in narrows between upper and lower Arrow lakes, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What improvements do you intend to make there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have given a contract for a small dredge to carry on the improvements.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for a dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, the wording of your item is wrong. It speaks of the improvements in the channel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The best way of making these improvements is to build a dredge there.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you should ask for money to build the dredge. The wording of the item is misleading. I do not think the minister will try to justify that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe it is all right. We are doing the same thing at Lake Temiscamingue. Suppose instead of building a dredge I should buy shovels and things like that to make the improvements. I think I am justified in getting the dredge.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister may be quite justified in building a dredge, but he cannot take the money for that purpose from a vote to improve the channel. The Auditor General would not allow that to pass if he was looking after it, because one of his duties is to see that the money voted by

parliament for a specific purpose is spent for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is all right. I do not hide anything, I am stating the facts.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not say that you are not stating the facts, but I complain of the impropriety of voting money for one purpose and spending it on another.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection to changing the wording of the item if the hon. gentleman wishes. I move to add the words 'to include the building of a dredge.'

Mr. SPROULE. That is all right then.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Skeena river, $7,500.

Mr. SPROULE. What are you doing on the Skeena river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is one of the great salmon rivers and there is a great deal of trade there, and we are removing snags and obstacles of all kinds.

Mr. BLAIN. Have you a government dredge in British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have two dredges there ?

Mr. BLAIN. Do you use these dredges on that work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not always use dredges; we use implements of all kinds to do the work.

Dredge vessels—repairs, $30,000.

Mr. SPROULE. There is over half a million dollars involved in the item before the House, and I would suggest that you do not go on with it to-night, as some of our friends may have something to say about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection to that.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Public Works, House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 17, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 52) respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—Hon. Mr. Tisdale.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the Order of the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means and any motion in reference thereto be made the first order of the day after Questions on Wednesday, March 19th, and all subsequent days until the Debate is completed.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would move, seconded by Mr. Borden (Halifax) :

That the name of Mr. Robinson (Elgin) be added to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Maxwell.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Montreal and St. Lawrence Bridge Company.—Mr. Madore.

Bill (No. 49) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of John Westren.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Dyment Banking Loan and Savings Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 15) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—Mr. Ingram.

Bill (No. 18) to incorporate the Velvet (Rossland) Mine Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

CANADA SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 7) An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Ingram.

On section 1.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the points for the commencement and termination of these branches should be more definitely set forth in the Bill. Is there not an additional clause to be proposed covering this point?

Mr. INGRAM. I may explain that the Bill was laid over for a time in order to allow opportunity for full consideration. It was taken up at a time, when, I believe, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) was absent, and passed in its present form by the unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. It was explained that the Canada Southern Railway Company were unable to fix definitely the terminal points of their proposed branches on the Niagara river, because bridges which it was designed to use had not yet been located. One is expected to cross at Grand Island, and another to be built in the neighbourhood of Queenston. The branches will not be constructed until the bridges are located, and, in the meantime, they cannot define the point exactly to which the lines are intended to run. The description is as definite as it can be made at the present time.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

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

That the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my happy privilege to present to the House to-day another chapter in the continued story of Canada's prosperity. A year ago, when speaking on an occasion similar to this, and congratulating the House on the then happy state of affairs, I expressed the opinion that the country had about reached the crest of the wave of business activity. I did not anticipate any immediate depression or any severe depression at all. What I suggested was that we might look forward to a period of check, a period during which we would not continue the rapid advance of the past—a period of rest after which the Dominion would again go forward by leaps and bounds. Some hon. gentlemen opposite thought that my view was too hopeful. Their observation of the signs of the times led them to believe that we had already entered upon a period of depression. In view of the operations of the year which has since passed and of the present outlook for the future we are able to see that my own anticipations and those of my hon. friends opposite have both been agreeably disappointed. The business condition of the country has proved very satisfactory, better than my own expectations, much better than the less hopeful views of my hon. friends on the other side. In a country so vast as ours, with such varied conditions, it would be too much to expect that every section and every industry would be able to make the same gratifying report of prosperity. But I think I can truly say that during the past few years we have approached as near to that happy condition as could reasonably be hoped for. In nearly all the great branches of industry, the past year has been one of activity and prosperity. In the paramount industry of agriculture, which must long continue to be the very foundation of our prosperity, the results of the year have been most gratifying, especially in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, where increased acreage under cultivation and a most bountiful harvest gave us vast stores of grain which have taxed our facilities of transportation to the utmost, and warned us that larger provision must be made for the handling of the treasures of the great west.

The one disappointing feature of the year's affairs has been the census returns, which show a growth of population somewhat less than many had hoped for. But while these returns are for the moment disappointing, they are by no means discouraging. It is well known that during the first part of the ten years term there was comparatively little development of our country. But for the last five years Canada has been making very rapid advance. If it were possible to discriminate in the census between the two periods, it would probably be seen that practically the whole increase of population has taken place within the last five years, and viewed in that light the returns are encouraging. Fortunately, the condition of Canada in recent

years has been such that no statistics have been needed to prove its progress. The activity that has prevailed in all parts of the Dominion, the large enterprises that have been undertaken, the continued demand for labour—all these prove beyond question that Canada has recently been developing rapidly and give us every reason to believe that when the next census is taken the result will be satisfactory.

From the financial point of view, Mr. Speaker, the results of the year were exceedingly satisfactory. We had a revenue of $52,514,701.13, a little less than my anticipations, but considerably greater than the revenue of the previous year. It will be interesting to know that this increase in revenue comes to us from all the different classes into which we divide our receipts, as appears by the following statement:

DETAILS OF REVENUE, 1900-1901 compared with previous year.

—	Fiscal Year 1899-1900.	Fiscal Year 1900-1901.	Increase.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Customs	28,374,147 64	28,425,284 25	51,136 61
Excise	9,868,075 35	10,318,266 03	450,190 68
Post Office	3,205,535 16	3,441,504 93	235,969 77
*Railways	4,774,162 02	5,213,381 24	439,219 22
Dominion Lands	1,388,023 78	1,517,319 52	129,295 74
Miscellaneous	3,420,050 07	3,598,945 16	178,895 09
	51,029,994 02	52,514,701 13	1,484,707 11

*This includes 'railways only'—canals revenue is included in 'Miscellaneous.'

These increases are all interesting, but some of them are worthy of special note. The excise duties are always interesting, not only because of the amount of duty involved in them, but because they show the consumption of certain articles which enlist a good deal of attention in the country. Whether or not it will be gratifying to make the statement, the fact must be stated that there has been an increase during the year in the receipts in all branches of the excise duties, as appears from this table:

EXCISE DUTIES, 1900-1901.

—	QUANTITY.		DUTY.		INCREASE.
	1899-1900.	1900-1901.	1899-1900.	1900-1901.	
			$	$	$
Spirits ..... Galls.	2,659,038	2,863,950	4,818,842	5,178,275	359,433
Malt ..... Lbs.	60,284,064	64,723,616	904,262	970,855	66,593
Cigars ..... No.	138,041,707	141,096,889	811,612	822,738	11,126
Cigarettes ..... "	116,061,522	121,383,584	347,252	362,626	15,374
Tobacco and snuff ..... Lbs.	10,816,854	11,330,345	2,306,861	2,308,460	1,599
Raw leaf, foreign ..... "	9,352,535	9,848,803	971,977	1,026,265	54,288

I give these figures because, as I have stated, the growth of trade in these articles is always a matter of interest, whether or not it meets with general approval. There are one or two other items in the revenue which are worthy of special note. I think my hon. friend the Postmaster General has reason to congratulate himself on the state of the post office revenue. There was an increase of $235,969.77 in the revenue of that department. The post office receipts as shown in the books of the Finance Department amounted to $3,441,504.93. The expenditure, by the same account, was $3,939,446.01, showing a deficit of $489,941.08, according to the books of the Finance Department. My hon. friend the Postmaster General has in his own report drawn attention to the different services performed as compared with the services of former years, and in that light has made out a more favourable statement. But I give the figures as they appear in the books of the Finance Department, and they represent a deficit for the year of $489,941.08. It is of course quite a large sum; but when we remember that only a few years ago the deficits of the Post Office Department were $700,000 and $800,000 per annum, if there was nothing else to explain the matter, this reduction down to $489,000 would be a remarkable reduction on which my hon. friend the Postmaster General might well congratulate himself. But when we are able to go further and show that in the meantime my hon. friend has more than cut the English postage in two, and that he has reduced the Canadian postage one-third, that he has practically cut off what somebody else has described as a mil-

lion dollars in the charges upon the people, and still has reduced the deficit from $700,000 and $800,000 to $489,000, I think it will be agreed that this is a very gratifying statement, and in the highest degree creditable to the government, and especially to the minister in charge of that department.

I am glad to be able to say that the post office returns for the present year indicate that we shall have at the next Budget a still more gratifying statement to make concerning that department. I find that for the eight months of the present fiscal year the sales of stamps, which of course is the chief source of revenue, have amounted to $3,172,931. Last year for the corresponding period they were $2,909,128. In 1898, before the reduction of postage, the receipts for eight months were $2,946,513. So that to-day, with a three cent rate reduced to two cents, and with the English rate reduced from five cents to two cents, we are able to show receipts in the eight months of $3,172,000, against $2,946,000 when the higher rate prevailed. Looking at the operations of the present eight months in another form, the increased expenditure of the Post Office Department during these eight months amounts to $45,000; but the increased revenue for these eight months amounts to $260,000 ; so that in the operations of these eight months the Post Office Department shows a betterment of $215,000. I have every reason to anticipate that when the Postmaster General prepares his next report he will have a very gratifying statement to present indeed.

Then, Sir, I think the receipts from railways are worthy of special notice. We hear very much about the expenditures on railways, because our outlay has been large. We hear very much of a deficit on railways when one occurs; but we are sometimes apt to overlook the large increase which has taken place in the receipts of those roads. I find that in 1896 the receipts for railways were $3,140,678.47; last year, the receipts were $5,213,381.24, an increase in five years of $2,072,702.77. So that if my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals makes large demands upon us, he is at all events able to show that we receive very large returns for them. In connection with the statement of last year, I would invite attention also to the operations of the railways for a period of seven months, as we have only returns to the end of January. I find that for the seven months of last year there was a loss on the operation of the Intercolonial Railway of $537,479.40. But in the corresponding period of seven months in this year the loss on the Intercolonial Railway operation is only $89,787.17, which would seem to indicate that at the close of the present fiscal year my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals will have a fairly satisfactory statement to present as against the one for the past year, which showed a deficit of $488,000.

Our expenditure on consolidated fund for the year past was $46,866,367.84, as against, in the previous year, $42,975,279.51, showing an increase in expenditure on consolidated fund for the year of $3,891,088.33.

There have been some increases in many of the departments. In legislation there was an increase of $342,424 an item due to circumstances which are probably generally understood. In arts, agriculture and statistics, which includes the census, there was an increase of $235,645. In militia there was an increase of $215,495 ; in railways and canals, collection—that is the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway—there was an increase of $1,133,660 but, as I have shown before, that outlay comes back by way of increased receipts. In public works there was a large increase of $1,096,743 ; in the government of the North-west Territories $150,177 and in the the post office department $173,431, which, however, comes back to us, as I have already shown, very handsomely.

I have prepared a statement of comparison for the two years showing the expenditure on the consolidated fund account and several items which make up what are called capital and special charges. The word 'capital' is used in the books of the department in a technical sense. It refers to a certain class of works. There are certain others which are nominally not capital charges but which are really special charges, as railway subsidies, for example. They do not appear as capital charges, but special charges. But for the purpose of our discussion these may all be called capital charges inasmuch as they are not charges to income. This comparison shows that on consolidated fund as I have already stated, there was an increase of $3,891,088.33. For railways, on capital account, there was an expenditure in 1901, of $3,914,010.50, an increase of $605,116.19 ; for canals, $2,360,569.89 ; a decrease of $278,995.04 ; public works, $1,006,983.39 ; a decrease of $82,843.90 ; Dominion lands, $269,060.90, an increase of $69,590,81 ; militia, $135,884,79, a decrease of $94,965.72 ; and Canadian Pacific Railway, a small item of $8,978.87, an increase of $8,742.76. The total expenditure for the year 1900-1 was $7,695,488.34, showing an increase of $226,645.10. Then there are the special expenditures that I have described, as follows : Railway subsidies, $2,512,328.86 as against $725,720.35 for 1899-1900, an increase in that item alone of $1,786,608.51. For the South African war and Halifax garrison we spent $908,681.42, which shows a decrease of $638,942.32. If we take the total capital and special expenditures, which, practically we treat as capital in our discussions, we find that the

expenditure was in 1901, $11,116,498.62 against $9,742,187.33, an increase under these heads of $1,374,311.29. If we take the aggregate expenditures, that is consolidated fund, capital, special and all classes, the total expenditure for the year 1900-1 was $57,982,866.46, an increase in the total expenditures of all classes of $5,265,399.62.

EXPENDITURE.

	1899-1900.	1900-1.	Increase.	Decrease.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Consolidated Fund	42,975,279 51	46,866,367 84	3,891,088 33	
Capital—				
Railways	3,308,894 31	3,914,010 50	605,116 19	
Canals	2,639,564 93	2,360,569 89		278,995 04
Public Works	1,089,827 29	1,006,983 39		82,843 90
Dominion Lands	199,470 09	269,060 90	69,590 81	
Militia	230,850 51	135,884 79		94,965 72
Canadian Pacific Railway	236 11	8,978 87	8,742 76	
Total Capital	7,468,843 24	7,695,488 34	226,645 10	
Special—				
Railway Subsidies	725,720 35	2,512,328 86	1,786,608 51	
South Africa and Halifax Garrison	1,547,623 74	908,681 42		638,942 32
Total Special	2,273,344 09	3,421,010 28	1,147,666 19	
Total Capital and Special	9,742,187 33	11,116,498 62	1,374,311 29	
Total Expenditure of all kinds	52,717,466 84	57,982,866 46	5,265,399 62	

It will be noticed that the largest item of increase in this statement is on account of railway subsidies. As I have pointed out we spent last year $2,512,328.86 on railway subsidies as against $725,720.35 in the previous year. It may be interesting that I should place in the budget a statement of these various railways which received this large amount of money. It is as follows:

Atlantic and North-western Railway	$ 186,600 00
Massawippi Valley Railway	5,376 00
Great Northern Railway	345,323 11
South Shore Railway	88,400 00
Iverness and Richmond Railway	132,800 00
Canadian Northern Railway	537,600 00
Grand Trunk Railway	228,371 75
Central Ontario Railway	67,200 00
Midland Railway	170,264 00
Canadian Pacific Railway	92,800 00
Ottawa and New York Railway	90,000 00
Quebec Bridge	74,570 00
St. Mary's River Railway	75,000 00
Crows Nest Pass Railway	205,524 00
Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway and Gatineau Valley Railway	212,500 00
	$2,512,328 86

I come now to the question of the public debt. The net debt on the 30th of June, 1901, was $268,480,003.69, while the corresponding debt of the preceding year was $265,493,806.89, making an increase in the net debt of $2,986,196.80. I have here a statement of the increase in the net debt for several years and I find in going over the items of the net debt, the increases for each year and the decrease which occurred in one year, we have this result, that in five years the net increase of the debt has been $9,982,570.92, being an average of $1,996,514.18 as against an average for the previous eighteen years of $6,563,075. The increase in the net debt is accounted for in the following manner: Capital expenditure on railways and canals, public works, including Canadian Pacific Railway, $7,290,542.65; Dominion lands, $269,060.90; militia, $135,884.79; railway subsidies, $2,512,328.86; South African contingent and Halifax garrison, $908,681.42, making a total of $11,116,498.62. Deduct from this the surplus of $5,648,333.29, sinking fund $2,480,336.90 and a small refund in connection with the North-west Territory Rebellion of $1,631.63, or a deduction altogether of $8,130,301.82, and there is an increase in the net debt of $2,986,196.80.

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Net debt 30th June, 1901	$268,480,003 69
" " 1900	265,493,806 89
Increase in debt in 1900-1	2.986,196 80

—	Net Debt.	Increase in Debt.	Decrease in Debt.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1897	261,538,596 46	3,041,163 69	
1898	263,956,398 91	2,417,802 45	
1899	266,273,446 60	2,317,047 69	
1900	265,493,806 89	.....	779,639 71
1901	268,480,003 69	2,986,196 80	
Total for five years		10,762,210 63	779,639 71
		779,639 71	
Net increase 5 years		9,982,570 92	
Average increase 5 years		1,996,514 18	
Average of 18 years from 1878 to 1896		6,563,075 00	

The increase in the net debt in 1900-1901 is accounted for as follows :—

		$ cts.
Capital expenditure on Railways and Canals, Public Works, including C. P. Railway		7,290,542 65
" " Dom. lands		269,060 90
" " Militia		135,884 79
Railway subsidies		2,512,328 86
South African Contingent and Halifax garrison		908,681 42
		11,116,498 62
Less: Surplus	5,648,333 29	
Sinking Fund	2,480,336 90	
Refunds N.W.T. rebellion	1,631 63	
		8,130,301 82
Increase net debt		2,986,196 80

I have spoken in this statement of the surplus received during the past year amounting to $5,648,333.29. I am sure it will be gratifying to know that we are able from year to year to present these statements of satisfactory surpluses. I am aware that there is some criticism on this subject from year to year as to whether or not we do present a surplus. There was a tendency to represent that there was some change in the methods of keeping the accounts, and that the surplus that we represented was somewhat different from the surpluses of former years. That contention has now been abandoned because we have shown from time to time that there has been no change in the method of keeping the accounts. The methods are the same, the officials who keep the accounts are the same, and when we show a surplus in the public accounts we reach it in precisely the same manner as in former years.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the iron bounties which are now charged to capital ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That cannot affect the question of the debt in any way at all.

Mr. SPROULE. You are talking about a surplus ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The iron bounties have hitherto amounted each year to a comparatively small sum. I presented to the House last year, the reasons why we are now proposing to charge the iron bounties to capital. Let me tell my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that as respects the operations of the past year which I am speaking of, we had not begun to charge these bounties to capital, but the old method continued. I think, however, that this old method was a very mistaken one. I impute nothing but the best of motives to the gentlemen who preceded me in charge of the department. What they did was to treat these iron bounties as a drawback, and to be paid as such by the Customs Department. I do not see how you can pay a drawback when no money has been paid into the revenue, and I think the idea of treating this as a drawback and simply deducting it from the customs duty, and making the customs duty appear a good deal less than it really was, was a mistake. From the 1st of July last, we have changed that method. But up to that date and covering the period of which I am now speaking, as regards the surpluses, we continued the old method, and therefore the suggestion of my hon. friend is not important.

As I have said, some hon. gentlemen have made the criticism that these surpluses were brought about by some peculiar method of bookkeeping, but more recently I have noticed in some of the papers, a tendency to argue that even if the method was an old one, it was a bad one, and we had better get rid of it altogether. I entirely dissent from that. I think, in a country like Canada, we shall always, certainly for a long time, require for the construction of public works and things of that kind, special sums of money which cannot be obtained from the ordinary revenue, and there is every reason in the world why these should be charged to capital account. There is just the same reason that would obtain with a man in his private affairs. If a man were paying rent he would charge the rent against the income for the year, but if he bought a house he would not expect to charge it against income, but would open a special account and make some provision for paying for

the house. What is fair with the individual is fair with regard to the affairs of the nation. There is a proper distinction between the ordinary expenses of the government and special expenses for public works, or some special or exceptional charge which should be set apart and treated in a different way. I am therefore defending not only my own method, but I am defending the method of all the illustrious men who have preceded me in the Department of Finance when I claim that this is a proper distinction to make and a proper way to treat the accounts.

Having thus shown, as I hope I have, that that method is correct, and that we have had surpluses just precisely as our opponents in some cases had them, I now invite your attention to this record of surpluses.

For the first year of this government, we had a deficit of $519,981.44; but the next year we entered upon the era of surpluses which is not yet ended. The following table will show the surpluses for each year from 1897 down to the present:

	Surplus.	Deficit.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
1896-7		519,981 44
1897-8	1,722,712 33	
1898-9	4,837,749 00	
1899-1900	8,054,714 51	
1900-1901	5,648,333 29	
Total for 5 years	20,263,509 13	519,981 44
Net surplus	19,743,527 69	
Average	3,948,705 53	

For the 18 years 1st July, 1878, to 30th June, 1896, the total surpluses were	$27,862,361 68
And total deficits	18,060,648 55
Leaving net surplus	$ 9,801,713 13
Or an average of	544,539 61

For the eighteen years from the 1st of July, 1878, to the 30th of June, 1896, the total surpluses were $27,862,361.68, and the total deficits for these eighteen years amounted to $18,060,648.55. Deducting the deficits from the surpluses we find that during these eighteen years the gentlemen then managing the public affairs had a net surplus of $9,801,713.13, or an average surplus per year of $554,539.61; while we have had an average yearly surplus during our term of office, amounting to $3,948,705.53.

Hitherto I have spoken of the financial affairs of the past year. Coming now to the affairs of the current year; there is a considerable increase in the revenue and a corresponding increase in the expenditure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friends say 'Hear, hear.' Well, we are lucky people when we can make the two go hand in hand. We have received for the current year to the 10th of March, this present month as revenue $38,047,685.82. Having regard to the receipts of the corresponding period a year ago; to the amount which was received from this date to the end of that fiscal year, and to the anticipation in which I indulge that there will be some increase; I am of opinion that we shall have at the close of this current year a revenue of $56,800,000 (in round numbers) as against an actual revenue last year of $52,514,701. There will thus be a probable increase in our revenue this year to the amount of $4,285,298.

Now with regard to the expenditure. We have expended this year up to the 10th of March, $30,133,502.76; and taking into account the amount which we expended last year from this date to the 30th of June, and making allowances for a probable increase during the present year—because there will be some increase—I am of opinion that at the close of the year we shall have an expenditure in all, probably of nearly $51,000,000 in round numbers. I make it a shade below that, but for convenience we may call it $51,000,000. That will be an increase in the expenditure, over the expenditure on consolidated account for the past year, of $4,133,632. It will be observed that I estimate an increase of revenue of $4,285,298, and an increase of expenditure of $4,133,632. The two sums would nearly balance one another. If they exactly balanced one another they would leave us with the same surplus as last year, namely, $5,648,333; but as the increase of revenue is a little more than the increase of expenditure, I think I am warranted in saying that the surplus for the current year will be a little larger than that of last year and will amount to $5,800,000.

As to the capital expenditure of the present year, it is exceptionally large; the largest we have had for some years. I anticipate that at the close of the year, we shall have a charge for capital and special expenditure of $14,250,000, as against $11,116,000 last year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I got the estimated expenditure as $51,000,000 in round numbers; is that right?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is correct. We have this year very special charges to swell the capital account. Our railway subsidies will be considerable, as they were last year. The House is aware that railway operations have been going on throughout the Dominion pretty largely. We shall have to pay for bounties this year,

chargeable for the first time to capital account, about $700,000. There are large sums chargeable to capital for the equipment of the Intercolonial Railway with rolling stock and with new rails. There are large sums for transportation in the Public Works Department. There is a very considerable sum amounting to $950,000, representing the awards to two provinces on certain questions which were dealt with last session. For these and other expenditures we shall have, as I have already stated, a total of about $14,000,000 on capital account; and the result will be that we shall be obliged to make this year a larger addition to our public debt than we have done in any previous year in the history of this government.

Mr. SPROULE. Notwithstanding the surpluses.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Notwithstanding the surpluses. On that point I am going to endeavour to satisfy my hon. friend that we have a most admirable record; and if, by and by, in the dim and distant future, he is to stand in my place, and shall be as lucky as I am, and I should be on the other side of the House, I will congratulate him from the bottom of my heart.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. A gross expenditure of $65,250,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About that. The amount which I anticipate we shall have to add to the debt of the Dominion for the current year will be close upon $6,000,000. This will be, as I have stated, the largest addition to the public debt under the present administration, and will be almost in line with, though a shade above, the addition made to the public debt in the last year of the late government, when the addition was $5,422,000. You see it has taken us five years to catch up to them in that one matter. But even with this large increase to the public debt for the current year, we shall still be able to present a very gratifying statement, as to the average annual increase to the public debt—and hon. gentlemen opposite are much fonder of averages than we are.

Mr. WILSON. Will you average the income ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, we ought to be very glad to know that under a tariff which takes out of the pockets of the people $4,000,000 a year less than the old tariff would, if it had remained in operation—under a tariff which has been reduced so much that hon. gentlemen opposite complain that our taxation is too low—we are still in the happy position of having a largely increased income. Even with this considerable addition to the public debt of the current year, we shall have a very satisfactory statement of averages to present; for when we have added the $6,000,000, if it shall prove to be that, to the public debt this year, we shall have made an average yearly increase of $2,793,000, as against $6,563,000 for all the years of our predecessors.

Now, in a country like Canada, I think that about all we could be expected to do would be to provide out of taxation for our ordinary expenditure; and if perchance we needed important works of a permanent character, or if there were some exceptional charge, such as bounties, railway subsidies, or the South African war, it would not be entirely wrong if we were to charge every penny of the cost to the public debt. A young country like Canada might be placed in that position without being regarded as going behind. But if she is able to do something better than that, if she is able to provide not only for her ordinary expenditure but also for a considerable part of her capital expenditure out of the revenue, then she makes a very fair showing. I have prepared a statement for the purpose of showing what these capital and special charges have been. I am taking periods of six years, from 1879 to 1884, from 1885 to 1890, from 1891 to 1896, and from 1897 to 1902. My object is to ascertain what were these capital or special charges in each of these terms, and what proportion of them was borne out of revenue, and what proportion passed into the public debt. I find that in the first period, from 1879 to 1884, these capital and special expenditures amounted to $72,339,172, of which $41,799,780 was added to the public debt; so that the government of that day were able to provide for these capital and special charges out of revenue to the extent of 42 per cent. In the next period, from 1885 to 1890, these capital and special charges amounted to $63,520,739, and during that period there was added to the public debt $55,371,361, showing that in that period only 13 per cent of these capital charges was paid out of revenue, and all the rest was added to the public debt. In the period from 1891 to 1896, $31,306,340 was expended on these capital and special charges, of which $20,964,221 was added to the public debt; in other words 33 per cent of these charges was paid out of revenue and the balance was added to the public debt. In the last six years, from 1897 to 1902, assuming that we spend the amount on capital which I estimate, and add to the public debt $6,000,000, at the close of this year we shall have spent $55,872,572 on these capital and special charges above ordinary expenditure, and we shall have added to the public debt only $15,982,570; so that we shall have provided for these capital and special expenditures out of revenue to the extent of no less that 71 per cent.

	Capital and special expenditure.	Increase of net debt.	Amount of capital and special expenditure provided out of revenue.	Percentage of capital and special expenditure provided out of revenue.
	$	$	$	per cent.
1879	6,324,556	2,628,117		
1880	9,191,121	9,461,405		
1881	8,294,088	2,944,191		
1882	7,607,521	—1,734,129		
1883	14,168,728	4,805,063		
1884	26,753,155	23,695,135		
	72,339,172	41,799,780	30,539,392	42
1885	14,126,017	14,245,841		
1886	22,825,956	26,751,414		
1887	5,846,471	4,155,668		
1888	8,345,629	7,216,582		
1889	6,600,363	2,998,683		
1890	5,776,301	3,170		
	63,520,739	55,371,361	8,149,377	13
1891	4,449,640	275,818		
1892	5,506,242	3,322,403		
1893	4,039,675	549,605		
1894	5,423,208	4,501,987		
1895	4,740,332	6,891,897		
1896	7,147,241	5,422,505		
	31,306,340	20,964,221	10,342,119	33
1897	4,622,996	3,041,163		
1898	6,501,755	2,417,802		
1899	9,639,134	2,317,047		
1900	9,742,187	—779,639		
1901	11,116,498	2,986,196		
1902	*14,250,000	*6,000,000		
	55,872,572	15,982,570	39,890,002	71

* Estimated.

With respect to the year which will begin on the first of July next, it is much too early to attempt anything like close calculations. I see no reason why we should not look forward to a very hopeful year. If I may use the words of Mr. Clouston, the president of the Canadian Bankers' Association, all the outward and visible signs still indicate that we are in prosperous times. Still, much will depend on the harvest for the coming year, and it is too far away for us to make any guess about that. If we should be so fortunate as to have in the North-west another harvest such as that of last season, and if the general conditions of Canada continue as they have been, we shall indeed have the greatest year in Canada's history. I think we may look forward hopefully, at the same time not counting too much on those things which are still in the future; and if a change should come, owing to a bad harvest or anything of that sort, it will be our duty to observe the signs of the times, and limit our expenditure accordingly.

The buoyancy of our revenues has enabled us to carry on our large operations for some years without the issue of loans in the public money market. In the year 1897 I obtained from parliament authority for the issue of a loan of $15,000,000. There was at the time a considerable outstanding borrowing power. Thus at the close of that session I had authority to raise loans to quite a large amount. So hopeful, however, did I feel as to the financial prospects of the Dominion that I concluded to use the borrowing power in a very moderate way. The loan which I placed on the London market in the autumn of 1897 was for £2,000,000, or a little under $10,000,000. No public loan has since been issued. Our surplus revenues helped us to bear a large part of our capital and special expenditure, and when these proved insufficient occasional temporary loans were obtained from the banks. We have now a considerable temporary loan of this character, and having regard to the need of providing for it and for old loans which will shortly mature in London, it is evident that we shall at no distant date have occasion to offer an issue of our securities to the public. Whether we shall do this during the present calendar year, or postpone it until next year, when a considerable sum of the existing loans matures, is a point which will have to be considered a little later, in accordance with the condition and prospects of the money market. We shall have to ask parliament for authority for these loans, to be used when required.

The existing temporary loan which I have referred to, amounts to £1,250,000, or a little over $6,000,000. This loan, which will mature on the 1st of July next, bears interest at a shade above 3¼ per cent, which, having regard to the conditions of the money market for some months past, is a reasonable rate.

If we find it necessary to go on the London money market this year, I have no doubt that we shall be able to go under very favourable conditions, though not exactly as favourable as those of five years ago. At that time we were lucky in striking the happy moment when we were able to negotiate a 2½ per cent loan. I am afraid that the present conditions of the money market are not as favourable as they were then. If we may judge by making a comparison of the rates of Canadian securities with those of English consols, we find that at the time our loan was placed on the market in 1897 there was a very broad difference between the two; but owing to the high position Canada has attained in the eyes of the world, and especially to the change brought about by the admission of Canadian securities to the English trustee list, Canadian securities have come much nearer to English consols, although the quotations for our securities are lower than they were a few years ago. So that if this is a fair test of credit, the credit of Canada has improved to a very appreciable degree; and I have no doubt that when the moment comes, we shall be able to obtain our loan on favourable and reasonable terms. I have

stated the amount of the temporary loan. Perhaps it would be convenient if I were to state also the amount of the loans which are likely to mature in a short time. For the sake of convenience I have made a statement—which, of course, can be obtained from the Public Accounts in more detail—of the loans maturing within the next three years :

LOANS IN LONDON FALLING DUE BETWEEN 1902 AND 1906.

Date of Maturity.	Name of Loan.	Amount in £	Equivalent in Currency.	Year.
		£	$	
Oct. 1, 1903....	I.C.R. Guaranteed 4 per cent Loan	1,500,000	7,300,000	1903
" 1, 1903....	I.C.R. Unguaranteed 5 per cent Loan	500,000	2,433,333	1903
Apl. 1, 1904....	Rupert's Land Guaranteed 4 per cent	300,000	1,460,000	1904
May 1, 1904....	Loan of 1874, 4 per cent	4,000,000	19,466,666	1904
" 1, 1905....	Loan of 1875, 4 per cent	1,000,000	4,866,666	1905
Nov. 1, 1906....	Loan of 1876, 4 per cent	2,500,000	12,166,666	1906

There will then be no maturing loan until April, 1908.

RECAPITULATION.

	£	$
1903	2,000,000	9,733,333
1904	4,300,000	20,926,666
1905	1,000,000	4,866,666
1906	2,500,000	12,166,666
Total	9,800,000	47,693,333

There is also a loan of $2,852,000, falling due in Canada, 1st November, 1903, now bearing 4 per cent.

In the Budget last year I presented in some detail—possibly with tedious detail—some statistics showing the wonderful growth of the trade of Canada. I do not intend to go into that so fully to-day, but simply to remind the House that gratifying as was the report for 1900 we are able to show in the year following an advance beyond the figures of that date, which is an evidence that Canada is indeed prosperous. I propose to give a very few figures, making a comparison between the business of 1901 and that of 1900 :

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS, 1900 AND 1901.

Imports for Consumption—Dutiable.

1900	$104,346,795
1901	105,969,756
Increase	$ 1,622,961

Imports for Consumption—Free.

1900	$68,160,083
1901	71,730,938
Increase	$ 3,570,855

Total Imports for Consumption, including coin and bullion.

1900	$180,804,316
1901	181,237,988
Increase	$ 433,672

Total Imports.

1900	$189,622,513
1901	190,415,525
Increase	$ 793,012

Total Exports.

1900	$191,894,723
1901	196,487,632
Increase	$ 4,592,909

Total Exports—Produce of Canada.

1900	$170,642,369
1901	177,431,386
Increase	$ 6,789,017

Total Trade.

1900	$381,517,236
1901	386,903,157
Increase	$ 5,385,921

Deposits by the people in the Chartered Banks.

1900	$277,256,716
1901	315,775,429
Increase	$ 38,518,713

Deposits in the Savings Banks (including Post Office and Government Savings Bank; the City and District Savings Bank and the Caisse d'Economie de Notre Dame de Québec).

1900	$70,575,193
1901	75,174,053
Increase	$ 4,598,860

Discounts—Chartered Banks.

1900	$316,634,620
1901	318,240,549
Increase	$ 1,605,929

Note Circulation (including Dominion notes and notes of Chartered Banks).

1900	$71,672,310
1901	76,790,931
Increase	$ 5,118,621

Railway Traffic—Tons carried.

1900	35,946,183
1901	36,999,371
Increase	1,053,188

These figures briefly recount the great advance indeed in 1901 over the year 1900. I have at hand a statement of the trade of the past eight months of the current year, and it is pleasing to see that that also continues favourable:

EIGHT MONTHS TRADE, PRESENT YEAR

IMPORTS—HOME CONSUMPTION.

	Eight Months ending February.	
	1901.	1902.
	$	$
Dutiable Goods	68,365,018	74,368,939
Free Goods	46,121,536	49,452,300
Total	114,486,554	123,821,239
Coin and Bullion	3,267,574	4,563,824
Grand Total	117,754,128	128,385,063
Duty collected	18,864,162	20,492,093

EXPORTS.

	Eight Months ending February.			
	1901.		1902.	
	Domestic.	Foreign.	Domestic.	Foreign.
	$	$	$	$
The Mine	27,009,630	114,352	24,617,043	116,122
" Fisheries	7,968,143	8,781	10,798,438	36,446
" Forest	21,052,427	256,370	22,240,309	8,453
Animals and their Produce	42,753,901	649,143	44,203,926	525,216
Agriculture	17,463,156	10,462,722	21,890,748	8,409,101
Manufactures	10,199,086	1,107,264	11,424,953	1,565,664
Miscellaneous	42,923	217,466	24,804	162,375
Total Merchandise	126,489,266	12,816,098	135,200,221	10,823,377
Coin and Bullion	187,173	1,110,707		1,539,195
Grand Total Exports	126,676,439	13,926,805	135,200,221	12,362,572

Thus the statement for the eight months goes to show that the indications for business during the current year are so far exceedingly good, and I see no reason why we should not look forward to a continuance of good business.

A feature which deserves a passing remark is the gratifying increase reported by the Department of the Interior with regard to the immigration. Not only from the old country is there a moderate increase, but a new feature has been introduced of late in the very large increase of immigration from the United States. Some portion of this, no doubt, is made up of Canadians coming back, while the others are people who have been settled in the United States for years and who are now coming across the line. I need hardly say that they are the most desirable class of immigrants, and we ought to feel pleased that so many are casting in their lot with us. From the returns of immigration, from the returns of homestead entries, from the returns of sales of land by the railway companies, from the recent announcement that the price is advancing of private lands throughout the North-west, we are led to the conclusion that, at last, the great work of filling up the North-west has begun in earnest. There is reason to believe that we may look forward to a splendid development of that great territory during the next few years.

There has been much discussion of late about the operation of our tariff as respects imports from Great Britain and the United States. Leaving out of consideration the question of free goods, it has been represented that on the dutiable goods imported the average rate of duty has actually been higher on British goods than on American. This statement of the average duties, even if correct, may be so presented as to be somewhat misleading. If you buy from England a quantity of fine goods on which the duties are considerable, and from the United States a quantity of goods of another class on which the duties are low, you may strike an average which will seem to show that the duties on British goods are higher. But if the comparison be made of the duties in any one class of goods, the result will be quite different. No figures of this kind respecting averages can shut out from view the simple fact that there are no duties on British goods higher than on American, and that with the exception of a few articles which are excluded from the preference the duties on all British imports are just one-third less than on similar goods from the United States. As a matter of fact, however, the statements respecting the levying of higher average duties on British than on American dutiable imports appear to be inaccurate. By referring to the Trade and Commerce Report (part 1, page 15) it will be found that the average rate of duty on British dutiable goods last year was 24·74, while the average rate on American dutiable goods was 24·83. The fractional difference, therefore, was in favour of Great Britain. Practically, however, on the business of last year the two average rates were the same. How does this compare with previous conditions? One would assume from some of the criticisms that have been offered that the previous tariff bore more lightly on British as compared with American goods. But what are the facts? In the year 1896, under the tariff of the late government, the average duty on dutiable imports from the United States was 26·69. In the same year the average duty on British dutiable imports was 30·20, showing a difference against Great Britain of nearly 4 per cent. Thus, even taking the averages, it will be seen that under the operation of our tariff a discrimination of about 4 per cent against Great Britain has been wiped out, until now there is a small difference in favour of Great Britain. But a closer examination shows still more clearly how the present tariff has operated favourably to British trade. The British preference does not apply to all goods. By general consent it has been deemed well to exclude certain articles such as wines, spirits and tobacco from the benefit of the preference. Leaving out these non-preference articles and comparing imports of British dutiable goods with imports of American dutiable goods—that is to say, taking into consideration all the articles to which the British preference applies—I find that while the average duty on American goods is over 24½ per cent, the average duty on British goods is only a shade above 21 per cent.

If any importance is to be attached to this question of the relative duty on British and American dutiable goods, it is well that we should have the facts and figures clearly stated.

As bearing upon this question, I desire to draw attention to the figures with regard to our increased trade with Great Britain. It is not quite clear to me, by the way, whether some of my hon. friends opposite regard an increase of trade with Great Britain as desirable or not. Therefore, the application of these figures is somewhat difficult. Some hon. gentlemen profess to view an increase of trade with Great Britain favourably, while others think we ought not to buy so much from Great Britain. However that may be, it is undoubtedly the case that we expected that our trade with Great Britain would be increased under the preferential tariff. I have here the figures showing the imports:

Trade with Great Britain. Imports for consumption—merchandise only, dutiable and free.

1895	$31,059,332
1896	32,824,505
1897	29,401,188
1898	32,043,461
1899	36,931,323
1900	44,279,983
1901	42,819,995

Now, it will be observed that, under the old tariff, from 1895 to 1897, the imports from Great Britain decreased. Under the new tariff, they began to increase and ran up to over $44,000,000. And, although last year, they dropped a little, they are far and away above any figures that could be quoted of any time under the old tariff. But, my hon. friends opposite may not attach much importance to the imports. Then, perhaps, they will consider the exports. I will give first the exports of goods produced in Canada :

Exports of Home Produce to Great Britain.

1895	$57,903,564
1896	62,717,941
1897	69,533,852
1898	93,065,019
1899	85,113,681
1900	96,562,875
1901	92,857,525

But, if we consider both home and foreign products, the figures of our exports are as follows :

Exports to Great Britain, Home and Foreign Products.

1895	$ 61,856,990
1896	66,689,253
1897	77,227,502
1898	104,998,818
1899	99,086,981
1900	107,735,968
1901	105,328,956

So, thus far, our trade with Great Britain has enormously increased since the adoption of the preferential tariff.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) give us the figures with regard to the United States ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) asked that exact question at this exact moment last year. I should have remembered that and brought the figures.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me say that I never asked the question in this House before. It may be that the late Mr. Wallace, then representing West York asked it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is that gentleman's worthy successor in several respects. I have not the figures here. But we know that the imports from the United States increased. We know that the trade with the whole world has increased.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We cannot help it, Sir, trade in all directions is increasing under the rule of this beneficent government.

Mr. MACLEAN. We got that information from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then, why does my hon. friend want it again ? What are we wasting time for ?

Mr. MACLEAN. We hope that the Minister of Finance has profited by it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for North Norfolk brought forward the fact prominently. I regret that it has not made a deeper impression on hon. gentlemen opposite. This question of how far the imports from Great Britain have been affected by our preferential tariff has been more or less, a matter of debate. I remember that, in the last session of the British parliament, that distinguished statesman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, in the debate on the sugar duties, during which reference was made to the Canadian preference, said, in terms very gratifying to all Canadians, that, while they appreciated very much the step that Canada had taken, the value was to be looked for, more in the good feeling that had been manifested than in the material results to trade.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friends opposite say : Hear, hear. I suppose they think likewise, and if they think likewise, what becomes of the statements that have been made for some time now that the increased imports under the preferential tariff are destroying some of the factories of Canada ? I am afraid my hon. friends are trying to blow hot and cold on that matter. I cannot find out whether they want that trade to increase or not. At one moment they complain the trade is not increasing under out preference, you will find a column of statistics in the Conservative papers designed to prove that there has been no increase at all, and the next thing we are told is that the preference is ruining the factories of Canada. However, coming back to my friend, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, I felt at the time that the statement, while made in good faith and made in terms which will be pleasing to all Canadians, was based upon a misconception of the situation. In the first place, the actual increase of trade as shown by the figures I have given, is very considerable. Then there is another point to which I fear Sir Michael's attention had not been drawn. In view of the severe competition which is now going on between the United States and other manufacturing nations, if, with the preference of one-third in favour of Great Britain, we have only been able to increase British imports to a small amount, what would have happened to the trade if there had been no preference at all ? Sir, I have no doubt in the world that but for the British preference, that advance in the imports from Great Britain would not have existed at all, there would not have been any increase in the imports from Great Britain. There is not much doubt but that, without the change this government made in the tariff, the imports from Great Britain would have continued to drop as they did from the year 1895 down to 1897.

There was one incident during the past year which calls for mention in the Budget speech. In the Tariff Act of 1897 there was the following clause :

Section 18. Whenever the Governor in Council has reason to believe that with regard to any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among manufacturers of such article or dealers therein, to unduly enhance the price of such article, or in any way to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any judge of the Supreme Court or Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any superior court in any province of Canada, to inquire in a summary way into and report to the Governor in Council whether such trust, combination, association or agreement exists.

2. The judge may compel the attendance of witnesses and examine them under oath, and require the production of books and papers, and shall have such other necessary powers as are conferred upon him by the Governor in Council for the purpose of any such inquiry.

3. If the judge reports that such trust, combination, association or agreement exists, and if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumers is facilitated by the duties of customs imposed on a like article, when imported, then the Governor in Council should place such article on the free list, or so reduce the duty on it as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in such article.

When the section was first submitted to the House, it provided that the Governor in Council should be the body to determine when the combine existed. On further consideration, however, it was deemed unwise for the government to take to itself so large a power. It was thought that in a matter of so much importance it would be better, even at the cost of some delay, to make use of the judicial machinery for the purpose of inquiry and to limit the authority of the government to action after the report of a judge. In several instances complaints were made to the government under this clause, but upon examination they did not appear to come within the provisions of the section. A few months ago, however, complaint was made by the Canadian Press Association in terms which were found to come within the intention of the section. It was alleged that the manufacturers of news printing paper had formed a combine for the purpose of unfairly enhancing the price of the article. The matter was referred under the provisions of the section to Mr. Justice Taschereau, who held a protracted inquiry, heard all parties concerned, and finally reported that the complaint of the Press Association was well founded. Thereupon, the government, exercising the power given it by the section, determined by Order in Council to reduce the duty on printing paper such as is commonly used for newspaper purposes, from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. To distinguish between news print and other papers, it was decided that the reduction should apply to all printing paper of the value of 2¼ cents per pound or less. That, of course, means not the value in Canada, but the value for customs purposes—the value at the place of production abroad. It has been represented to us that while the purpose of the government will be effected as respects the daily journals, the proprietors of which buy in large quantities, it may not cover the case of the weekly papers, which do not buy in such large quantities. The Press Association is to furnish us with further information on that point, and if it be found that the words used in our Order in Council do not properly effect the object in view, an amendment will have to be made. I have no doubt that the results of this inquiry will be of material advantage to the publishers of the Dominion in the making of their arrangements with the Canadian paper manufacturers. Beyond this immediate result, however, the proceedings are interesting and important, and they will serve to remind other manufacturers that if they make an unfair use of any advantage which is given to them by the tariff, a remedy is open to those who will take proceedings under this section of the Tariff Act.

We have again been approached by a large and influential delegation representing the Ontario Beet Root Sugar Association to ask that a bounty be granted on the production of beet root sugar and a similar application came from Prince Edward Island. A new suggestion is offered by some of the parties connected with the movement, that the industry be encouraged by a considerable increase in the customs duty on sugar. I regret that we are obliged to take an unfavourable view of both these proposals. Sugar is an article of prime necessity, universally used in Canada, and already we have a considerable customs duty. Such an increase of the taxation on sugar as was asked would hardly prove acceptable to the sugar consumers of the Dominion, and should not be adopted without urgent reasons. Nor are we satisfied that even the best interests of the beet sugar industry would be promoted by the granting of the aid that is asked. We have to remember that some years ago Canada undertook to encourage the beet sugar industry by the granting of bounties, and that the results were not satisfactory. The capitalists who invested their money lost it, and everybody concerned in the movement suffered a severe disappointment. Naturally, in the presence of that fact, we should be more than usually careful in entering again upon a policy of granting bounties for this industry.

It is represented that the advantages of the province of Ontario, and I suppose the same will be claimed for other provinces which are raising the question, are much greater than were possessed by the eastern townships for raising beet sugar, and it is also claimed that such an

advance has since been made in the manufacture of machinery and in the methods of manufacturing beet root sugar as to ensure the success of the enterprise now. I think there is something in that and that the conditions which exist to-day are such as to give that industry a fair trial if it is naturally adapted to the soil of Canada. Our customs duty, which runs as high as $1.26 per 100 lbs. or a cent and a quarter a lb. on the highest grade of sugar, while it is designed for revenue purposes will provide an incidental protection for beet root sugar produced in the country. The competition from foreign beet sugar is likely to be less keen hereafter as it seems to be settled that the continental bounties on this article,which have so long had a disturbing influence on the world's sugar trade, are about to be abolished. In addition the Ontario government have granted a bounty of half a cent a lb. for two years and of one-quarter of a cent a lb. for the third year, but limited to $75,000 per annum, and I understand that at least three factories are at the present moment in the course of construction in that province. They are certain to go on—one of them is already started—and I am inclined to think that a fourth is in a fair way to being erected. In addition to that the establishment of the industry is no longer problematical but it is a certainty in the North-west Territories. Gentlemen have come in from the south and are erecting a refinery in Lethbridge. With the aid which has been given in the way I have described, with the incidental advantage derived from the customs duty on sugar, with the abolition of the bounties on continental sugar, with the advantage of the Ontario bounty as respects factories in that province, and with the further advantage we have given the beet root sugar industry of the free admission of machinery and structural iron for the purposes of beet root sugar factories, I am inclined to think that there are sufficient inducements to enable the promoters to give the industry a fair trial if it is adapted to the soil of the country. I think it would be a mistake if we were to give further aid which might result in encouraging the erection of a large number of factories which might come to grief. I think it is better to encourage the industry in this moderate way, to have three or four factories in the province of Ontario and one in the North-west Territories established so as to give the industry a fair trial than that we should encourage the starting of factories all over the country which might end in disaster.

Mr. SPROULE. The right to import machinery free of duty will soon end.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will end on the first day of April, but we propose to extend that for another year. Perhaps I ought to say that there has been some objection on the part of Canadian manufacturers to the granting of this privilege of free admission. They say that this machinery is now largely made in Canada and they do not see why we should go abroad for it. I think, however, that the reason on which our previous action was based a year ago still holds good. The argument then used was that where the promoters of an enterprise of that character wish to make a contract for machinery it is an advantage to them to be able to make a contract with one manufacturer, so that he can take the contract for the whole of the machinery, make it where he pleases, be held responsible and guarantee that the machinery will be sufficient for the successful operation of the factory. We have concluded not to propose any changes in the sugar duties, or any bounty on beet root sugar, but to extend for another year the term in which certain machinery and materials for the erection of beet root factories may be admitted free. This privilege will therefore be extended to the first day of April, 1903.

We do not propose to make any changes in the tariff this session. I do not for a moment claim that the tariff is perfect. I think, that, on the whole, it has proved a very good tariff. Indeed, when we recall the circumstances under which our tariff revision took place, when we remember the very complicated and difficult problem with which we had to deal, we may well congratulate ourselves upon our success in devising a tariff so well adapted to the requirements of the country, a tariff under which Canada has prospered in a greater degree than in any previous period in her history. I have occasionally pointed out the desirability of a reasonable measure of tariff stability. Nothing would be more likely to unsettle business than a practice of introducing frequent tariff changes. Hence, we have resisted applications for many small changs and we think it well to do so to-day. But I would not have it understood that this view can always be held. As time passes, conditions change in our own country and it will be well for us to take note of this, so that we may adjust the tariff accordingly. Nor is that the only reason that might require some change. Conditions arise in other countries of which we are obliged to take account. We do not propose that we shall stand still and that this tariff shall remain unchanged, but we think the time is not opportune for making changes at present.

There are several reasons which operate in our minds against entering upon a policy of tariff changes to-day. We have just completed the taking of a census, and while some of the results are available others of much importance have yet to be prepared. Among these are the returns of the operations of our industries. In considering the tariff in relation to the industries of the country, it is desirable that we should have

before us, with ample time for consideration, the industrial statistics of the recent census.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the market gardeners of West York who have been living on promises ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If there are any people who have been living on promises that is what they were accustomed to do for eighteen years and they will find it very easy. A further reason against present change is that we are having certain negotiations with other countries in regard to trade of a more or less formal character. We are not without hope that we will be able to broaden the scope of our treaty with France, though of that I am not in a position to make any definite statement. Much has been said in regard to our relations with Germany. My impression is that there has been a misconception on the part of the German authorities as to the position of Canada. Our position on this question is strong in respect to Germany, but that is no reason why we should ignore the German side of the matter. I admit that there is a colour of excuse for the position which Germany has taken. As I have pointed out on a previous occasion, Germany has two tariffs, one for the world generally, the other, known as the conventional tariff, for those countries which have commercial treaties with Germany. I suppose many hon. gentlemen will say that this is sound policy. Germany had a treaty with Canada, or Canada participated in an imperial treaty with Germany, and under that treaty Canada had the advantage from what is called the conventional tariff as respects Canadian products. Canada put an end to that treaty for her own purposes, for good and sufficient reasons. Not one party in Canada, but all of Canada, reached the conclusion that this treaty was not in the best interests of Canada, or of the empire, and it should come to an end. Our sister colonies took the same view on the subject. But it was admittedly the action of Canada above all others which brought about the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties. When we ceased to have that treaty with Germany, when we ceased to extend to Germany certain privileges which she had enjoyed, Germany withdrew from us the privileges of its conventional tariff. Canada thus came into the class of non-treaty countries, the products of which were subject to the higher tariff. Let us not deny that from one point of view there was some colour of excuse for the German action.

But a more careful examination of the question must lead to the conclusion that the action of Germany, while it might have had an appearance of fairness, was based upon a misconception of the spirit and purpose of Canada's policy. It is true that we have withdrawn from Germany tariff privileges which she formerly enjoyed. But it is necessary to point out that the privileges which Germany lost were not privileges which rightfully belonged to any foreign nation, but privileges which properly belonged to the family circle of the British Empire. Germany might reasonably ask that her products have as fair treatment in our markets as the products of any other foreign country. But she ought not to demand that her products should have the same treatment as the products of our mother country and our sister colonies. Public men in Germany appear to have received the impression that the action of Canada was in some way a discrimination against Germany. Such is not the case. Canada has been quite willing to give to the products of Germany the same treatment as is given to the products of any other foreign nation. That, it seems to us, is all that Germany can reasonably ask. We are inclined to think that the action of Germany has been the result of a misunderstanding of the Canadian policy, and we have therefore been disposed to exercise a large degree of patience in having the matter very clearly put before the German government. We are hopeful that our representation of these facts will in the end bring about a better understanding of the matter. Our trade with Germany is not at present very important to us; although what is called the balance of trade is against us, the value of our exports to that country has been increasing rather than diminishing. Nevertheless, at a time when we are stretching out in all directions for extension of our trade, it is not well to despise the opportunities which might come to us under fairer arrangements with Germany. Besides, the principle involved in Germany's action is important, and on that account, as well as for the possibilities of a larger trade, we should make every effort to have the matter settled in a satisfactory way. There are those who have advocated retaliatory legislation as the only means of settlement. We are hopeful that better results may be obtained by a patient presentation of the facts. Another and stronger reason against immediate changes in our tariff is the present position of our trade relations with the mother country and with our sister colonies. We are about to participate in two important conferences to take place in London. One of these has been called at the suggestion of our government for the special purpose of considering the possibilities of enlarging the trade between Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The other conference is of a broader character and has been called by the Imperial government. The ceremonies attending the coronation of the King will take to London representative public men from all parts of the empire, and the Imperial government desires to avail itself of the opportunity to discuss various matters, including questions of trade and commerce affecting the interests of the empire. Canada will

be expected to take an active part in the consideration of these questions, and at the close of these conferences we shall be in possession of a knowledge of the disposition of other portions of the empire which will undoubtedly be valuable to us in the consideration of any proposed tariff changes. I do not underestimate the difficulties in the way of bringing about such trade relations within the empire as are desirable from the Canadian point of view. However, it is our duty to avail ourselves of the opportunity to discuss these matters with the public men of the other parts of the empire and to use every effort to bring about such improved arrangements as would be beneficial to Canada and to the empire.

For these reasons we postpone for the present the question of tariff revision. When the moment for revision arrives, the public of Canada may rest assured that the government will undertake the work in the spirit of moderation and caution that has prevailed in their past actions in tariff affairs, avoiding the extremes which almost always find advocates, and having regard to what is best, not for particular industries or particular sections of the country, but for the interests of the people of the whole Dominion.

The Budget, Mr. Speaker, has friendly relations with the Saints.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was on the morning of St. George's day, five years ago that I had the honour to place on the Table of this House the tariff resolutions containing that principle of British preference which has given so much satisfaction to all who honour St. George and Merrie England. This year our Budget is submitted on Ireland's day of rejoicing. This is St. Patrick's day, and from the topmost roof of our parliament House the British flag flies in honour of this occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is something suggestive in the coincidence. It seems to remind us that, gratifying as is the story we are able to tell of the material progress of the Dominion, there is something that is more pleasing still. It is the very harmonious and happy relations which prevail between our people of all sections, classes and creeds. Here in this broad Dominion we have a population drawn from many races and nationalities—English, French, Scotch, Irish, Welsh, German—all cherishing the memories and traditions of their mother lands, and specially honouring them at appropriate times, as the memories of Ireland are honoured to-day, yet all cordially uniting their efforts for the development of this country and for the maintenance of institutions under which all enjoy the priceless blessings of civil and religious liberty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker. I am afraid that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is taking too much comfort to himself with regard to the relation of the Budget to the Saints' days, in as much as he intended to deliver his Budget speech last Thursday and I induced him to change his mind and to deliver it on St. Patrick's day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) wanted it on Tuesday.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I acquiesced without a moment's hesitation to the suggestion of the Minister of Finance that it should be delivered to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am bound to say that if there is not more consolation for that grand old island across the sea in the matter of public expenditure, than there is for Canada in the Budget speech which the hon. gentleman has presented to-day, Ireland will not have much to comfort herself with.

Before dealing with the main matter in the Budget speech, I wish to make an observation or two about the tariff relations between Canada and Germany. It seems to me remarkably late in the day for the Finance Minister to arrive at the conclusion that the position taken by Canada in this respect should be pressed upon the attention of the German government. For about three years Canada has been excluded from the benefits of the German minimum tariff, and although we on this side had pressed the matter on the attention of this government session after session, the Minister of Finance is only now awakening to the fact that it is desirable to bring the true state of affairs to the attention of the German government. We have been urging upon the hon. gentleman and upon the government for three years past that this matter should be dealt with vigorously and promptly; and though it is somewhat late in the day for the Canadian government to think of taking action, it is better late than never, and I hope our government will move at once.

The Minister of Finance asserted that the census returns are disappointing. They are disappointing to all of us. But when the hon. gentleman asserts that the increase is due entirely to the last five years he asserts that the official statements which have from time to time been presented by the government are absolutely misleading and inaccurate. We all know that the Minister of Finance does not mean anything of the kind, and that it is a mere catch cry to save himself from the position in which he would be placed if we referred to the criticism of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) made ten years ago. But even for the purposes of a catch cry, it is hardly worth while for

my hon. friend to descend to a statement which is so far from the true facts as that which he has made to-day. He also referred to the post office deficit of $489,000; but he omitted to tell us that the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), during the election in the year 1900, told us that the Post Office Department would be self-sustaining. That indicated that the hon. Postmaster General was nearly $500,000 out in regard to the revenues and expenses of his own department; and I do not know that it is much of a compliment from the Minister of Finance to the Postmaster General.

Now, I am not going to follow my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, in a great many of the comparative statements he has made. I wish, in the first place, to say a word or two about the general prosperity of this country and of the world. We, as well as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, congratulate, not the government, but the country, on the splendid prosperity which has prevailed throughout Canada during the past year. We are not behindhand in doing our duty in that respect; but when my hon. friend, as well as the hon. gentlemen behind him, seem to suggest that this prosperity is in any way due to the present government or to any measure which they have brought down, they lay themselves open to fair criticism. Why, Mr. Speaker, a cock crowing at dawn might think his efforts occasioned, because they preceded, the rising of the sun. It would be just as reasonable for the cock to congratulate himself on the rising of the sun on that particular morning as for my hon. friend to congratulate the government of this country upon the prosperity which has prevailed throughout Canada and throughout the world. That particular chanticleer would crow on a certain morning when the sun rose, and my hon. friend happens to be Finance Minister of Canada during a period of great prosperity not only in Canada but throughout the world; and I venture to say that there is just as much cause for congratulation in the one case as there is in the other.

With regard to the expansion of trade, my hon. friend has submitted figures to us with which we are very much pleased in some respects, though not in others, as I shall endeavour to show a little later on. In years gone by my hon. friend has presented diagrams to the House showing the enormous expansion in the trade and revenue of the country since 1896. I have sometimes been tempted to inquire why it is that my hon. friend has never seen fit to present to this House a diagram showing the increased expenditure and the increased taxation of this country from 1896 to the present time.

An hon. MEMBER. There is not room enough.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is suggested that he could not get a diagram large enough; but I do not think that is the case. Possibly there would not be room for it in 'Hansard.' Now, speaking from the standpoint of a critic, I think it is only right that I should bring to your attention and to the attention of the country, the expansion of the expenditure in some of the principal items involved in the administration of this country, which has taken place from 1896 down to the present time.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of expenditure on account of consolidated fund for 1896 and 1901, respectively, with increases.

	1896.	1901.	Increase.
	$	$	$
Interest on debt	10,502,430	10,807,955	305,525
Administration of Justice	758,270	873,233	114,963
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics	210,878	*697,206	486,328
Civil Government	1,396,628	1,474,919	78,291
Fisheries	427,251	491,351	74,100
Geological Survey	134,368	552,493	428,125
Immigration	120,199	444,730	324,531
Quarantine	95,247	170,166	74,919
Indians	880,408	1,019,329	148,911
Insurance superintendence	10,039	12,824	2,785
Legislation	904,688	1,172,726	268,038
Lighthouse and coast service	466,058	578,618	112,560
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions	534,917	629,198	84,281
Militia and Defence	1,136,714	2,061,674	124,960
Miscellaneous	172,364	290,940	118,576
Mounted Police	533,014	912,151	379,137
N. W. T. Government	330,703	504,388	173,685
Ocean and river service	181,452	233,162	51,710
Penitentiaries	385,228	456,351	71,123
Pensions	86,080	93,551	7,471
Police	22,703	68,981	46,278
Public Works	1,299,769	3,386,632	2,186,863
Railways and Canals	126,444	210,414	83,970
Superannuation	311,232	324,507	13,275

*Census not included.

These are all items chargeable to consolidated fund, and then there are certain items chargeable to collections :

CHARGEABLE TO COLLECTION.

	1896.	1901.	Increase.
	$	$	$
Customs	896,332	1,123,817	227,485
Dominion Lands	119,908	133,417	13,509
Inspection of Staples	22,577	14,835	12,258
Post Office	3,665,011	3,931,446	266,435
Public Works	159,460	272,809	113,349
Railways and Canals	3,826,226	6,377,961	2,551,735
Trade and Commerce	9,463	41,699	32,236
Weights and measures, gas, &c	97,295	103,725	5,800

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has not advanced as rapidly as some of his colleagues. Then, there is

CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

	1896.	1901.	Increase.
	$	$	$
Dominion Lands	82,184	269,061	186,877
Intercolonial Railway	260,396	3,633,837	3,373,441
Public Works	114,826	966,502	851,676
Public buildings, Ottawa	Nil.	40,482	40,482
Prince Edward Island Railway	Nil.	280,174	280,174

My hon friend the Minister of Finance has not dealt very fully with this question of expenditure, so far as comparative expenditure is concerned, and I would like to draw his attention to certain figures during a period of five years from 1892 to 1896 as compared with those from 1897 to 1901. Let me give a diagram showing the increase in the total expenditure :

1892	$ 42,272,136	1897	$ 42,972,756
1893	40,853,728	1898	45,334,281
1894	43,009,234	1899	51,542,635
1895	42,872,338	1900	52,717,467
1896	41,702,383	1901	57,982,866
	210,708,819		250,550,005

Average annual expenditure during 5 years of Liberal rule	$50,110,001
Average annual expenditure during 5 years of Conservative rule	42,141,764
Average annual increase under Liberal rule	$7,968,237
Total expenditure, 1897 to 1901 both years inclusive	$250,550,005
Total expenditure, 1892 to 1896, both years inclusive	210,708,819
Liberal rule	$9,841,186

Thus, from 1892 to 1896, the aggregate total expenditure amounted to $210,708,819, and from 1897 to 1901 it amounted to $250,550,005, showing an increased expenditure of nearly $40,000,000 in the latter five years. Therefore, during the five years of Liberal rule, there was a yearly average expenditure of $50,110,001 as compared with $42,141,764 during the previous five years of Conservative administration, or an average increase of annual expenditure of $7,968,237 by the present government over its predecessors.

Why does not my hon. friend the Minister of Finance claim the benefit of this result ? It is one to the full benefit of which he is certainly entitled. He may not be entitled to the credit of the prosperity which prevails in Canada, as well as in all the rest of the world, but certainly he is entitled to the credit of all this expenditure.

My hon. friend became reminiscent this afternoon. Does he ever think of the years gone by in which an expenditure of $38,000,000 was declared by his friends to be $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 too much. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) published an article in the 'North American Review,' in which he attacked the increase in expenditure, during

the eleven years between 1878 and 1889, of $13,385,581. I happen to have the article in my hand. It does not appear to interest my hon. friend now, because I observed him yawn when I merely mentioned it. But I assure him that I am not speaking of him simply as the Minister of Trade and Commerce or the financial critic of the opposition at that time, but as the representative of the Liberal party in those days—the man who was put forward as its ablest exponent; who, in the introduction to this very article, is referred to as the real, though not the titular leader of the opposition; whose views were put forward throughout this country as those of the real leader of the opposition. I invite his attention to some of the views he then expressed—views not set out in the heat of an election campaign, but in the calmness of a magazine review; thought out carefully in the quiet of his study and not uttered on a political platform or in the heat of a political struggle. Let us see what view he took of the situation at that time. He said :

> In 1878, the actual taxation of Canada was $17,841,938, though, as there was a deficit in that year, the necessary taxation might be placed at $19,000,000. In 1889, the actual taxation was $30,613,522, being an increase of $11,613,522.

Now, if we compare 1897 with 1901, we find an increase of $15,000,000 in the four years of Liberal rule, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was shocked at an actual taxation of $30,613,522 in 1889, is not shocked at an actual expenditure of $57,982,000 at the present time.

My hon. friend may say that I am comparing the receipts from taxes with the total expenditure. Well, I will compare something else for him. The total receipts from taxes during 1901 were $38,743,550, so that if my hon. friend had occasion to grow eloquent at that time, he certainly has still more occasion to do so at present. What did he say about it in this magazine article :

> Comment is hardly necessary, nor, indeed, does space permit me to point out the enormous mischiefs which result in a young and poor country from absorbing so large a proportion of the earnings of the people, in defraying the charges of the federal government, as is now being taken in Canada.

Yet, although $8,000,000 more are taken now than then, the Minister of Trade and Commerce seems perfectly contented over the situation. Let us take a comparison which he was good enough to make then, and which is the most striking thing in the article :

In 1845 the population of the United States was (by estimate).....	20,000,000
The taxes of the United States were..	$27,531,630
The total expenditure was.....	22,935,828

Then, he says :

In 1889 the population of Canada was perhaps.....	4,800,000
The taxes of Canada were....	$30,613,522
The total expenditure was.....	36,917,854

And he makes a pitiful comparison between the position of Canada and that of the United States, based on that standpoint. But suppose we were to make a similar comparison at the present time, would not the Minister of Trade and Commerce think it was a perfectly fair one :

In 1845 the population of the United States was (by estimate)..... ..	20,000,000
The taxes of the United States were..	$27,531,630
The total expenditure was....	22,935,828
In 1900 the population of Canada was (so far as we can ascertain from the census).....	5,340,000
The taxes of Canada were.....	$38,743,550
The total expenditure was.....	57,982,866

I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to take the figures I have read to him and go over the article which he wrote in 1889 and apply the same language to the state of affairs in Canada to-day, which he was good enough to apply to its condition ten years ago, and I am sure no stronger indictment can be made against the extravagance of this government.

It is remarkable that my hon. friend, in this article, attributed this scandalous and enormous increase of expenditure—during those eleven years—to what do you suppose ? To the fact that protection existed in Canada. But he tells us himself that in Canada protection does not exist to-day, so he has not that excuse. What then is the reason for the increase in four years of $15,000,000 in our total expenditure ? It cannot be on account of protection, because the Minister of Trade and Commerce tells us that there is no protection in the country and that we have merely a revenue tariff. To what cause must we attribute it ? Surely it cannot be due to the extravagance of this government, because having preached the doctrine of economy during so many years it is impossible to believe that these hon. gentlemen, now that they are at the head of affairs, are actuated by motives other than those of the most strict economy.

Let us look at the expenditure in another way. The per capita expenditure was a subject upon which the hon. gentleman was wont to be very eloquent in days gone by. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says that our population remained stationery from 1890 to 1896. If he is correct, the figures which I am giving will show very much worse against the government. But I do not intend to take that position, because I do not think it would be a fair one. I intend to take the position—which I think is reasonable—that in 1896 the population of this country was about 5,070,000. In that year our expenditure was $41,702,383, and the per capita tax 8·22. In 1897 the population, as I estimate it, was 5,120,000, and our expenditure $42,972,756, and the per capita tax had increased to 8·39. Let me give a tabulated statement, made up from the Public Accounts :

PER CAPITA—TOTAL EXPENDITURE.

Year.	Population estimated.	Expenditure.	Per Capita.
		$	
1896.....	5,070,000	41,702,383	8·22
1897.....	5,120,000	42,972,756	8·39
1898.....	5,175,000	45,334,281	8·76
1899.....	5,230,000	51,542,635	9·85
1900.....	5,285,000	52,717,467	9·98
1901.....	5,340,000	57,982,866	10·88

Thus, these gentlemen have increased the expenditure about 36 per cent, the per capita expenditure about 32 per cent, while the population has increased less than 7 per cent.

And, from the proposed expenditure, it is evident that there will be a great increase in the per capita tax for the ensuing year, unless there is a much greater increase in the population than we can reasonably anticipate or look forward for. Now, the taxation of the country might be looked at for a moment in periods of five years, in the way in which I have just dealt with the expenditure :

TOTAL RECEIPTS FROM TAXES.

1892.....	$28,446,157	1897.....	$28,648,626
1893.....	29,321,367	1898.....	29,576,456
1894.....	27,579,203	1999.....	34,958,069
1895.....	25,446,199	1900.....	38,242,223
1896.....	27,759,285	1901.....	38,743,550
	$138,106,054		$170,168,924

Average annual taxation under five years of Liberal rule.....	$34,033,785
Average annual taxation under five years of Conservative rule.....	27,710,442
Average annual increase under Liberal rule.....	6,323,343
Total taxation, 1897 to 1901, both inclusive.....	$170,168,924
Total taxation, 1892 to 1896, both inclusive.....	138,106,054
Increase under Liberal rule....	$ 32,062,870

Thus we see that the taxes had increased by no less than $32,000,000 in a period of five years. Therefore, I thought it right to bring to the attention of the government and of the country the fact that, while there has been a very great increase in the volume of trade, and in the revenues of the country, there has been an enormous, a startling increase in the public expenditure. During this period of buoyant revenue we have had no decrease in the public debt as might have been expected. The Minister of Finance has referred to the increase in the public debt under Conservative administration, but if during the period of eighteen years of Conservative rule, the government had had so large an average revenue as this government has had for the past five years, not only would there have been no increase in the public debt, but there would have been a great diminution. I desire to point out also that, during that period of time, the Conservative government expended enormous amounts in the public works of this country. From 1878 to 1896, the Conservatives spent $65,000,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway; the Liberals, from 1896 to 1901, have spent about $33,000 for the same purpose. On canals, the Conservatives spent $36,000,000, the Liberals, $14,250,000. The Conservatives set aside as debt for the provinces, $10,300,000, while this government set aside $267,000. The Conservatives spent on the Intercolonial Railway, $20,500,000; the Liberals spent $8,250,000. Taking these things into consideration, I do not know that the Minister of Finance has dealt quite fairly with the country in his comparison of the increased debt during the last five years and during the eighteen years of Conservative rule. He does not take into consideration the enormous revenues we have had for the past five years, nor does he take into consideration the very much larger amount the Conservatives spent on public works in this country than have been spent by the present government.

Now, with regard to the trade conditions of the past year, I do not think it necessarily follows that because importations into Canada are greater than they have been in past years, the country is prospering. If the tariff of this country were so arranged as to close dozens of our factories and drive thousands of our people to the United States to seek employment, one of the first results would be an enormous increase in our imports. Merely that this country has increased its imports, that of itself does not prove that the country is prospering; on the contrary, it may indicate a very bad condition of affairs so far as some of our industries are concerned.

The following figures afford a comparison of the exports for 1900 and 1901 :—

EXPORTS OF CANADA.

——	1900.	1901.
	$	$
Produce of mines.....	24,778,339	40,531,314
" fisheries...	11,224,866	10,730,999
" forest.....	29,954,089	30,276,180
Animals and their produce	57,296,667	56,299,282
Agricultural products.	38,469,961	38,568,052
Manufactures	15,511,581	17,751,350
Miscellaneous	540,541	351,966

A considerable portion of the increase of the produce of the mine consists of the exports of gold-bearing quartz, nuggets, and silver concentrates and ore, which went to the United States, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) told us, to pay the balance of trade which exists between this country and the United States. Let us eliminate these articles from the calculation. The total exports for 1900 were $191,894,723. Deduct gold-bearing quartz, silver concentrates, coin and bullion, amounting to $24,159,666, and we find that the exports of other articles were $167,735,057. In 1901, our total exports were $196,487,632. Deducting coin, bullion, concentrates, &c., $28,844,393, and we have a balance of $167,643,237, or about half a million dollars less of exports than we had last year. The following is a tabulated statement :—

TOTAL EXPORTS OF CANADA.

	1900.	1901.
Total exports of Canada	$191,894,723	$196,487,632
Less gold-bearing quartz, silver concentrates, coin and bullion	24,159,666	28,844,393
	$167,735,057	$167,643,237

I do not see that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has so much to congratulate himself upon so far as the agricultural, mineral and forest exports of the country are concerned, because the advance seems to be made up altogether of gold-bearing quartz, bullion, &c., coupled with the substantial advance of upwards of $2,000,000 in manufactured goods.

Now if we look at the imports and the exports in the same way for 1901, let us see how we stand. If we eliminate from our exports and imports gold-bearing quartz, silver concentrates, bullion and coin, our imports and exports stand as follows : Imports, $186,878,231; exports, $167,643,237; leaving what my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would call a balance of trade against Canada of $19,234,994. The following is a tabulated statement :—

Total imports, 1901	$ 186,878,231
" exports, 1901	167,643,237
Balance of trade against Canada.	$ 19,234,994

Now the development of our trade with the mother country is a circumstance upon which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has seen fit to congratulate the country; but I notice that in doing so he congratulated the country more particularly on the average for five years, and not on the particular results of the past year. Well, let us look at the results of the past year and compare them with those of 1900 :

	Exports to United Kingdom.	Imports from United Kingdom.	Aggregate trade with United Kingdom.
	$	$	$
1900	107,736,368	45,472,294	153,208,662
1901	105,328,956	43,164,297	148,493,253
Decreases	2,407,412	2,307,997	4,715,409

I do not know as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance thinks that the country is to be congratulated upon the decrease in our exports.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You will find it in my speech, at all events.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance does not think that the decrease in our aggregate trade with Great Britain is a very satisfactory showing, having regard to what he has always claimed for the British preference. He says the British preference works in two ways : In the first place, he says it brings British goods into this country instead of American goods. If he does not say that, I do not know what his argument means. On the other hand, he says that the sentiment in Great Britain created by the preference results in a very large increased exportation of Canadian goods to the mother country. Well, the net result during the past year of that preferential trade system has been, as I have already pointed out, that there is a decrease of our exports to Great Britain of $2,407,412, and a decrease of our imports from Great Britain of $2,307,997, and a total falling off of our trade with the mother country, of $4,715,409.

Now let us look at our trade with the mother country during the past year and see in what articles it has increased or decreased, comparing our exports of 1900 with those of 1901 :

EXPORTS of certain Articles from Canada to United Kingdom.

——	1900.	1901.	Decrease.
	$	$	$
Bacon and ham	12,749,175	11,732,785	1,017,390
Wheat	11,350,942	6,112,230	4,238,712
Butter	4,947,000	3,142,353	1,804,647
Fish	3,530,495	3,102,344	428,151
Pine deals	3,223,585	2,698,508	525,077
Apples	2,423,079	1,422,665	1,000,414
Furs	2,020,723	1,249,393	771,330
White pine	1,182,048	880,669	291,379
Iron and steel and manfs. of	792,528	773,124	19,404
Horses	517,641	230,295	287,346

EXPORTS of certain Articles from Canada to United Kingdom—*Concluded.*

—	1900.	1901.	Decrease.
	$	$	$
Sheep	475,508	435,335	40,173
Furniture	238,657	163,538	65,119
Doors, sash, &c	287,602	164,903	122,699
Drugs, &c	179,311	173,623	5,688
Cordage, rope and twine	137,394	119,625	17,769
Bran	100,044	65,499	36,545
Wool and manfs. of.	66,318	27,327	38,991
Beans	17,700	11,049	6,651

There are other items which show an increase, for example, leather, $425,813; wood and manufactures of, $762,236; metals, minerals and manufactures of, $268,342; seeds, $186,200, and animals, $157,681; leaving a net decrease of about $2,500,000. But the astonishing thing is that we find as to some of the articles in which our exports to Great Britain have decreased, that Great Britain has actually bought more of those articles in 1901 than she did in 1900. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce have told us over and over again that our preferential tariff has created a sentiment in the mother country which operates as a real preference to Canadian products. The figures of the present year show nothing of the kind. While there has been a falling off in many articles imported by the mother country from Canada, her imports of similar articles from other countries have increased, as the following figures show :—

IMPORTS by the United Kingdom of certain Articles.

—	1900.	1901.	Increase.
	£	£	£
Bacon and ham	15,995,778	18,118,564	2,122,786
Grain, all kinds	58,942,390	61,241,027	2,298,637
Butter	17,450,435	19,297,005	1,846,570
Chemicals, drugs	4,221,926	4,780,870	558,944
Wool	1,227,473	1,309,050	71,577
Iron and steel mfrs.	4,830,476	5,104,502	274,026

Therefore so far as all these articles are concerned, while there is in some a very substantial, an enormous increase in total importations by the mother country, we find in every one of them that there is a falling off in her imports from Canada.

Now let us look at our trade relations with the United States in the same aspect, and see whether the preferential tariff trade policy of the government has had the effect which has been claimed for it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the right hon. gentleman propose to sit this evening ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If it will suit the convenience of my hon. friend I propose to go on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have just this to say to my right hon. friend. I propose to move an amendment, and I thought possibly it might be more convenient for me to announce it immediately than during my speech to-morrow afternoon.

The PRIME MINISTER. As the hon. gentleman prefers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I move the adjournment of the debate, and in doing so I may state that in concluding my remarks to-morrow I will move the following amendment :

That all the words after 'that' in the proposed motion be left out and the following substituted therefore :

This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries, as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians. And, while always firmly maintaining the necessity of such protection to Canadian interests, this House affirms its belief in a policy of reciprocal trade preferences within the empire.

Motion (Mr. Borden, Halifax) agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Department of Militia and Defence, 1901.—Hon. Mr. Borden.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 18, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). In the absence of the Chairman of the Committee, I move that the second report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present session be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—Mr. Sutherland (Essex).

Bill (No. 56) to indemnify sufferers from fires caused by railways.—Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, certified copies of the judgments and decisions of the said Court in the Election Appeals for the electoral districts of Two Mountains and Richelieu, by which the said appeals were dismissed.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the first minister if the Japanese section of the oriental report has been brought down, or when it will be brought down ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It has not yet been received, so far as I know.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance :

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the debate was adjourned yesterday, I had pointed out that while the revenue and trade of this country had expanded to a very great extent during the past five years, the expenditure of the country also, as the Minister of Finance would have expressed it, had increased by leaps and bounds. From a total expenditure of $42,972,756 in 1897 to $57,982,866 in 1901 is a pretty good leap. But my hon. friend the Minister of Finance proposes to take a leap of nearly seven and a half millions dollars next year, as he estimates the total expenditure of that year at $65,250,000—being a leap from 1897 to 1902 of $22,277,244, or over 50 per cent increase.

I pointed out also an increase of nearly $50,000,000 in the total expenditure for the last five years, as compared with the total expenditure of the previous five years, and an increase of more than $32,000,000 in the taxes taken from the people during the past five years as compared with the five years preceding. And if we look to the United States, we find that the expenditure of that country, when its population was 20,000,000, was only a little more than one-third of that which the Minister of Finance proposes for the ensuing year, with a population of not more than 5,500,000.

I again invite my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to devote his attention to that article written by him for the 'North American Review,' to which I referred yesterday, and tell us why it is proper now to have an expenditure of $65,250,000, when our population is only five and a half million, in view of the fact that he lamented so greatly our extravagance in 1889 and 1890, when our expenditure was only about two-thirds as much ?

Mr. COWAN. What was the trade of the United States when they had a population of 20,000,000 ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think my hon. friend will find the figures in the article to which I have already referred—the article prepared by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

I have pointed out that the per capita expenditure has increased from 8·22 in 1896 to 10·88 in 1901, and with the proposed expenditure for 1902 it will be increased to 11·86, assuming our population to be 5,500,000. Is there not food in this for some comment from the Minister of Trade and Commerce—more food I should say than there was for the articles which he wrote concerning the expenditure of this country in days gone by ? We have been told by a very high authority that as to some matters which the hon. gentleman touched upon in those days, he did not express perhaps his real convictions, and possibly when dealing with the subject of economy and declaiming against extravagance, he was not any more serious than he is said to have been when holding forth on the question of protection and free trade.

I have also pointed out the enormous expenditure in public works made by the Conservatives during their administration of eighteen years—four items of which, the Canadian Pacific Railway, canals, assignment of debt to provinces, and Intercolonial Railway, amounted to $131,800,000.

I have also pointed out that if during those eighteen years, the average revenue available to the Conservative administration had been equal to the average of the past five years, the public debt of the country would have been decreased by many millions instead of being increased.

Comparing 1901 with 1900, I also pointed out that our exports to Great Britain had decreased by $2,407,412, and our imports from Great Britain had decreased by $2,307,997, so that our aggregate trade with Great Britain had decreased by $4,715,409.

Coming to our trade with the United States, we observe an entirely different condition of affairs. In 1900 our total exports to the United States were $68,619,023. If

we deduct from that the gold-bearing quartz, silver concentrates, coin and bullion, amounting to $24,141,872, we have a net export of merchandise to the United States of $44,477,151.

Compare this with 1901. In 1901 our total exports to the United States were $72,382,230. If we make a like deduction for gold-bearing quartz, silver concentrates, coin and bullion, amounting to $28,587,229, we find that our net exports of merchandise to the United States in 1901 were $43,795,001, or an actual decrease, compared with 1900, of $682,150.

But when we turn to the imports of Canada from the United States, a very different condition of affairs confronts us. In 1900 our total imports from the United States amounted to $116,972,554. Deducting coin and bullion, $7,764,201, we find that our net importation of merchandise from the United States was $109,208,353.

Compare this with 1901. Our total imports from the United States in that year were $119,306,775. Deducting coin and bullion, $3,335,687, we have a balance of $115,971,086, being our net importation of merchandise from the United States in 1901, which shows an actual increase of $6,762,733 compared with 1900.

What does that show ? It shows that the gain to the United States over Great Britain in aggregate trade with Canada in 1891, as compared with 1900, is no less than $10,785,391, and the gain to the United States over Great Britain in exports to Canada in 1901, as compared with 1900, is more than $9,000,000. That is to say, in 1901, we, as customers of Great Britain on the one hand and the United States on the other hand, gave to the United States a gain of no less than $9,000,000 over the mother country. The following is a tabulated statement :—

TOTAL EXPORTS to the United States.

	1900.	1901.
Total exports	$68,619,023	$72,382,230
Less gold-bearing quartz, silver concentrates, coin and bullion	24,141,872	28,587,229
	44,477,151	43,795,001

A decrease of $682,150.

IMPORTS from United States.

	1900.	1901.
Total imports	$116,972,554	$119,306,775
Less coin and bullion	7,764,201	3,335,687
	$109,208,353	$115,971,086

An increase of $6,762,733.

	Aggregate Trade with United States.
1901	$ 191,689,005
1900	185,619,023
Increase	$ 6,069,982

	Aggregate Trade with United Kingdom.
1901	$ 148,493,662
1900	153,208,253
Decrease	$ 4,715,409

Increase in aggregate trade with United States	$ 6,069,982
Decrease in aggregate trade with United Kingdom	4,715,409
Gain of United States over United Kingdom in aggregate trade	$10,785,391
Increase in our imports from United States	$ 6,762,733
Decrease in our imports from United Kingdom	2,307,997
Gain to United States over United Kingdom	$ 9,070,730

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in dealing with this matter in 1897, said that in the very last year of the Conservative term of office, we exported to England apparently $66,000,000 worth of our products, and to the United States, $44,000,000 worth, and that we bought from England $32,000,000 worth of their merchandise and from the United States $58,000,000 worth of their goods. This, he declared was genuine, practical discrimination, to an enormous extent, against England and in favour of the United States under the Conservative policy. Well, hon. gentlemen will at once realize that the figures are very much more in favour of the United States and against England to-day than they were then. Does the Minister of Trade and Commerce say that there is now a genuine, practical discrimination to an enormous extent against England and in favour of the United States under the Liberal policy ? Look at the figures now. In 1901 we exported to England $105,000,000 worth of our products, and to the United States, after deducting gold bullion and silver concentrates, $44,000,000, and we bought from England $43,000,000 worth of goods, and from the United States goods to the extent of $116,000,000. If the criticism, which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce made in former years, was sincere, what will be his criticism of the state of affairs to-day ? The House and the country will be very glad to hear from him on that subject.

The Americans do not conceal their exultation, nor do the manufacturers of Great Britain conceal their disappointment at this condition of our trade. We know that there was in November last in the United States a convention of manufacturers, called the National Reciprocity Convention, which my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had the honour of addressing. Mr. Clarke, a leading manufacturer in the United States, delivered a very

strong protectionist address at the opening of that convention, and in the course of his remarks used the following language :—

In 1898 Canada put into effect a tariff which now gives to the British exporter 33 per cent better rates than you can get if you export to Canada. Here was a chance to see how reciprocity would work under favourable circumstances. With what result ? You would think England would have made enormous gains. I will not bother with the figures, but will say that up to and including 1900 England had absolutely lost ground and we gained it, with a 33 per cent differential duty operating against us. The Canadians had every kind of inducement, the money inducement and the loyalty inducement and the desire to buy British goods, and yet we beat the Englishman on Canadian ground with a 33 per cent duty in their favour.

My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was at that convention. The Americans were rather curious about that matter and asked him to explain the circumstances. In the report of his speech the hon. gentleman is represented as making the following very lucid statement as to the causes that had led to this condition of affairs :—

The Canadian tariff against England has a rebate of 33⅓ per cent, but the goods imported from the two countries are dissimilar and the rates of duty on the goods from England happen to be higher than the rates of duty on the class of goods coming from the United States, and the net result, the total duty, is almost the same.

Now, what delightful simplicity there is in that word 'happen' in the speech of my hon. friend from Norfolk. He takes it for granted that this government had brought down a tariff without having the slightest idea of what they were doing when they fixed the rate of duty. Well, according to the view of the hon. member for North Norfolk, British goods, counting all dutiable goods together, pay a higher rate of duty than goods from the United States. And, even according to the statement of the Minister of Finance, the duty paid on dutiable goods coming from the United States is an average of 24·83 per cent, while that on British goods is 24·74 per cent. If you exclude from the calculation, as the hon. Minister of Finance saw fit to do, goods which do not enjoy the advantage of the preferential tariff, you still have a duty of 24·50 per cent—I think he said—upon United States goods, and on British goods a fraction over 21 per cent. Now, this preferential tariff was announced to the country as a tariff which gave the mother country a real advantage of 33⅓ per cent. The Minister of Finance took great credit to himself for bringing down that tariff on St. George's Day, and said there was an association between the saints and his budget. All I have to say is, that, considering the words of the Finance Minister of yesterday, this seems to be the first time on record when any saint was ever taken in by a confidence man. We read in Holy Writ of those who would deceive the very elect. But my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, seems to be proud of having deceived the very saints of heaven.

Now, a gentleman who is in favour of closer trade relations with Canada, and who addressed this same National Reciprocity Convention, said that it was interesting to make an analysis of what the United States sold to Canada. He collected the figures from our returns for 1900 and showed that we bought from the United States the following :—Products of the mine, $11,600,000 ; fish, $484,000 ; forest products, $5,200,000 ; animals, $3,420,000 ; agricultural products, $19,080,000 ; manufactured wares, $61,362,000 ; making a total of $101,146,000. He then went on to show the amount of these different articles of manufactured goods that we imported. I have not been able to verify his figures but, on examining the trade returns for the past year, I find that our imports from the United States may be roughly classed as follows :—

Products of the mine	$14,000,000
Fisheries	416,500
Agricultural products and animals	25,700,000
Manufactures	65,000,000

The amount of manufactures is the amount calculated by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), which, I have no doubt, is approximately correct. Then, on examining our trade returns a little more closely, I find that the manufactures that we bought from the United States include the following principal items :—

IMPORTS of Certain Manufactured Articles from the United States, 1901.

——	Dutiable.	Free.
	$	$
Metals, minerals and manfs. of.	17,768,502	9,388,167
Wood and manufactures of	1,229,065	3,481,338
Drugs, chemicals, &c.	765,109	1,917,007
Gutta percha and manfs. of	432,649	2,402,123
Oils	1,426,155	101,135
Manufactures of cotton	1,527,290	.....
Paper and manufactures of	1,320,870	.....
Tobacco	72,395	1,720,589
Leather	1,450,890	.....
Cordage, twine, &c	95,315	1,015,674
Books, &c	790,827	349,030
Carriages	1,033,805	.....
Sugar and molasses	988,538	.....
Electric apparatus	904,629	.....
Hats, caps, &c	893,561	63,735
Wool and manufactures of	370,453	424,497
Bricks	23,987	97,290
Silk	255,754	277,200
Glass	538,692	.....
Watches	511,019	.....
Paints	387,112	52,773
Paintings, oil, &c.	148,743	233,000
Jewellery	422,150	.....
Musical instruments	308,197	.....
Soaps	204,980	.....
	34,770,626	21,503,558

Adding together the dutiable imports of $34,770,626 and the free imports of $21,503,558, we have a total of imports of manufactured goods of the kinds comprised in this list of $56,274,124. Now, this accounts for our main imports from the United States, leaving a balance of about $9,000,000 of miscellaneous articles, assuming the calculations of my hon. friend to be correct. On the import of these manufactured goods from the United States, Mr. Coppins commented as follows :—

> These are but a few of a long list of American manufactures which by their large entrance into the Dominion have given to the retail shops of Canada the appearance of American stores.

That is the way they regard the situation in the United States. That, I suppose, is one of the reasons that caused my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to say, in Montreal, that there was a crisis. But that crisis does not seem to be taken cognizance of by my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, in preparing his budget speech. Further on, referring to the same subject, this gentleman, Mr. Coppins, asked what the United States took in exchange. I have made an examination of our trade returns and I find that they took the following :—

EXPORTS to United State, 1901.

Produce of the mine	$38,355,330	
Fisheries	4,224,948	
Forest	12,190,617	
Animals and their produce	5,331,657	
Agricultural products	2,907,963	
Manufactures	4,963,247	
Miscellaneous articles	9,305	
		$67,983,673
Foreign produce		2,423,168
Coin and bullion		1,975,389
		$72,382,230

But, Sir, we must recollect that of the produce of the mine $28,587,229 represents gold dust, nuggets and silver concentrates ; and looking at the total value of animals and their produce and agricultural products exported by us to the United States, we find that they amount to $8,239,626, or just a little less than one-third of that which the United States exports to Canada of the same articles. Looking at our manufactured goods exported to the United States we find that they amount to $4,963,247, or less than one-thirteenth of the value of manufactured articles that the United States exported into Canada in the same year. Now, when you deduct from the $72,382,232 of exports from Canada to the United States that I have mentioned, the silver concentrates, gold bullion and coin, gold dust and nuggets, amounting to $28,587,229, you will see that our exports to the United States for the past fifteen years have increased very little, while on the other hand our imports from the United States, accepting the statement made by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) before the National Reciprocity Convention, have increased during the same period about three-fold.

Now, Sir, I venture to inquire whether it is not possible for the people of Canada to manufacture a very considerable portion of the $65,000,000 worth of goods which we are taking every year from the United States. I venture to think that it is not holding out any impossibility to the people of this country to say that, possessing the resources for manufacturing which we do, we should within a very short time, if the government of this country would enact a sufficient system of protection, be able to manufacture a very considerable proportion of these articles ourselves, and keep in this country the people who are now going to the United States, getting work there in the very factories that are turning out the articles which afterwards come to Canada, and which have been produced by people from this country.

Nor is that the only thing that attracts our attention in dealing with the trade relations between Canada and the United States. Is it not possible also that of the $25,700,000 of agricultural products and animals and their produce which are imported into Canada from the United States, a very large proportion can be produced in Canada, and in this way the prosperity and wealth of our farming population be materially increased ? On referring to our Trade and Commerce Reports, and selecting six principal agricultural products, I find that last year we imported from the United States :

—	Dutiable.	Free.	Total.
Animals	$ 624,252	$ 127,371	$ 751,623
Breadstuffs	944,238	6,488,292	7,432,530
Fruits	1,766,379	666,995	2,433,974
Provisions	2,254,630	2,553	2,257,183
Seeds and roots	517,047	688,388	1,205,435
Vegetables	370,419		370,419
	$6,477,565	$7,973,599	$14,451,164

So that taking these six principal articles, if I may call them so, I find we imported from the United States last year, of agricultural products and of animals and their products, $6,477,565 dutiable, and $7,973,599 free, or a total of $14,451,164 of free and dutiable goods. I venture to think, Sir, that that affords an opportunity to the government of this country of doing something to readjust the tariff for the benefit of our farming community.

In framing a tariff for Canada, or in readjusting a tariff for Canada, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we must bear in mind our fiscal situation, our agricultural resources, the abundance of raw material which we possess for almost every branch of our manufacturing industry ; and

especially it must be borne in mind that our frontier extends for more than 4,000 miles along that of the greatest agricultural and manufacturing country in the world. For the first time in the history of the United States her domestic exports in 1901 exceeded those of Great Britain. The figures for that year are as follows: Domestic exports of the United States, $1,460,462,806; domestic exports of Great Britain, $1,363,224,000; or nearly $100,000,000 less than those of the United States. Of those exports of the domestic products of the United States, $943,811,020 were agricultural products and $412,155,066 were manufactures.

Now, there is another thing we should consider in this connection, and that is that the growth of manufactures in the United States during the past five years has been phenomenal, and will probably advance in a somewhat similar ratio in future. At the National Reciprocity Convention, of which I have already spoken, the figures which I am about to give were accepted by the convention as correct, and I therefore assume that they are correct. They show the growth of manufactures in the United States during the past fifty years:

1850	$ 1,000,000,000
1860	2,000,000,000
1870	4,000,000,000
1880	5,500,000,000
1890	9,000,000,000
1900	13,000,000,000

From one billion in 1850 to thirteen billions in 1900, an increase of 1,300 per cent in fifty years. Now, Sir, I am pointing that out for this reason, that when we come to compare those figures with the exports of the United States, they indicate to us what an enormous home market the United States have, and how slight an increase in the produce of manufactured articles in the United States, or how slight a decrease in the consuming power of the United States, would immediately enormously increase the exports of the United States, or rather the surplus for export.

The total manufactures of the United States in 1900, aggregated thirteen billion dollars. Their exports of manufactures in that year aggregated $4,333,851,756, so that you will see that the total exports of the United States of manufactured goods in 1900 were less than 3½ per cent of their total production. This is a pretty significant fact when we have to look at the possibility of competition with the United States in times of depression that may not be so very many years away. Now, as to the total agricultural production of the United States in 1900, I cannot give the exact figures, but of this we are well assured that the agricultural products of the United States were many times in excess of their exports of agricultural products in that year which aggregated $835,858,123. If there were any doubt about that I might quote from vol. 19 of the final report of the Industrial Commission of the United States, page 187, where it is said that:

> The products of agriculture comprised 64·64 per cent of the value of our domestic exports in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901. In spite of this extraordinary preponderance, only a comparatively minor proportion of our farm products ever passes out of the home market. * * * Only one fourth of the commercial corn crop ever leaves the county in which it is grown. * * * From 5 to 10 per cent enters into foreign trade. * * *

Less than one-third of the wheat crop is exported and 4·6 per cent of the oat crop is exported. The conclusion of this report is that even taking these great staples as to which the percentage of export would probably be greater than in most other articles:

> The three great staples taken as a whole are mostly consumed at home.

Now, as the produce of the United States both in agriculture and manufactures, will be increasing beyond the home consumption, their need of a foreign market is becoming more and more apparent to them. The utterances of their public men and of their leading business men during the past year indicate that they fully realize the situation and that they are determined to conquer foreign markets in the near future. For example, the late President McKinley, of the United States, in his speech at Buffalo, which has been hailed throughout the United States as the embodiment of political and economic wisdom, used the following language:

> We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now so firmly established. What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad, the excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet.

Another utterance of the same gentleman is as follows:

> It——
>
> That is reciprocity—
>
> ——is to afford new markets for our surplus agricultural and manufactured products without loss to the American labourer of a single day's work that he might otherwise procure.

That seems to be hailed in the United States as the height of economic and politic wisdom, as I have said. Possibly it would not be out of place for us in Canada to take a line from that which has been placed before us by these gentlemen in the United States and to consider whether our policy should not be to so frame our tariff that there would not be the loss of a day's work to a single Canadian labourer. Then, a senator of the United States, Mr. Foraker, said:

> We must have markets for our surplus or quit producing it.

Mr. Deering, President of the Deering Manufacturing Company, in his speech at the National Reciprocity Convention, expressed the following views :

> But now that the protective system has done its work, we are confronted by new problems that are more serious than the old. If we cannot go forward and find new markets to absorb our increasing output, it is inevitable that we shall turn upon ourselves and waste in destructive competition the energy that might with a proper output give us command of the markets of the world. It is axiomatic that with industry stagnant and mills half idle the country at large cannot prosper.

Mr. A. B. Farquhar, representing the National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers, in his introductory address at the same convention, used the following language :

> That our import duties as they stand invite retaliation from countries with whose interests they conflict every week's cable dispatches bring us added testimony. * * * We are the greatest manufacturing nation upon the earth and the general prosperity depends largely on that of the manufacturers of the country. * * * Our capacity for production at low cost renders foreign markets a necessity to keep our labour employed.

Mr. Thomas C. Search, chairman of that convention, expressed similar views in the following language :

> Many of our industries have reached a stage in their development where the home market alone cannot absorb their entire product, and consequently new outlets are necessary for their continuous operation and the steady employment of their operatives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, taking these matters into consideration as they strike me, two causes do, and will contribute towards the slaughtering of American goods on the Canadian market. In the first place, their enormous total production which enables them to produce at a relatively small cost in the United States and in the next place the absolute necessity of getting rid of their surplus even at a loss. Now, Canada, as I have said, lies contiguous to the American market for 4,000 miles, and affords a market—you might say a slaughter market—for some portion at least of the excess which must be disposed of. The manufactured and agricultural products of this country are more likely to feel competition from the United States than those of any other country, not only for the reason that we border the United States for 4,000 miles, but also for another reason, that we are their third best customer, receiving one-fourteenth of their exports. We are their third best customer of their total products, and according to the hon. member for North Norfolk, we are their best customer so far as manufactured goods are concerned. In 1901 we took nearly one-sixth of the total export of manufactured goods from the United States. Their total export of manufactured goods in 1901 was $412,155,066, and we took of that $65,000,000, or nearly one-sixth. Our own resources are not only those of an agricultural, but of a great manufacturing people. We have the coal, the iron and raw materials of many kinds which should enable manufacturing industries to be built up and sustained in this country. If we are not to possess such manufacturing industries in the future, then this country must become very largely an agricultural and pastoral country selling its produce and importing all its manufactures. The result of that would be a large diminution of our population, because a large portion of our people would go to the United States for the work which they could not obtain here, and we would be at the mercy of the trusts in the United States, which in the future, beyond doubt, will control the agricultural production of that country as they now, to a very considerable extent, control certain other industries in that country. I do not believe that the people of this country are prepared to accept such a destiny as that. On the contrary, I believe that they propose to develop this country not only on the lines of agriculture, but on the lines of manufacturing and industrial development as well, and I believe they will look to the government to so readjust the tariff as to prevent Canada being made the slaughter market of the United States, whether of manufactured products or of agricultural products. They will look for a policy which will enable this country to be developed along every legitimate line.

Now, when we make a comparison of our tariff with the tariff of the United States, one would suppose that we were a country of 70,000,000 people and the United States a country of 5,500,000 ; one would suppose that we were the greatest exporting, the greatest agricultural, and the greatest manufacturing country in the world, and that the United States was a country practically undeveloped beside us, a country from which we need fear no competition whatever. We find that our rate of duty on total imports from the United States is about 12½ per cent, and on dutiable goods from the United States 24·83 per cent ; while on the other hand, the rate of duty on the total imports of the United States is 28·91 per cent, and on dutiable goods it is 49·83 per cent, or, more than double our rate in each case. As has been already pointed out, the United States has nearly three-fourths of the total importation of free goods into Canada, while Great Britain has to be content with some 15 per cent. One would expect that if we intend to maintain and build up our own products and manufactures against such powerful and tremendous competition as that which we must anticipate from the United States we would fix our tariff of

customs against that country on a scale at least as high as is that of their tariff against us. We must remember that our producers and manufacturers are restricted very much as to the home market, while in Great Britain and in other countries we enjoy no advantages in their markets over the United States. In Germany, for example, Canadian products have to meet a less favourable tariff than that which the United States enjoys. While we have no greater advantages abroad, we have a more restricted market at home on account of our small population, and we therefore can reasonably say that having regard to that fact there is all the more reason for that restricted market such as it is being protected for the manufacturers and for the agricultural producers of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to emphasize that which I mentioned a little time ago, namely, the condition which will be brought about if the production of the United States in manufactured goods or in agricultural products, or in both, increases more rapidly than their power of consuming these commodities at home. You will bear in mind that the United States exports between 3 and 4 per cent only of its manufactured goods and probably not more than 10 per cent of its total agricultural products. If you increase the output in the United States of manufactured goods by 5 per cent, what have you ? If the home consumption does not keep up to that ratio you have an enormous increase of surplus for export, and where, let me ask, will that surplus for export be first slaughtered ? Where will it first be sent for the purpose of getting rid of it ? Naturally it will be sent to Canada, which at the present time is the third best customer of the United States in all products, and the best customer of the United States so far as manufactured goods are concerned.

In this connection we must not forget the enormous importance of the home market, not only to Canadian manufacturers but also to Canadian agriculturists. Our total manufactures (including under that term all articles made in factories using machinery and motive power), have been estimated by a very competent authority during the past year at $730,000,000. Of these, we exported less than $68,000,000 or about 9 per cent. Therefore, 91 per cent of the goods manufactured in Canada have been consumed in Canada. We have consequently at the present time to look first to the home market and not to a foreign market. Having regard to that, is it not right that we should take care that the home market is properly protected for the industries of this country ? We can see at a glance that if we increase our foreign export by 300 per cent, and gave away half of our home market, we would be infinitely worse off in Canada than we are to-day. Our home market is in proportion to our foreign market in the ratio of at least nine to one so far as we can get at the figures.

With regard to our agricultural products the same is almost equally true. The agricultural products of Canada are very largely used by Canada herself. If you take the article of wheat alone, an article which I suppose in proportion we export more largely than any other article ; assuming the consumption to be four bushels per head in Canada (which I believe is a fair average), we would use in Canada at least 22,000,000 bushels. In reference to many other articles of agricultural products the proportion would be two or three times as great, I have no doubt.

In discussing this question from the standpoint I have taken, I am following a very illustrious example in the United States. The late President McKinley, speaking in support of a Bill which he introduced into congress and which formed the customs tariff of that country, known as the McKinley Bill, quoted my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and Professor Goldwin Smith for the purpose of showing that Canada not only greatly desired, but could not do without the United States market. And accepting the conclusions of those gentlemen he argued that if reciprocity was so much desired in Canada and would greatly benefit this country, it could do so only at the expense of the United States, and therefore, the proper policy for the United States was to enact a tariff such as he then proposed. He for one was against granting reciprocity to Canada, and so he put up the tariff against Canada, and it has practically remained on that basis ever since.

Now, I do not say that our policy should be framed on any principle of retaliation of tariff. I absolutely and decidedly dissent from that. I say that our tariff should be framed from the standpoint of the Canadian people and with the view of the preservation of the Canadian markets for the Canadian people themselves.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not prepared to say that we want reciprocity in natural products with the United States at the present time. In that I disagree with my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). There was a period during which such reciprocity was desirable, and during which it would have been a benefit to this country. That period may or may not have passed away. That period probably has passed. What I object to, in any principle of reciprocity of tariffs or retaliation of tariffs, is, that it may bind us to put our tariff down, admitting the United States manufactures to crush out our own manufacturers ; admitting United States agricultural products to the detriment and destruc-

tion of our own farming population. I say we do not want that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What we want in this country is a tariff framed for the benefit of our own Canadian people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What we want in Canada is a tariff framed for the purpose of preserving the Canadian markets for the Canadian people, and that I believe is a policy which will meet with the approbation of the Canadian people whenever it is placed before them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And if we have this reciprocity of tariffs that is talked of, how would we stand with these enormous American trusts which are beginning to control all the industries of that country. I do not know how the clause in the customs tariff which was spoken of by the Finance Minister could be applied to these trusts if we were practically to have free trade with the United States. It would certainly be of no service whatever. We will have a hard enough time in fighting trusts and combinations in Canada without undertaking the task of subduing the trusts and combines of the United States which are giving the congress and the legislatures of that country all they can do. And if American writers are to be believed these trusts in the United States have more than once controlled the legislatures of several states of the union in the past, if they do not so control them at the present time.

It may be said that a readjustment of the tariff on the lines which have been suggested will necessarily increase the burdens of the people. I do not think that at all follows. It may be said that the labouring classes and the manufacturing classes will pay more for agricultural products, and that the farming population will pay more for manufactured articles. I do not believe this will be the necessary result. I believe that internal competition will keep the prices down to a reasonable limit. It has done so in Canada in years gone by; though I believe the labouring classes, the manufacturing classes and the agricultural classes of this country, for the sake of developing the country, for the sake of keeping their markets for themselves, for the sake of preventing American competition, which has reached so disastrous a point, would be willing, for a few years at least, to pay slightly increased prices, if necessary.

So fas as competition within our own country is concerned, we have the remedy which was pointed out by the Minister of Finance yesterday, and which has been acted upon during the past year. If the manufacturers in Canada keep up prices unduly, if they use any combination among themselves to the detriment of the consumer, or if the agricultural products of the country should happen to get into the hands of a trust or a combine, it would be open to the government, whatever it might be, to use the clause which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance referred to yesterday, and, by a reduction of the customs duties or otherwise, to teach those people that the people of Canada want nothing of trusts or combines, but want their industries developed on plain, straightforward, and honest lines.

Now, I do not expect that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) will take very much stock in the principles I have been putting forward. We know that in days gone by he has vowed death to protection; he has wanted to stamp upon it; he has called it that villainous protection; he has called it a system of robbery; he has called the men engaged in manufacturing robbers; and, even at this late date, I hardly expect that the lamp holds out sufficiently for my hon. friend to return. Therefore, whatever impression I may have made upon any other gentleman in the House, I do not apprehend that I have made the slightest impression upon my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He will still adhere to his view that to develop the industries of this country on the lines I have suggested would not be in the interest of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in saying that the manufactures of Canada should be developed in this way, I adopt the principle, so far as the mother country is concerned—for I have been dealing up to the present time largely with the United States—that the manufactures of Canada are of as much value to the empire as manufactures in Great Britain. The development of Canada has been intrusted to us, and we certainly would not be true to our duty if we did not seek to develop this country along the lines of manufacturing industries as well as along the lines of agricultural industries, provided we consider that the resources of this country justify us in doing so. We know that the resources of this country do justify us in doing so. We know that we possess the material for carrying on manufacturing industries to an extent possessed by few other countries in the world, and I say that we would not be true to ourselves if we did not seek to avail ourselves of those materials which are close to our hands, and seek to build up in this way not only an agricultural production, but a manufacturing production as well. Our interests must sometimes give way to imperial interests; but any system or policy which closes our industries, causes our machinery and plant to lie idle, and sends our operatives to the United States is not a policy which is advantageous to Canada or to the empire, merely because it gives an increased output to some manufacturing industry in

Great Britain. Our policy should be, in the first place, to conserve our own interests ; and, in the next place, as between our competitors, British and foreign, our policy should be to give to the manufactures of the mother country a preference over those of other countries.

In considering this matter, Mr. Speaker, we must not fail to bear in mind, of course, that the mother country is our best customer ; but we must not shut our eyes to the fact that she is also the best customer of the United States, and that she takes a very large proportion of the product of the United States of America. In 1901 Great Britain exported to the United States $143,000,000, and took from the United States $631,000,000, a very much larger proportion of imports over exports than her trade relations with Canada would show.

I submit that the policy which I advocate has nothing in it to which any man in Great Britain or any man in the empire should have the slightest objection. It is sometimes suggested that we have not contributed our proper share towards the defence of the empire. Well, Sir, if we have not, let us go about it in a straightforward way. Let us not, when the mother country suggests it, tell her that we will not even discuss it with her. I wondered that our hon. friends on the other side of the House did not get up and sing 'God save the King,' when that correspondence was brought down the other day. I suppose that although we must settle these matters ourselves, it would be no harm to discuss them at least with the mother country. I for one will always maintain the utmost rights of Canadians to their own self-government. I will always maintain that Canada must settle for herself what her contribution towards the defence of the empire shall be ; but I do not think it necessarily follows that Canada should slap the mother country in the face when the mother country proposes in a courteous manner to discuss this subject with her. I say that I believe in dealing with the defence of the empire in a straightforward way. I do not believe in dealing with it by adopting a preferential tariff which will shut up mills in Canada and give increased profits and outputs to some manufacturers in Yorkshire. That is not the way to contribute to the defence of the empire. We may have our differences about this matter ; but we can settle them in our own way, according to the principles of constitutional government that prevail in this country, and every man in Canada is perfectly entitled to express his views on the matter either in parliament or outside of it. But when we once settle the question to our own satisfaction, let us approach the mother country in regard to it in a courteous manner ; and if we do propose to contribute to the defence of the empire, let us do it in a straightforward, manly way, and not, as is suggested on the other side of the House, by creating a preference and ruining our own industries, because we have not contributed our proper share towards the defence of the empire.

My hon. friend the Minster of Finance, gave utterance yesterday to certain remarks with regard to the preferential tariff which I thought were hardly worthy of the hon. gentleman. He sought to put gentlemen on this side of the House in a dilemma with regard to the action of the preferential tariff. He said that if it had not done Great Britain any good, it could not have done Canada any harm. That was the substance of his remark.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is what his argument meant if it meant anything. If it did not mean that, it meant nothing. Well, Sir, I should think that speaking to men who are supposed to have common sense at least, the Minister of Finance might have remembered that the preferential tariff might yield only a very inappreciable increase to the $1,400,000,000 of exports of Great Britain, and at the same time close up some Canadian industries. I would not suppose that a gentleman of the ability and the astuteness of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would require to be reminded of that. Why, take just a very few millions, not worth considering in the average $1,400,000,000 of Great Britain's annual exports, and apply them to the product of the woollen and some other industries in Canada, and you might close every woollen mill in Canada without appreciably affecting the total output of Great Britain. Yet the Minister of Finance wants us to believe that because this has not resulted in any appreciable benefit, to the mother country, therefore it cannot do any harm to Canada. I repeat that an argument of that kind does not seem to me a legitimate one in the mouth of a gentleman of the standing and position of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

I do not need to reiterate what Conservatives have said in the past with regard to the policy of mutual trade preference within the empire. That is a policy which, if I am not mistaken, was first put forward by the Conservative party in Canada. We still believe that mutual preferential trade in the empire will be advantageous to all portions of the empire, and are prepared to adopt and carry out that policy, if called into power, having regard in the first place to the protection of our labour and of our agricultural, mining, manufacturing and other industries.

One feature of the present tariff we do strongly object to, and that is the feature under which German and Belgium goods are admitted to the benefit of our preferential tariff under the pretense that they are British goods. That such is the case we

know. That such is the case our manufacturers know. That such is the case is apparent from the very terms of the customs regulations which deal with that particular subject. Goods are manufactured in Germany and taken over to Great Britain, where a trifling value of work or material is added to them, and then they come into Canada as British goods entitled to the preferential tariff, while at the same time Germany is imposing on Canada her maximum tariff. And the Minister of Finance only woke up yesterday for the purpose of endeavouring to press upon the German government the injustice which is being done to Canada in this respect. When he goes to the German government, perhaps he will tell them that a considerable proportion of the goods brought into Canada under the so-called British preference are really German goods, to which have been added a small value of work or material in Great Britain, and which have been exported from Great Britain to Canada as British goods. Perhaps that would be as forcible a way of putting the position before the German authorities as my hon. friend could adopt. I venture to think that some greater precaution should be adopted by the government for the purpose of preventing German and Belgium goods coming into this country under the preferential clause.

I must apologize for having detained the House at so great length. I have very little to add. I say that in this country we want a declared fiscal policy. We have not had that during the past five years. We have had the Minister of Trade and Commerce telling us that the ship's head is pointed towards the open sea of free trade. We have had the Minister of Finance telling us that all these matters are matters of compromise, and that eternal vigilance is the price of protection. We have had the Minister of the Interior in the west telling us that this tariff is a free trade or revenue tariff. We have had the Minister of Public Works openly and repeatedly telling the people that he is a protectionist, first, last and all the time. We have had him telling the people that there is a crisis because there is not sufficient protection, and we have had the Minister of Finance telling us at the same banquet that all these matters are matters of compromise, and the right hon. gentleman, who leads the House, telling us on the same occasion that the tariff is as nearly perfect as it can be. Half an hour afterwards the Minister of Public Works declared that he is a protectionist, and a fortnight or three weeks afterwards he told the people that there is a crisis because we have not sufficient protection. How can we expect men to put their money into the industries of the country with any confidence ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Are they not doing it ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I believe that some of them are shrinking from doing it. I tell the Minister of Finance that we do not want a cabinet of all the policies, but a cabinet of one national and Canadian policy. Criticism was made in England a good many years ago of a cabinet which was called the cabinet of all the talents; but to have a cabinet of all the policies is the greatest misfortune which any country under heaven can suffer from. We do not want any vague suggestions from the Minister of Finance about what will be done in the future. He tells us that this tariff will be readjusted some time in the future, and readjusted in all moderation—whatever that means. That is a splendidly indefinite statement with which to go to the people. We want to know what will be the policy of this government, as a government, with regard to the fiscal affairs of the country. We want that to be a declared policy so that the people will know what to expect. In asking that we are asking nothing unreasonable or unfair. We want a policy of protection to our labour, agriculturing, manufacturing and other industries. We want a policy which will give to our people the advantage in their own market—a policy of Canada for the Canadians ; and Canada for the Canadians means not the less Canada for the empire as well. Because in seeking to promote the development, prosperity and advancement of Canada, we are but doing our duty to that portion of the empire which has been specially committed to our charge. And, lastly, we believe in a policy of mutual or reciprocal trade under which, while protecting Canadian interests, we shall give to and receive from the other portions of the empire preference over foreign goods. Therefore I beg to move :

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

This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries, as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians. And, while always firmly maintaining the necessity of such protection to Canadian interests, this House affirms its belief in a policy of reciprocal trade preferences within the empire.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, it is very pleasant for me on all occasions to welcome old friends back. And, when I listened to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and to the terms of the motion which he has placed in your hands, I had only to close my eyes, and five and twenty years rolled away, and his predecessor in that very seat was putting before the House precisely the same idea.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Let my hon. friends hear me out. I have said, Sir, that this was a very old friend. And, most assuredly, no more fitting time could be imagined for the introduction of our old friend to our notice than when the third census that has been taken in Canada since the promulgation of the national policy will give us, as I shall presently show, such an opportunity as we have never had before of seeing what that policy has done for Canada. Now, Sir, I am not going to wade through all the weary statistics that afflicted my hon. friend; I am not going to bother myself with the doctrine of averages as defined by himself or anybody else. There is better game afoot. However, in the first place, I would like to know from my hon. friend what are those 'official statistics,' forsooth, which induced him to dispute the assertion of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) who sits beside me that, in all human probability, the growth of Canada during the last five years had been equal to that during the fifteen years preceding. Perhaps my hon. friend would gratify my curiosity ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Year-book.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am sorry for my hon. friend if that is all the authority he has to adduce. The Year-book may be a very valuable document. I will give a few illustrations of what the Year-book was worth a little while ago. I remember that this same document—I thought that that was what my hon. friend referred to—estimated, in 1887, that the population of Canada was 4,856,226. In 1888 the Year-book's estimation of the population of Canada was 4,946,497. In 1899, it had risen to 5,075,855. They suppressed 1890 and 1891, but I will carry out the calculation. On the same line of calculation, the Year-book would have given us a population of 5,210,000 for 1890, and 5,345,000 for 1891—just ten years ahead of time. These are the 'official statistics' that the hon. gentleman relied upon for the purpose of contradicting what, as I shall show presently, was a very well-reasoned hypothesis on the part of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding). There is another matter I would like to call to the attention of the House. I do not know whether the House noticed it, but I did, that, whenever the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was able to point to anything showing the slightest reduction in our trade with Great Britain, his loyal followers cheered; and, when he was able to point to any increase in our trade with the United States, his loyal followers cheered more loudly. Let me give the hon. gentleman a few facts as to our trade with Great Britain. We need not follow those microscopic fluctations on which the hon. gentleman lays so much stress. A large trade will vary one or two points from year to year, no doubt. But, what were the broad facts as to our trade with Great Britain ? In 1889, our trade with Great Britain was $43,277,000, on which we collected a duty of $9,576,000. In 1897, the last year of the national policy, our trade with Great Britain had fallen to $29,401,000. In 1901, our trade with Great Britain was $42,819,000, on which we collected a duty of $7,845,000. What did our preference do for Great Britain ? In eight years, under the national policy, we had lost $14,000,000; in the four years under our policy we had gained $14,000,000. And, whereas under the old tariff on imports of about forty-three and a quarter millions, we collected $9,576,000 of duty, under our tariff, on imports of almost forty-three millions—bear in mind, the merest fraction of a difference—we collected $7,845,000 of duty, or about $1,700,000 less duty than was collected on a nearly similar amount of goods imported into Canada in 1889. Of course, there are fluctuations, we know that perfectly well. It has been stated recently—I think the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) told us the other night—that there had been a fluctuation amounting to several millions in the importation of cheese into Great Britain. Under these circumstances what did the present government do ? Did it sit down and wail ? Not a bit. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fisher) at once held a conference with those who represented the great dairy interests of this country, and they are now applying themselves, as men should do, not to give more protection for the dairy interests, but to enable them to help themselves over their difficulty and restore the cheese interest of Canada to the proud position it has hitherto held in the British market. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) thought it a very absurd thing that the hon. Minister of Finance should intimate that the government had anything to do with the prosperity which, thank heaven, has blessed Canada during the past four years. That is a very new doctrine from those benches. When I sat here before and the hon. gentleman's predecessor sat there, was there a day, was there an hour, in which it was not thundered out, much more loudly than my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has done, that a government did not deserve to exist for an hour—this was what was said by Sir Charles Tupper—unless it could bring prosperity to a country ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) say about it ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This was the doctrine of my hon. friend's predecessor. Does he repudiate Sir Charles Tupper ? Does he say that Sir Charles Tupper was wrong ? Does he pretend to say that the great and the good Sir Charles Tupper was saying what he did not mean when he said that a government was good for nothing which did not bring prosperity to a country ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What did my hon. friend say ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I said then, what I say now—that even the best government that ever existed, even a government like Mackenzie's, could not altogether avert a disaster which overspread the whole world, though it could greatly modify it; and that the position of Canada while Mackenzie was at the head of the administration, compared most favourably with the condition of the adjoining republic, the United States, as every man who examined the conditions of the United States from 1873 to 1879 knows right well. That, Sir, is what I told the hon. gentleman. Now, it is quite true that the best governments cannot always avert a calamity, but unfortunately the reverse is only too true, that a government can very easily bring about disaster to a country, as I shall presently show the government which we displaced was eminently successful in doing, from 1878 to 1896.

Now, Sir, the doctrine of averages is a great doctrine, the favourite doctrine, I remember, of my old friend Sir Leonard Tilley, and I cannot see that it has advanced much in the hands of his successor. But take a sample or two of the doctrine of averages, take the case of Holland. My hon. friend was great on the fact that we apparently discriminated against Great Britain, although I do not think he quite understood the case. We will take the case of Holland, and I call his attention to it. From Holland we imported the last year $797,000 worth of goods, and we taxed these imports $1,350,000. Was not that a fearful discrimination, 170 per cent on the average of goods we imported from Holland? Perhaps my hon. friend thinks that, being pro-Boers, it is all right to punish the Dutch. Or how does he explain that horrible discrimination against the unfortunate Hollanders? We imported less than $800,000 worth, and taxed it $1,350,000. Has my hon. friend any explanation to give?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should say it was gin.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. He is perfectly right, it was gin; and it shows the utter absurdity of applying this same doctrine of averages. Here one single article amounting to about one-fourth of the whole importation is so taxed that it brings the average up to 170 per cent. Yet the hon. gentleman thinks it is quite safe to apply the doctrine of averages as between Canada and Great Britain, and as between Canada and the United States. Now, I will give the hon. gentleman another illustration of the danger of relying on this doctrine of averages. We import from the United States this very moment a very large quantity of anthracite coal and a very large quantity of cotton wool. Suppose my hon. friend here in the exercise of his discretion was to place a duty of, let us say five per cent, on those articles, and what would the result be? Why, he would at once lower the average on the importations of American goods from twenty-five to twenty per cent. Would that be a proof that we discriminated in favour of the United States as against England? And yet, Sir, under these conditions we would be importing goods from the United States on an average of twenty per cent as against twenty-five per cent charged against England.

Sir, the whole comparison that the hon. gentleman has made of the expenditure is vicious to a degree. I hoped better from the hon. gentleman. I hoped he would have had the candour, when he came to compare the expenditure of last year with that of half a dozen years ago, to point out that a very large proportion of our increased expenditure could not have occurred in the time of his predecessor, and that a very large proportion of our increased expenditure does not cost the people of Canada one cent. It has not cost one cent to the people of Canada collectively, of older Canada at any rate, that we spent a million and a half in the Yukon, because we get a million and a half and more out of the Yukon. It does not cost them one cent that we pay half a million more for sinking fund than we did in 1895. What comes out of one pocket goes into the other. If my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals asks us for six millions for the purpose of carrying on the work of the Intercolonial Railway, he brings back very nearly, though not quite, six millions to us in the increased receipts, without costing the people of Canada a penny beyond the small difference between receipts and expenditures. I beg the hon. gentleman to remember that that is quite as near to an equilibrium as the predecessors of the hon. gentleman ever got. Now, Sir, he allows nothing for that, he won't allow anything for sinking fund, he won't allow anything for expenditure on the Yukon, he won't allow anything for increased receipts from the railway, he won't allow anything for increased receipts from the post office. My hon. friend the Postmaster General, I believe, is spending about $300,000, in round numbers, more than was spent in 1895. But my hon. friend is getting back $500,000 more. The deficit is very considerably less now than the deficit was then; and the people of Canada, Sir, have received, under my hon. friends administration, the advantage that they can send a letter for two cents from one end of the British empire to the other which used to cost them five cents, and they can send a letter from one end of the Dominion to the other for two cents which used to cost them three cents; in other words, they are being charged very little more than one-half what they were charged a few years ago. The burden of the people has been lessened to the extent of one million dollars, but no credit is to be

given, of course, to this government for anything of that kind. Why, Sir, we will take this hon. gentleman's mode of calculating and computing the average expenditure. We will suppose, for illustration's sake, that the railways were earning twenty-five millions, and that my hon. friend was expending twenty million dollars upon them. Under these conditions, if we were to apply the line of argument used by the hon. gentleman, the people of Canada would be four dollars per head worse off than they were before ; the expenditure per head would be about fourteen dollars instead of ten dollars under those circumstances, and we would be, I suppose, just so much worse off if his way of reckoning our expenditure is to prevail.

Now, the hon. gentleman must needs mix and muddle up capital and ordinary expenditure. That is always indiscreet, that always leads to confusion. They must be judged by different canons and different principles, and he would have done far better to confine himself to the ordinary expenditure. Sir, I am willing to meet the hon. gentleman, I am always willing to meet these hon. gentlemen on their own ground. I will take a parallel case. He was appalled just now because my hon. friend spent $57,000,000 last year and was in danger of spending $65,000,000 for all purposes during the next year. Sir, I turn to the public records which I have under my hand and I find that in 1884 this hon. gentleman's predecessors found it necessary to expend $57,-860,000 ; in 1885 they found it necessary to expend $49,163,000; in 1886—let the hon. gentleman mark it—they were obliged to spend $61,837,000. Sir, on what population ? The population of Canada in 1884-85-86 amounted roughly to about 4,450,000 to 4,500,000 souls. Now, Sir, if it be such a terrible thing for us to expend $57,000,000, or even $65,000,000, if, as this hon. gentleman declares, it is so terrible a thing that the gross total expenditure of Canada for all purposes, good, bad or indifferent, whether productive or unproductive, should range to a matter of $10 or $11 per head, what has he to say of the case of 1884 when the average annual expenditure per capita amounted to $13.50, or of 1885, when the average annual expenditure per capita amounted to $11.18, or of 1886, when it amounted to $13.75 ? It is a poor rule that wont work both ways. I care little myself for this doctrine of averages, but if it pleases the hon. gentlemen to know what the averages are, why, I am always willing to oblige them. Sir, let us look at the broad facts of the case. We find that the broad facts of the case are these : In 1895, as he can see by looking at the public records, our total expenditure on consolidated account was $38,138,000. Our population, taking his own estimate, which I do not concur in for reasons I will give presently, was about five million. Now, in 1901 it is quite true that our expenditure amounted to $46,866,000 ; but of that sum $5,000,000 represented cross entries, sums which we received with one hand and which we paid out with the other, sums for sinking fund, sums for post office, sums for Yukon Territory, sums recived from the railway and paid out again in wages on the railway.

Strike, as I have a right to strike, this $5,000,000 out, and then apply your per capita calculation. What is the result ? Your 5,000,000 people in 1895 spent $38,138,-000 representing an expenditure per head of $7.63, and your 5,370,000, deducting the $5,000,000 I have spoken of, as entries on both sides of the account, expended $41,-360,000, being a per capita amount of $7.70 as against $7.63. Well, Sir, seven cents per head are not to be sneezed at. We required three of those cents (with the full concurrence of hon. gentlemen opposite) to pay our extra indemnity last year. We required four cents of the balance, making up the seven cents, to meet the necessary expense incurred by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) in collecting nearly double the revenue we had in 1895. I ask the hon. gentleman, does he consider that the people of Canada are any poorer with the addition of this $5,-000,000 for the purposes that I have enumerated, or, do any of the hon. gentleman's friends contend that it should be fairly counted as a part of the taxation to be reckoned against us, in stating as he did the fact that we spent $50,000,000 a year as against the $40,000,000 spent by our predecessors ? I have not the time, but I would like to go over the $3,000,000 of difference between the $46,000,000 and the $38,000,000, deducting the $5,000,000 that I have spoken of, and I think if the hon. gentleman or any of his friends, choose to go over that in detail they will see that for that additional sum that was expended by us during these five or six years the people have received very ample returns. A certain portion of that amount was expended for the benefit of the agricultural community and they have received, I venture to say, from ten to twenty fold in the increased value of their productions from the annual expenditure which was made for the purpose of promoting their interests under the administration of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), Another considerable portion of that expenditure was for the purpose of promoting and increasing immigration to this country, one of the most desirable objects in a country like Canada for which we can possibly expend our money. Yet another part, with the full concurrence and approbation of these hon. gentlemen who are constantly pressing us, forsooth, to spend more money in that direction, was expended for the purpose of putting our militia on a more efficient footing. And so, I might go on through the whole of it. The hon. gentle-

man has not chosen to do it. Possibly the hon. gentleman considered that as neither he nor his friends ventured to oppose these expenditures on the floor of the House, they could not with much decency criticise them on the present occasion.

As to the capital expenditure, that, I say, is entirely on another footing. It must be judged by itself because it may be productive, or it may be unproductive. If it be not productive it is the hon. gentleman's duty, and it is the duty of his friends behind him, to criticise any proposition we make and I invite him most cordially to do so. It is all very well to say that because we have added a few million dollars to the public debt we are open to criticism. It is for the hon. gentleman to show that this expenditure will not be profitable. An addition of $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 may be a most useful and productive outlay, while, on the other hand, an addition of half a million to the public debt may be most useless and mischievous. You must judge each case on its individual merits. We are all prepared, and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) is prepared, to challenge the sharpest criticism as to any amounts we have added to the public debt for the purpose of public improvements, and here I may add as to the remainder, it is well known that a very considerable portion of the addition to the public debt was incurred by the gift we made to England to help her in her South African difficulty. I must say that I did hope for better things from the hon. leader of the opposition who is a lawyer and a lawyer of repute. I thought that he would have embraced this opportunity to make something like a discriminating review of these expenditures. I expected that making due allowance for the circumstances I have referred to, that recognizing the facts I have stated, that admitting that it was not fair to charge us with those large sums which came into one pocket as fast as they went out of the other, that admitting what he has not alluded to in the slightest degree that within the last four years there has been a marked increase in the cost of living and a marked increase in the rates of wages all through the Dominion necessarily involving a large increase in the cost of carrying on public works, that allowing that there is an increase of population under our regime to be accounted for, and that this was a growing time in a period of great expansion, if then he had any criticism to make, if he thought there had been improvidence and extravagance my hon. friend might have done a great service to this country by pointing it out. I, myself, desire to say that I think the time has come when we should proceed more cautiously, when we must consider very carefully what further large expenditures we commit ourselves to, and I think that in that respect the opposition, if they choose to do their duty, may be of considerable use to us. The hon. gentleman talks very lightly and rather flippantly, I think of the progress of Canadian trade. I do not take quite the same view as the hon. gentleman does. I do not regard it as being a matter of indifference that our Canadian imports and Canadian exports should expand in a ratio hitherto unknown in this country. I have here a rather interesting table showing the total trade of Canada, our imports and exports, as compared with the trade of Australasia, the trade of the United States, the trade of Great Britain, the trade of Belgium, the trade of France and the trade of Germany. I will give the House a few extracts from that which are worth considering. Our total imports, per capita, in 1890 amounted to about $24. In 1895 they were $22, per capita, and in 1900 they had risen to $36.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman dislikes to hear that Canada's imports have increased. I differ from him. I take issue with him and with all those other hon. gentlemen. I am glad to see Canada's imports increase, and I am glad to see Canada's exports increase. I think, if he does not, that if we wish to sell we must also buy. In 1890 our exports amounted to $19 per capita, in 1895 they had risen to $22, while in 1900 they had risen to $36, or nearly double within the period of ten years, and they have largely increased within the period of four years that I have alluded to. How does this compare with the trade of the other countries which I have mentioned during corresponding periods? In Australasia imports remained stationary and exports increased at a vastly less ratio than ours. Ours rose from $19 to $36, while theirs rose from $45 to $59 per capita. In the case of the United States I find that they began in 1890 with $13 per capita, that in 1895 they had sunk to about $12, and that in 1900 the per capita exports of the United States had risen to $19. That is to say that they were just exactly in the position which we held ourselves ten years ago, and at this present moment have very little more than half per head in their export trade of that of Canada.

I take the total volume of trade. In 1890 it amounted to $44 per head; in 1895 it amounted to the same; in 1900 it had risen to $71 per head. And, how does this compare with our neighbours to the south? In 1890 it was $26 per head in the United States; in 1895 it was $23 per head in the United States, and in 1890 their total volume of trade amounted to $29 per head; very little more than one-third per head as much as the people of Canada. I have not time to go through all these figures, but I will give the House the general result. Of all these countries—and several of them, as you

know, are in the very van of progress in all ways—of Australia, the United States, Great Britain, Belgium, France, and Germany, Canada has increased at all points; increased in her imports, increased in her exports, increased in her total volume of trade, in a far greater ratio than the best of the others—not by any means excepting Great Britain.

Our volume of trade compares with Great Britain, as follows : In 1890 we had $44 per head; in 1890 Great Britain had $97 per head. In 1900, we had $71 per head; we had increased in the ratio of about 60 per cent; and Great Britain had $104 per head, having increased in the ratio of about 7 per cent. I commend these figures to my hon. friends opposite. They ought to do them good, but I am afraid they won't so long as they continue in their hide-bound state of adherence to their medieval ideas of trade and commerce.

Now, Sir, this tariff-making which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is engaged in is no doubt a very interesting problem. Perhaps he will pardon me for giving him a few hints. I am an older man than he is; I have a little more experience in the trade. I think I can give him a few hints even in the art of making a tariff to suit a protective community. Would it surprise my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) very much to know that it would be a very easy matter indeed to make a tariff which should be at once and the same time a most highly protective tariff and yet under which the average duty on all imports would be very low indeed ? Would it surprise him to hear that ? Would he like to know how it is done—it may be useful to him ? Would it surprise him to know that it would be equally easy to double, to treble, and to quadruple the actual taxation of the people of the country and at the same time to reduce their nominal taxation to one-half or one-third of what it now is ? Would it surprise him to know that ? Would it surprise him very much to know that it would be an easy matter—and he is on the high road to it—to frame a tariff under which the people of Canada should be taxed $60,000,000 a year, and under which $20,000,000 would go into the treasury and $40,000,000 would go into the pockets of a few favoured interests, from whom in good time a campaign fund might be levied as in the old days to keep the hon. gentlemen opposite in power ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) does not know that, I will be very pleased to give him a few lessons in these three matters at any time he likes. Here you have the protective practice and the protective theory in a nutshell. What I have suggested is not a mere matter of academic possibility, but it is what is being done to-day in the United States, which the hon. gentleman has been holding up to us during the latter part of his speech as such a model of political economy. I have very great respect for the memory of the late Mr. McKinley. I had the pleasure of making his acquaintance, and I very greatly honour Mr. McKinley in many respects; but he was not the sort of person whom I would advise a Canadian legislator to look up to as a model of all that was wise and prudent and successful in economic questions. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is disposed to follow Mr. McKinley. I have no objection. It is not the first time that we have found these gentlemen hiding a very strong appreciation of American political methods and of American political designs under the guise of an earnest desire to keep up British connection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Now, Sir, while I am on this subject, I would like to say a word to our manufacturing friends. I understand that many of them are pleased to regard me as their particular enemy. Well, Sir, I have no desire to quarrel with the manufacturers of Canada. I desire to do justice to them as I desire to do justice to all classes of my fellow-countrymen. But, I would like to say a few words to these gentlemen. Sir John Macdonald was in the habit very frequently of calling attention to a certain epitaph which he said he had seen in a grave yard, to the effect :

I was well, I would be better, here I am.

Now, Sir, I would advise our manufacturing friends to lay this to heart.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I say that this government has treated them with the greatest consideration. I say that this government used all possible care to see that their interests—not alone, mind you, but in common with the interests of the rest of the people—were safeguarded in the preparation of our present tariff. And in any alterations that may be made in the tariff, whatever line they may be pleased to take, I for one shall never advise that injustice be done to the manufacturers or done to anybody. But, I have to say to them, that they have had most uncommonly good fortune and most uncommonly good times. If they have used these well they ought to be most admirably prepared to-day to meet any reverses which may happen to overtake them, as reverses may overtake them, as reverses may overtake all classes of the community. I hope they have used their opportunities well. But, I do not believe that the way to really advance their interests is to impose higher taxes for their benefit on the rest of the community. If we are to have protection, I have this to say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I may tell him that we will see that that

protection shall be thorough. We do not want any more of the jug-handled, one-sided kind of protection which prevailed under the late administration. There are other classes to be heard. I have the honour to represent one of the richest, wealthiest, and most independent agricultural communities in the province of Ontario, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that the farmers of Ontario—and the farmers, I think, of Canada at large—are not disposed, if this protective question is to come to the front again, any more to be content with the sort of sham protection that was awarded to them before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Sir, you cannot protect the farmers of Canada or of the North-west. You cannot protect men who raise a vast deal more of food products than they can possibly dispose of in the home market; and the price of whose farm products is fixed for them in England and in London. You cannot protect them by any paltry fence of a tariff that you may put up against importations of food from the United States. There is but one way in which the farmer, if you are going to have protection, can have a share in it. Again, I make a present to the hon. gentleman—as he appears to be desirous to protect all interests—of the way in which it ought to be done and can be done. That way is simple enough. You cannot protect the farmer, as I say, by putting up a higher tariff fence, but you can protect the farmer, if you like, by giving him a bounty on all that he raises. If you are going to have protection let it be thorough; let the farmer have protection on every bushel of grain he raises; let him have protection on every pound of bacon, every pound of butter, every pound of cheese, every horse, every cow, every hog, that he brings to maturity. Has he not the right ? Has he not as good a right as the manufacturer, the fisherman, the lumberman, the miner ? Are not the farmers men on whose prosperity the prosperity of all of us depends—the prosperity of the manufacturer, the prosperity of the professional man, the prosperity of all classes in Canada ? And, therefore, I say, that if we are to have protection, by all manner of means let it be thorough, and let us begin, and let the hon. gentleman begin, by introducing a proper scale of protection for our farmers in the only way it can be given, namely, by giving a cash bounty down on the nail to our farmers for all they may be pleased to produce.

I admit that it will cost a trifle. Our farmers are not greedy. They do not want 35 per cent, they do not want 40 per cent, or 50 per cent or 60 per cent ; they will be content with a very moderate rate. But, Sir, what would a moderate rate amount to ? Well I made a calculation. Say, for instance, ten cents a bushel on all the grain they raise, one cent a pound on all their butter, all their cheese and all their pork, $10 for each decent horse, $5 for each decent cow. It would cost a trifle—$40,000,000 or $50,000,000 ; but what is that by the side of a great principle for the benefit of the whole community, such as my hon. friend advocates ? My hon. friend sitting opposite me sees that the farmers have to be considered in this matter ; and if it be so extraordinarily advantageous, by protection, to increase the manufacturing population a few thousands, what would it be if we were to add several hundreds of thousands to the farming population by a moderate system of bounties, amounting to 10 per cent only, such as I suggest to my hon. friend ?

Sir, this puts me in mind of a little story, I do not tell many stories, and therefore I may be pardoned on this occasion. It so happened that once upon a time I was present with a distinguished member of this House, who I am afraid at this moment is slightly backsliding towards protection—no less a person than my distinguished friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Now, my distinguished friend is a devout man. We know it because he has told us so more than once ; and, like other devout men, he had seen a vision. We were present at a certain agricultural gathering. My hon. friend narrated his vision. Like Dante, he had visited the nether regions. He had travelled through the various circles, including that circle to which faithless friends, according to Dante, are committed. At last he came to a very large and very extensive room, where he saw a number of persons suspended in a very curious attitude, closely resembling flitches of bacon prepared for market. My hon. friend addressed his sable guide, and inquired what on earth they were doing with these people overhead. The black gentleman informed him that these were the souls of farmers who in their lifetime had believed in protection, but, being found too green to burn, they were hung up to dry until they could be made fit for fuel. Now, I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet; but I warn our manufacturing friends that it would not be a very difficult business—because the tempers which once influenced the patrons of industry is not dead in Ontario—in a campaign of a few months to unite the farmers of Ontario, and I suspect the farmers of some other provinces, in a demand to be given their share of protection, if protection is to be the law of Canada ; and they are wide awake enough to know that the way I suggest is the only way in which the farmers of Canada will ever obtain any fair share of protection.

Now, Sir, I have another matter to bring before this House. As I stated at the commencement of my remarks, I was very much pleased—more pleased than I can express—that this question was being brought up at the time when the records of the third census of Canada were being laid before us.

No more fitting time could be selected for investigating the policy under which the government of Canada has been carried on during the major part of the 24 years that have elapsed since Mr. Mackenzie was defeated. My hon. friend beside me had very great cause indeed, as I thought, to congratulate the people of Canada on the immense accession of material wealth in various ways which had marked our progress during the last four years. But, Sir, there is one thing which is more important to Canada than even an increase of wealth, and that is an increase of the number of intelligent, industrious, active and vigorous people residing in Canada. That is the true wealth of a nation. That is what I desire to see grow and increase very much more than I do savings bank deposits of the volume of trade and commerce. I beg to say to hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly to the hon. leader of the opposition, that I adhere at all points to the statement made by me, not once only, but many times in this House, that the best test of the growth of any nation, more especially any young nation like Canada, with boundless areas of fertile land untouched, lies in this, whether in such a country you find the people of the land willing to stay in it, and the strangers who come induced to remain. That is the true test, not only of the growth of the country, but of the way in which it is administered. By that test I am ready to be judged, and that test I am about to apply. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the estimate which he appeared inclined to dispute, the estimate which I made of the natural increase that might be expected in a country like Canada unless violently disturbed, is perfectly correct; and the record of our census and that of the census of the United States go very far to establish it, if they do not establish it completely.

I say that the record of the last twenty years—because in order to do justice to this matter we must go back not merely to 1891 but to 1881—is a most singular record. Prima facie that record shows the grossest misgovernment on the part of those who were entrusted with the destinies of Canada during the greater part of that period. If the opposition be correct in what they appear disposed to contend, if they are right in the statement that after four years of unexampled prosperity, after adding nearly 100 per cent to the total volume of our trade and commerce, the exodus is still going on unchecked, if our growth has been as slow since 1895 as it was before that time, then I should say that the outlook for Canada was gloomy indeed. But if analysis proves the direct reverse—if I am able to show, as I think I shall be able to show, that the plague has stopped, that the current has been reversed, that our own people are remaining in Canada and that strangers are crowding in, notably from the United States, then there is a good hope for Canada, for a better era is dawning on this country.

Now, I cannot doubt that, as loyal Canadians, hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly the hon. leader of the opposition, will be very pleased to hear me say that I have good ground for stating that after a careful analysis of these two censuses, I believe first of all, the increase during the last decade is double the increase which took place during the decade from 1881 to 1891, and next, that the increase during the last five years, from 1896 to 1901, in all human probability equals the total increase of the preceding 15 years from 1881 to 1896. Sir, these are not statements to be made lightly by a man in my position, and I do not make them lightly. I shall be prepared before I sit down, even at the cost of wearying my hon. friends' patience, to give chapter and verse for these rather remarkable statements. I shall be prepared to show that the error which has led to the statements which have been circulated has been caused by very gross frauds in the census of 1891; that the returns for 1891 were purposely and deliberately for political purposes swelled unduly; and that in consequence the apparent rate of increase from 1891 to 1901 was very materially reduced. I challenge the keenest criticism on this point. If I make good the statements to which I now pledge myself, if I am able to show that the increase during the last decade was double the increase which took place between 1881 and 1891, and that the increase during the last five years in all probability is fully equal to the increase that took place during the preceding fifteen years, then I say that is a most pregnant fact, and while it is the best augury for the future, it sheds a most lurid light on the manner in which the administration of Canada was carried on from 1878 to 1896.

Sir, I say that the passage in the Address to which the hon. gentleman referred is true in all particulars and true to the letter. But first I would desire to contradict a slanderous statement which has crept into the public press, and concerning which I believe that those who circulated it did not fully comprehend what they were about. I refer to the statement which endeavours to put the blame for the small increase in the population of Canada on the shoulders of the ladies of Canada. I stand here to refute that slander and to say that the ladies of Canada, now as ever, have done their duty faithfully to their country. And if our numbers are less than we think they should be, it is no fault of theirs. If the men will go away what are the poor women to do? It is not through any fault of theirs that the rate of increase has not been so great as we would have desired. Of course we know that evil communications corrupt good manners, and it may be that here and there, certain Yankee practices have crept in; but

I deny that such practices have affected in the slightest degree, the great majority. They are prepared to do their duty by their country now and ever as they have always done. One thing more, I am breaking no state secret when I say that long ago I foresaw just this controversy which has occurred, and I was very desirous, when I came into office—knowing that gross frauds had been committed in 1891 in taking the census—to establish a fair point of departure, so that we might have absolute legal proof of where Canada had arrived in 1896. There was a good deal to say against taking a census then. No doubt such a measure was a contentious one and would have been violently opposed by the other side. Our finances were not very flourishing in 1896, and I am far from saying that those who opposed the idea had not a great deal to say for themselves. But I regret that we did not take a census in 1896 and obtain legal, absolute proof of what our population was at that time. I think, however, I will be able to lay before this House such ample circumstantial evidence as will fully bear out the statement I have just made.

I propose to deal with the exodus in several aspects. First, as regards its extent, which has been greatly underrated, or at least not sufficiently appreciated, by the people of Canada. I propose to deal with it also with respect to the quality of the exodus, which I consider to have been, in every sense and shape, a double loss to Canada. The people we lost and sent to the United States were emphatically the very flower of our population. They were to a most unusual extent, composed of young men and women in the very best of their youth, and the only consolation I have ever been able to find has been that wherever I have gone through the United States, from one end to the other, always and everywhere, I have found Canadians doing well, occupying places of trust and emolument, and in many cases places of the very highest position. I doubt whether any equal number of the people of the United States—any equal number, whether they be native or foreign born—could show to-day so many persons well and highly placed as the Canadian immigration to the United States. Look to the United States Senate and you will find Canadians there. Look to the United States judiciary and you will find them on the bench. Look at the very front rank of American inventors, who can surpass Edison, a Canadian boy. Look at the front rank of railway magnates, and there you will find Canadians. Everywhere you will find them, and if the very best of our people have gone to the United States, that only makes the loss to us the more severe, and how severe I shall presently proceed to show.

Our people hardly appreciate the immense extent of the loss which we sustained from 1880 to 1891. In 1880, according to the census returns of the United States, there were 717,000 Canadians in that country. In 1890 that number had increased to 980,000; in 1900 it amounted to 1,181,000. You will remember that in order to keep up the number of those who were found in the United States at any one of these given periods, a very much larger number than the difference between those found in 1890 and those found in 1880 must have emigrated to the United States. You cannot possibly put the death rate at less than 2 per cent per annum bearing in mind the very large number who had been in the United States a long period. If you bear that in mind, you find that Canada lost from 1880 to 1890 not less than 433,000 souls altogether, and from 1890 to 1900 Canada lost certainly not less than 417,000 souls. In other words, in the two decades, beginning in 1880 and terminating in 1900, the total loss to Canada—the absolute and ascertained loss—was not less than 850,000 souls; and bearing in mind that a most unusually large number of these people were men and women in the very flower of their youth, you must in all conscience, add to these the children who would naturally have been born to them had they remained in Canada, if you wish to form an estimate of the total loss to Canada during those years. Putting all those together, is it possible to believe that we lost less than 1,400,000 people who ought to have been in Canada between 1880 and 1901.

I have stated that this was a most miserable exhibit. I am aware that hon. gentlemen opposite have not paid very much attention to this rather unwelcome subject, and I doubt if they have ever taken the trouble to consider how other countries similarly circumstanced to ours have fared during the same period of twenty years. We, from 1880 to 1901, have barely added one million to our population. We began with 4,324,000, and we have increased to 5,370,000. What was the record in the United States during the last twenty years? Beginning with a population of 50,155,000, they rose to 62,000,000 in 1890, and advanced to 76,000,000 in 1900. The United States gained 26,000,000 in these twenty years, against Canada's 1,000,000. We gained at the rate of about 25 per cent—not quite that—in a period of twenty years, and the United States gained at the rate of 52 per cent. But I will take an illustration that is better than that. Take the United States at a time when they had no immigrants to fall back on, when the United States were left to their own resources, when locomotion was slow, when every yard of territory had to be gained at the point of the rifle, from 1790 to 1810, when the population of the United States was very considerably less than the population of Canada in 1880. How stands the record then? In 1790, the United States had a population of 3,929,000; in 1810, the

population had risen to 7,239,000. They had gained 3,310,000 on a population of less than 4,000,000; while we with the large addition from the immigrants who came to us, had gained a bare 1,000,000 in a like period starting with a population of about 4,300,000. Am I not justified in saying that this is a most miserable exhibit? Or, I will take the states adjoining our Northwest. Take the states of Dakota and Minnesota. In 1880, Dakota had a population of 135,000; in 1900, the population had risen to 720,000. Minnesota, in 1880, had a population of 780,000, and in 1900, the population had risen to 1,750,000. Why, in Dakota and Minnesota alone, in these twenty years, the growth of population was 1,500,000, starting as they did with a population of less than a million. Some of these hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of talking of national humiliation, because, forsooth, we buy more from the United States than we sell to the United States. But I have not heard them tell us what grievous national humiliation it is that England buys from us a great deal more than England sells to us. How it can be a disgrace to us to buy more from the United States than we sell to them, and not a disgrace for England to buy more from us than she sells to us, I do not see. But I say that this is the true national humiliation, that, under the circumstances I have stated, with boundless territories almost unexplored, with room for fifty millions of people—I well believe, for a hundred million—we are unable, after twenty years, to point to an increase of more than one million, while the United States, under far more disadvantageous circumstances, were able to show an increase of 3,300,000. I say that this is a national disgrace, and speaks in trumpet tones of the gross misgovernment and mismanagement of those who were charged with the government of the country during the greater part of that time.

I have said that I have very grave ground to distrust the census of 1891. One of my grounds was the conduct of the government of that day when the accuracy of that census was challenged. Unfortunately, there are but few here who had seats in parliament in 1891. But those hon. gentlemen who were then in the House will remember, when my hon. friend the present Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Borden) rising in his place, brought forward most incontrovertible evidence that gross frauds had been committed in one subdivision at least in his own province, how his statements were received. If the government had been honest men, they would have ordered a rigorous investigation. Or, at least and at lowest, they would have abstained from throwing every obstacle in their power in the way of the investigation that my hon. friend desired. They would give us no satisfaction, no opportunity to extend the scope of our investigation. But enough was done by my hon. friend on that occasion to show clearly and distinctly, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that, in the case he gave there had been very gross and deliberate stuffing of the lists on the part of the census enumerator. That was one ground for distrust. Another and even graver ground is to be found in the conduct of the enumerators employed. There were two objects which the census enumerators of that day had in mind. They were extremely desirous of making it appear that the national policy was a success. They were extremely desirous of swelling the number of the people. As it happens, we are in possession of very perfect evidence as to the means they adopted for the purposes of glorifying the national policy. Hon. members who were in the House at that time will remember how astonished they were to find that the national policy had called into existence twenty-five thousand new industries in the space of ten years. And we were still more astonished when we got hold of vol. 'C,' the third volume of the census of 1891, and when it dawned on our astonished mind what sort of means the Conservative enumerator on the warpath is ready to use for ad majorem Dei gloriam his own emolument and the renown of the national policy. I have here some choice samples, very choice samples, of the way in which these gentlemen made something out of nothing and created five and twenty thousand new industries to order. I find that, in 1881, Canada had eleven carpet factories. But I find that in 1891, Canada boasted 557 carpet factories. Of these, Sir, seventy were located in the good county of Antigonish. And a curious fact it is, which I have not been able quite to understand, that it is on record that these seventy factories employed sixty-nine hands. There was one man; sixty-four old women; one boy, and three girls. I am inclined to believe that the man, owing to the wonderful effects of the national policy, must have become ambidexterous and so expert that he could run two factories, one with each hand. I find on further examination—I am quoting, remember, from the census record, that invaluable volume 'C' which I desire my friends to cherish and prize—that the machinery required to run these seventy carpet factories was valued at $1,089, being an average of $15—nearly—apiece. I find that these seventy factories paid wages to the amount of $4,539, being, roughly, I think about $60 or $65 per annum, or about $1.15 a week—approximately 20 cents per day. Sir, I proceeded in my investigations, and I found that they had done nearly as well in knitting factories by the county of Shelburne, as they had done in carpet factories by the county of Antigonish. Shelburne boasted of ninety-three knitting factories. These ninety-three

knitting factories employed, I think, ninety-three hands, but I am not quite sure. At any rate, they had invested $623 in machinery, being at the rate of $6.50 per knitting factory in Shelburne. They possessed $1,500 working capital among them, being at the rate of $15 per factory. They paid in wages $1,833, being at the rate, roughly, of about $18 a year, which subdivided gave, if I remember right, about 4½ cents per day.

Not to do any wrong to the neighbouring provinces, I find that in the matter of basket factories Quebec was greatly favoured. Huntingdon possessed forty basket factories, employing forty-five hands. The value of the land, of the land, Sir, on which these forty-five basket factories stood, is given by the enumerator, I think, at $690 collectively, amounting to $17 each for the value of the land. The buildings are put at $1,800 collectively, amounting to $45 per building, $62 in all. Subsequent inquiries have led me to believe they were probably wigwams, constructed of bark. Their total wages, amounting to $1,970, being $47 a year, was ninety cents a week, or say fifteen cents per day.

New Brunswick, Sir, was rich, not in baskets but in carpet factories. New Brunswick had fifty-one factories employing fifty-one hands. These fifty-one hands required $707 worth of machinery to keep them going, and they earned wages at the rate of ten cents per day. Sir, we made a pretty careful investigation. We took Port Hope. Port Hope, I believe, had 147 industrial establishments, 120 of them employed 200 hands, one man or one woman as the case might be, and about half a boy or half a girl at each factory. And so on, and so on, and so on, until, before we had threshed the thing out, it became tolerably apparent that these census enumerators had succeeded in discovering 25,000 new industrial establishments out of what an ordinary mortal would have considered about 500. Why, Sir, such was the zeal of these worthy men that it is on record that rather than omit anything they included among industrial establishments certain institutions which I believe the great and good Saint Augustin has described as necessary evils, but which, until they fell in the way of the Conservative census enumerator, no one, past or present, sacred or profane, ever yet described as an industrial institution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to these matters for a definite purpose. Here you will see very clearly what was the animus that actuated the men who were intrusted with the task of compiling the census tables in 1891. If they were capable, in a case where detection was almost certain, of perpetrating the gross and impudent frauds I have just narrated, think you, they would hesitate to add here and there a name to the members of the family where detection was almost impossible, particularly under our de jure system ?

Now, Sir, I come to the Ontario returns for 1901. If these returns are correct, and if the returns for 1891 are correct, certain amazing results make themselves apparent. Sir, I knew Ontario from 1881 to 1891 as few men knew it. I had travelled Ontario a dozen times from end to end during those ten years ; I had addressed hundreds of thousands of my fellow countrymen during that interval.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It had a very bad effect.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think, if Sir John A. Macdonald was alive, he would say that the results in 1891 were beneficial to his party. Sir, I made it a special subject of inquiry, I spoke of it in my place in parliament, I inquired constantly in every possible place where I had any opportunity of obtaining information as to the exodus which was going on in Ontario from 1881 to 1891, and I obtained all sorts of evidence that the exodus was unparalleled, and everybody who knows Ontario knows that during that decade we lost an almost unprecedented number of our people. Sir, if, as I say, the census we have now got is correct, and if the census of 1891 is correct, this very remarkable result follows, that the growth of Ontario from 1881 to 1891 was three times as great as the growth of Ontario from 1891 to 1901, although the latter period includes four years of remarkable prosperity, to the people of Ontario at any rate. It follows also that the growth of Ontario from 1891 to 1901 was scarcely one-fourth part of the growth of England during the last decade. This other very remarkable result follows : We find that in Ontario, between 1881 and 1891, the number of families increased from 366,000 to 414,000. There was an increase of 48,000 families, and an increase in population of 191,000. In this second decade from 1891 to 1901, there was an increase of 40,367 families, and a total growth of population of only 68,000, as against 191,000 in the previous decade. There is another remarkable fact that I have to bring forward. Putting out of count the new districts, the unorganized districts in which a great part of the increase occurred, as everybody knows, it is a remarkable circumstance that the municipal census of Ontario shows that, less Nipissing, less Muskoka, less Parry Sound and less Algoma, there was a growth of about 70,000 between 1891 and 1901, while, according to the government census, there is only an increase of 16,000. Now, Sir, what is the deduction to be drawn from that ? The deduction is unanswerable, the deduction is clear, that there were a very considerable number of persons in Ontario in 1901 more than there were in 1891, and that one of two things has occurred, either the census of Ontario has been unduly di-

minished in 1901 by the error of our enumerators, or the census of Ontario was most unduly swollen in 1891 by the gross frauds of Conservative enumerators. I recommend hon. gentlemen to wait a little before they dispute that matter.

Now, there were a great many people, like myself, who thought that it was a very remarkable circumstance indeed that with this increase of 40,000 families in the province of Ontario there should only be an apparent increase of 68,000 people. It was supposed and alleged by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, it was supposed and alleged by their press, it was supposed and alleged by their supporters, that the number of people in Ontario had been largely underestimated and they selected the city of Toronto as a proof that the number of people in Toronto had been greatly under the mark in the enumeration. Well, Sir, they made an enumeration and they produced an apparent surplus of something like 13,000 over the number recorded by our enumerators. We caused an examination to be made into this matter. I have here the report, which I am going to lay on the Table of the House, of Mr. Carlyle, to whom was entrusted the duty of looking into this matter. Mr. Carlyle reported to my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture that after a careful examination——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who is Mr. Carlyle ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Mr. Carlyle is the gentleman who was entrusted by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture with the duty of taking the census in Toronto.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He is ex-Ald. Carlyle.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am going to give the House the benefit of Mr. Carlyle's figures, and it bears very remarkably on the assertion that the census taken, as far as our enumerators were concerned, was incorrect. The police commissioners took a census which showed a population of about 13,000 more than the census did, but when we came to examine the details of the police commissioners' census, we found that 4,000 students in the schools and colleges had been included, naturally enough, in the police census, who had not been included by our enumerators, because they had been reckoned elsewhere. We found that several thousand visitors from the country were at various hotels and had been included by the police commissioners' enumerators, who had not been included by our enumerators, that a considerable number of domestic servants had been counted by the police commissioners who had not been counted by our enumerators, and when you add to that the natural growth of Toronto during the seven months between the time of the taking of our census in April and the taking of the police commissioners' census, which would account for about 3,000, or 4,000, you get a remarkable confirmation of the accuracy of the enumeration made under the control of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. It is well known, Sir, that whereas Toronto remained as to population stationary during a period of five or six years from 1891 to 1897, after 1897, Toronto, I am happy to say, regained its former growth and on the average has been increasing at the rate of 6,000 or 7,000 a year. I place this on the Table for the information of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that all this mass of figures will hardly be admitted to 'Hansard' unless he reads the report ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Well, I have read all the figures that are pertinent, and I hand the report over and place it on the Table for the information of hon. gentlemen. I am afraid that if the hon. gentleman insisted on my reading all the figures I have here, I would be obliged to keep this House in session for a most unusual length of time.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I notice that this is a typewritten copy of the report, and of course it would be contrary to the usual rule to put it on 'Hansard' unless he reads it ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Has the hon. gentleman any wish to have it ?

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he would lay it on the Table so that it might appear in 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, not in 'Hansard,' but simply that the hon. gentleman might have access to it. Now, I desire to say that personally I would very greatly prefer to be able to believe that the miscount which I think has clearly taken place in Ontario was due to an under enumeration. It would be very much to the interest of myself and to the interest of the government, as it would relieve us of a very great deal of trouble and perplexity if we were able to say that the number credited to Ontario was greatly less than rightly belonged to it. I would desire that the enumeration might prove to be faulty, but the evidence we have been able to obtain and the examination we have been able to make go to show that our enumerators did their duty properly and that if any error has occurred, and error there undoubtedly has been, it to a very large extent arose from the miscount which took place in 1891. Now, Sir, I would like to call the attention of the House to the position in which the census enumerators found themselves in 1891. A general election had just taken place. The question of the exodus had been a burning issue and the public mind was

much excited on the question of the exodus. These persons who were employed as enumerators knew right well that the government of that day, their friends, were tottering to their fall, that Sir John Macdonald's days were numbered, that the result of the investigation then being prosecuted at the instance of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) would not fail to disclose facts extremely damaging to the Conservative administration and they knew perfectly well that if they were to give it out that the population of Ontario had been reduced between 1881 and 1891 to such an extent that the province was likely to lose several seats, the result could not fail to be most disastrous to the Conservative party. They were under the strongest motives to falsify the census, and they had shown what manner of men they were by the figures that they returned in respect to the enumeration of industries recently laid before you. But, I have to say to hon. gentlemen, if they do not think this is a sufficient reason it does not affect my main argument at all. Sir, if there has been a large increase in the population of Ontario, it equally proves my position that the increase between 1891 and 1901 has been very much greater than the increase from 1881 to 1891. Take it whichever way you please, it will not affect my main argument. If we diminished the population, we diminished it, Sir, to our own great injury. We certainly could not have desired to diminish the number of people in Ontario, or anywhere else, whereas the enumerators, as I have shown, who were employed by the Conservative government, had the strongest possible motives in the spring of 1891 to falsify the record and prevent the iniquities of their friends being brought to the knowledge of the people. It is, I see, just five minutes to six o'clock, and as I have a good deal more to say on this subject and cannot possibly conclude by that time, I will ask you, Mr. Speaker, to call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose I had been pointing out the extraordinary discrepancies which had occured between the census returns for 1901 and the census returns of 1891, for the province of Ontario. I think that both sides of the House will probably agree with me in this: That when you find that the municipal census of Ontario in the organized districts shows some 70,000, or nearly 70,000 more population than the government census does, and when you find that an addition of 40,000 families has resulted in the addition of barely 68,000 to the population of Ontario in ten years; I think that both sides of the House will agree thus far in believing that a prima facie case has been made out that there has been a gross error in either the census of 1891 or the census of 1901. So far I shall probably get the assent even of hon. gentlemen on the other side. As to whether that error occurred through the default of the enumerators of 1891 or the default of the enumerators of 1901 may be a question. For myself, while I entertain no doubt of the main fact, that is to say, of the discrepancy which exists between the two censuses of 1891 and 1901 in Ontario, and while I think that the presumption is very strong indeed that the error arose on the part of the enumerators in 1891; I am quite willing to admit that that is a fair subject for argument.

I have a few points to bring before the House in that connection before I proceed to the other divisions of Canada. It came to my knowledge between 1881 and 1891 that the exodus from Ontario had been enormous. I will give the House three cases all within my own personal knowledge which goes to show how very wide-spread that exodus was. In 1887 or 1888, I made inquiries from the editor of a newspaper which had a considerable circulation in western Ontario, and that gentleman informed me that in the three or four years preceding, 9,000 subscribers on its weekly list had sent him other addresses in the United States. That is to say that they had left Canada and had gone to the United States. Heretofore they had been residents in Canada and their addresses had been in Canada, but after that date he was directed to send his paper to the United States. I made inquiries with respect to the movement of the population in several small towns, and I remember that in all these a very considerable number of persons were reported within the three or four preceding years to have gone to the United States. I recollect in one small town alone; in the constituency I then represented, a town not having a population of more than 1,200 or 1,300; as many as 170 persons were reported to me, names given, to have removed to the United States within the three preceding years. I had another curious illustration of the extent of emigration from Ontario. For certain reasons of state, I was obliged to exercise a rather strict supervision over a certain election contest which took place in the earlier part of 1891 between one Alexander Gunn and one John Alexander Macdonald. The total vote polled on that occasion was a little over 3,000—and I need not tell you that every vote was polled that could be polled. Of that 3,000 we found that 400 voters in the city of Kingston had been brought from the United States at no inconsiderable expense to record their votes for Sir John Macdonald. Now, Sir, these three circumstances alone would go very far to show—and they were merely three of many others I could have obtained

evidence of—they will go far to show how extensive and widespread was the emigration from Ontario to the United States between the years 1881 and 1891. I have also shown the extraordinary fraud which had been committed by the census enumerators of 1891 in the way of stuffing the census returns in the matter of industries to be credited to the national policy, and I want the House to understand distinctly that the instances I gave were only a few instances out of many score. For days and for weeks in this House, as those who were then members will recollect, it was a constant practice to compel the Finance Minister of that day, much against his will, to answer certain questions with respect to the various industries which the enumerators had discovered throughout the province of Ontario and elsewhere. I doubt if there was a single hamlet in Ontario; I doubt if there was a single village in that province containing 500 or 600 people in which these ingenious persons did not discover at least 40 or 50 industrial establishments of various kinds. They are on record; there is no mistake about it; the 'Hansard' is there to testify to this day to the remarkable ingenuity which these enumerators displayed. There was not a blacksmith, there was not an artisan, there was not a carpenter throughout the province of Ontario I verily believe, who was not put down as an industrial establishment whether the thing was run by himself or run by himself and his boy combined. I say that all these things together, coupled with the conduct of the government (on which I lay very considerable stress) in absolutely refusing their aid to an investigation when charges of gross fraud were preferred by members in their place in parliament—I say that all these things go to constitute a very strong prima facie case against the good faith of the enumerators of 1891. However, I admit there is room for argument, only I further call attention to the fact that at that particular moment the Conservative party was in a very deplorable plight, a kind of plight which would tempt and almost excuse strong party men—and we know very well that the census enumerators were strong party men—to do a good deal that they might otherwise have hesitated to do for the benefit of their party; and that it would have been in the highest degree for the benefit of their party to make the Ontario lists appear larger than they actually were, no man who remembers the condition of things in the spring of 1901 can presume to doubt.

The emigration from Ontario is peculiar in some respects. It was not, as I understand the emigration from Quebec is or was, largely composed of families. It was almost exclusively composed of individuals, generally young men or young women from their several families, and under the de jure system which prevailed then and which has prevailed since, there was a great opportunity given to any enumerators who chose to include people who had left Canada for many years, as I believe the enumerators did to a very great extent. Beyond all that—although the difficulties in our way are very great and although the expense at this distant time of ascertaining the facts is almost prohibitory—the Minister of Agriculture at my instance did cause in some cases investigation to be made. It will be for the House later on to say whether it is or it is not desirable that a commission should issue to inquire further into this matter. It is of quite sufficient importance I think to make it worthy of consideration, speaking for myself alone of course. The hon. Minister of Agriculture found that in the case of several towns, notably in the case of Goderich, notably in the case of Clinton, notably in the case of Simcoe, notably in the case of Port Dover, notably in the case of Cornwall, there was a considerable number of instances in which evident frauds had been committed. As I say, the difficulties in his way are very great. The total number of these frauds which are discovered is probably insignificant compared with the number that were actually committed, but enough have been discovered—I think that the reports are in the hands of my hon. friend, and I have no doubt he will be only too ready to lay them on the Table of the House—to show conclusively that there is good prima facie ground for saying that the census returns of 1891 for the province of Ontario were grossly stuffed.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman tell us the newspaper he referred to, and 9,000 of whose subscribers he said had gone to the United States?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have no objection to state. It is the London 'Advertiser.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It never had 9,000 subscribers.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. On its weekly list? My hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) is very ignorant, I am sorry to say, of the extent to which the London 'Advertiser' at that time circulated. Now, Sir, I come to another and a still more important phase of this question. As I have said, in Ontario, where I think the evidence is conclusive that there has been a grave miscount, the evidence as to the date at which that miscount took place is necessarily somewhat imperfect. I can only go on circumstantial evidence and on presumption.

But it so happens that in the sister province of Quebec we stand on much firmer ground. Every hon. gentleman who knows anything of the customs of the people of

Quebec is aware that in that province the parochial clergy every year make a very accurate census of all their parishioners, and I am informed of all the people within their particular cure. From the nature of the case that census is more strictly accurate where the population is chiefly Catholic and French than where it is mixed; but in any case it is a census the fairness of which no one on either side of the House will, I think, dispute. I invite the special attention of the House to certain facts which I am about to lay before them with regard to the province of Quebec. I have here a report carefully made by a chief officer of the census, Mr. Côté, in which that gentleman gives us the difference between the parochial census taken in 1891 and the government census of that year, and the results are very extraordinary. In the county of Bagot the government census discovered 2,743 more people than the parochial investigators had been able to find three months before. In the county of Bellechasse is discovered 1,050 more people; in Berthier, 3,433 more; in Champlain, 2,230 more; in Dorchester, 608 more; in Iberville, 2,090 more; in Joliette, 3,817 more; in Kamouraska, 2,003 more; in l'Assomption, 1,223 more; in l'Islet, 1,008 more; in Lotbiniere, 1,191 more; in Maskinongé, 2,770 more; in Montmagny, 1,157 more; in Montmorency, 421 more; in Nicolet, 2,635 more; in Portneuf, 998 more; in Richelieu, 3,155 more; in Rimouski, 3,783 more; in Rouville, 3,123 more; in Témiscouata, 1,134 more. The above statement shows that the enumerators in 1891 raised in 21 counties 40,615 more names than were recorded three months previous to the census by the parish priests. I am willing to admit that there will always be a slight discrepancy between such a census and the census taken by the government enumerators. I believe the parish priests do not enumerate those who are absent at the time, and there are some other slight differences; but our census of 1901 corresponds with these parochial censuses within 8,000 souls. Therefore I say that these statements prima facie afford the clearest proof that can well be laid before the House at this distance of time that in these 21 counties of the province of Quebec the lists were stuffed in 1891 to the extent of at least 32,000 souls. Sir, that is by no means all. It is not to be supposed that this occurred in 21 districts only. There is evidence, and good evidence, as I think hon. gentlemen will have to admit, that not merely in these 21 counties, but in many others—I cannot say whether in all—of the 65 counties into which Quebec is divided, similar frauds were perpetrated. I have here a report of two subdivisions in the city of Montreal. That report shows that in these two subdivisions only the census over-estimated 1,006 persons. There were in the city of Montreal in 1891, 125 enumerators for 125 subdistricts. I do not at all pretend to say that the fictitious entries in the others were in as large as they were in these; but if there were in two subdivisions of Montreal fictitious entries to the extent of 1,006, the House can judge for itself how likely it would be that other districts would escape scot-free.

As this is a matter of more than ordinary importance, I have obtained, by the kind permission of my friend the Minister of Agriculture, more ample returns regarding the province of Quebec, which I shall proceed, for the information of the House, not to read—that would take too long a time—but to lay on the Table. Some of them, I observe, are in French; and it will be no doubt a pleasing task for some of the hon. gentlemen opposite of that persuasion—there are not many of them—to translate for the benefit of their English confreres. These are the returns for Bagot; these are the returns for Beauce; these for Berthier; these for Bonaventure; these for Bellechasse; these for Chateauguay; these for Champlain; these for Charlevoix; these for Chicoutimi; these for Dorchester; this for Gaspé. The hon. gentlemen will observe there is nothing to conceal. This for Jacques Cartier; this interesting one for Joliette; this for Kamouraska; this for l'Assomption; this for Labelle; Laprairie; Laval; Lévis; Lothbiniere; Maskinonge; Montcalm; Montmorency; the city of Montreal; Nicolet; Portneuf; Richelieu; St. Jean D'Iberville; Temiscouata.

I have here Mr. Côté's documents, which I lay on the Table, being desirous to furnish every information to hon. gentlemen.

It is utterly impossible to compute the total extent of the frauds that were committed in Quebec, but I do not think anybody will say that I am exaggerating when, after examining the evidence that I have laid on the Table, I say there is every reasonable ground for believing that at least 50,000 or 60,000 souls were improperly counted in Quebec in the census of 1891. In Ontario, as I have pointed out, I believe there was a grave miscount. I have given my reasons for thinking that that miscount occurred in 1891, and it will be for the House to judge for themselves how far those reasons are entitled to credit. But I think this much is clear. There was a very large over count in 1891, and strong probabilities—bearing in mind the evidence which the Minister of Militia produced with respect to the maritime provinces, and which was in no way contradicted—that at least from 125,000 to 150,000 persons were wrongly counted in the census of 1891, who consequently ought to be added to the census for 1901. Because it is plain to the meanest understanding that for every one improperly counted in 1891, we in 1901 are losing one. It does not very much matter to my main argument whether there was in Ontario an under count in 1901 or an over count in 1891. The main result would be the same, namely, that there has been a very much

larger increase in the total population from 1891 to 1901 than the census returns of 1891 and 1901 taken together would appear to indicate.

Now, I turn to another not unimportant but comparatively insignificant matter. That is the question as to how far the increase which did take place in the last decade took place between 1891 and 1896, or 1896 and 1901. Here I must appeal to the common sense of the House. From 1891 to 1896 everybody knows—and no men were louder in declaring it than the predecessors of those hon. gentlemen—that Canada was labouring under a period of great depression, a period of deficits, of reduction of trade—just the sort of period during which many men would be sure to leave the country and very few who came in would be likely to stay. That is a patent fact known to everybody. It is equally well known that from 1896 to 1901 Canada as a whole enjoyed a most unusual amount of prosperity. It is also well known that there has been a very great reduction in the exodus which has taken place from Canada in the last four or five years. The evidence from the province of Quebec and the evidence as to the settlement of the North-west prove that beyond a doubt. And a piece of evidence, which no doubt will commend itself strongly to hon. gentlemen opposite, goes very far to prove it also. I happen to have here the assessors return for Toronto. That is an interesting document. The assessors, as you know, take a yearly census in the good city of Toronto. Let me read to the House, without inflicting on it the details, the result of the assessors' census in the city of Toronto, because it bears pretty strongly on the point which the Minister of Finance made, that there was a strong probability, to say the least, that the increase in the last five years of this decade was very much greater than in the first five years. The assessors census for 1891 gave 170,951 as the population of Toronto. In 1896 it gave that population as numbering 178,185, showing an increase in five years of just 7,000 souls. That same assessors' census in 1901 gave the population as 205,887, being an increase of 28,000 souls, in round numbers, as against 7,000 in 1896. That may not be conclusive evidence for the province of Ontario, but it is pretty clear evidence as to the movement of population in the good city of Toronto. I have been at pains to procure a list of the vacant buildings in Toronto during that period. In 1894 there were 4,633 buildings vacant. Let me read the list :

In 1894	4,633
1895	3,990
1896	4,014
1897	2,514
1898	2,672
1899	1,706
1900	761
1901	676

I submit, with all respect that this is tolerably clear evidence, quo ad Toronto at any rate, of the truth of the Finance Minister's assertion that population increased a great deal more rapidly in our regime from 1896 to 1901 than it did from 1881 to 1896. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite admit—I do not ask them to admit, but if they are disposed, as my friends on this side are disposed, to admit—that I have made out a prima facie case for believing that there was an over count of 125,000 or 150,000 in the census of 1891, what follows ? Why, this follows, that in the ten years ending with 1891, the increased population was just about 350,000. And this further follows that, in the ten years from 1891 to 1901, the increase of population was just 700,000. And if I am correct in my opinion that, after 1896 the exodus was materially checked—I do not say abolished altogether—and if I am correct in the further statement which I make and for which I will give some further evidence presently, that from 1896 or 1897, the great bulk of the immigrants who came to this country remained in this country—then, Sir, I say it is not very unlikely, on the contrary there is the strongest ground for believing, that, after 1896, Canada gained at the rate of 100,000 a year. After all, that would be a very small matter. It would merely mean that we reduced the exodus from 50,000 to 25,000 and added 25,000 by immigration to our population. And, if that be so, if we added for five years —and all the evidence points that way—100,000 a year to our population, and if you admit my previous calculation as to the over count in 1891, then, everything I stated is proven to the letter and the growth of the last five years is shown to be fully equal to the growth of the preceding fifteen years. This matter of the immigration to Canada is one that has attracted a good deal of attention. It was my painful duty, some years ago, standing in the place at present occupied by the leader of the opposition, to call the attention of the House and the country to the very remarkable fact that, whereas our immigration returns as published by the late government showed an immigration to Canada in the ten years from 1881 to 1891 of 886,000 persons, the census returns, making every allowance for the loss by death of the foreign-born population, only showed 150,000 to have settled in Canada. As I have said, it is interesting to trace the movement of population in the North-west upon which so much depends. I have here an enumeration furnished me by the Department of Agriculture, of the number of immigrants that came to Canada from 1897 to 1900. I find that the total number of immigrants who came in 1897 was 20,016; in 1898 the number had risen to 30,742; in 1899 these immigrants numbered 44,506; in 1900 they mustered 44,697; and, for the fiscal year 1900-1, they mustered 49,149—although I apprehend that in these two years there was some overlapping. At any rate, and

making allowance for this, the total in these five years would amount to 164,000. I find further, that, in 1897, 712 immigrants from the United States reported themselves in Canada ; in 1898 the number of Americans was 9,119 ; in 1899 11,945 ; in 1900 there were 15,500; and, in the fiscal year 1900-1 there were 17,987. If these remained here, there is not much need to add further evidence to show the very strong probability, to say the least of it, that our population has increased 500,000 in the last five years. What is the ground for holding that probably at least the greater number of these people remained here? I have here a very interesting statement showing the number of acres sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Hudson's Bay Company, and other railways and other landowners in Manitoba and the North-west I invite the attention of the House to these records. I drop the odd figures. In 1893, these companies sold 120,000 acres; in 1894, they sold 68,000 acres; in 1895, 114,000 acres; and in 1896, 108,000 acres. This was a total of 411,000. In 1898, these same companies, in one year sold 448,000 acres—a good deal more in that one year than had been sold in the four years that I have just enumerated. In 1899, they sold 162,000 acres; in 1900, they sold 648,000 acres; and in 1901, they sold 621,000 acres. Thus, in the four years from 1893 to 1896 both inclusive, these companies sold to settlers 411,000 acres, and in the four years from 1898, to 1901 both inclusive, they sold 2,180,000 acres. I think that is tolerably good presumptive evidence that the great bulk of immigrants that came to Canada under our regime remained here. This is further confirmed by the information we have been able to obtain from our various agents scattered throughout the North-west Territories. But there is another little evidence in the same direction. I have here a statement showing the homesteads in these periods. Leaving out the cancelled homesteads, the number was as follows :

1893	2,493
1894	1,926
1895	1,419
1896	1,384
Total for four years	7,222
1898	3,876
1899	5,604
1900	7,012
1901	8,136
Total for four years	24,588

Now, that may not be direct evidence, but I submit that it is very strong circumstantial evidence in proof of the very important statement that we have been increasing our population in vastly greater ratio during the last five years than we did during the first five years of this decade.

Sir, it appears to me that in all this there is good promise for the future. And it appears to me there is good promise on this one condition, that we steer clear of former errors, and that Canada in the future does not, as she did in the past, go philandering—the Vulgate has a stronger word—go philandering after new inventions. Sir, our losses have been tremendous, our progress also may be tremendous if we only will condescend to learn where our real strength is, and where the future of Canada properly lies.

I would like to say something as to two or three other points of interest connected with this census ; I would like to say something about the distribution of our rural and urban population. I might have a word or two to say on the delicate question of the education that we are giving to our people. But I pause. I must pass over those subjects, because I have to deal with another and also very interesting portion of this subject, and that is the question of the causes of this exodus. I have pointed out how grave the exodus was; I have shown you that in all human probability, of our own flesh and blood alone we have lost about a million and a half within twenty years. And mind you, that statement, formidable as it is, is amply corroborated by the facts as to the growth of other countries in similar conditions to our own. Now, Sir, a question of the gravest moment, one which is the very reverse of an academic question in which that enormous exodus was due to causes which were beyond our control, or whether it was due to preventable causes. If due to causes beyond our control, there is nothing more to be said; if due to causes which can or should have been prevented, it demands our utmost strength and energy to prevent this fatal drain on our resources from continuing.

I say again that our exhibit in the matter of population from 1881 to 1891 is a most miserable exhibition. Take Manitoba, rural and urban, and we find the rural population of Manitoba in those twenty years increased by 24,000 families. We look across the border and we see that the state of Dakota alone, North and South together, increased its rural population by 120,000 families, while Manitoba was adding 24,000 to hers. We look at Minnesota, and we find that Minnesota gained 200,000 families in the same period. We find that 320,000 families were added to Dakota and to Minnesota in the twenty years from 1881 to 1901, while Manitoba and the North-west together hardly gained 35,000 or 40,000 families, Manitoba certainly not more than 24,000. Those 320,000 families were productive in the highest degree. They have added most enormously to the wealth and prosperity of the United States. Dakota and Minnesota have alone added hundreds of millions a year to the annual products of the United States. With good government and good management the huge territories that we possess, Manitoba, Alberta, Assiniboia and Saskatchewan, should have added in that interval equally to our resources and our trade.

Now, Sir, that statement alone is enough to condemn us, but there is much more behind. I charge over and above downright neglect and misuse of those superb opportunities, criminal maladministration on the part of the government of the day. On this subject I speak with knowledge. For many years, from 1880 to 1886, I was in the habit of making yearly visits to the province of Manitoba. I have traversed the greater part of it again and again, not by railroad, but in company with men like my friend, the Hon. Thomas Greenway, and others of the same standing, who were very intimately acquainted with the possibilities of the province of Manitoba. I witnessed that most extraordinary rush of settlers which went into Manitoba in the years 1879, 1880, 1881 and 1882. I never in all my life saw men more admirably qualified to develop a young country than were the settlers who were pouring in by tens of thousands from the best counties of Ontario, and other portions of this Dominion, to which I have already alluded. There were men and there was money in abundance, and nothing on earth but the most frightful blunders on the part of the government of the day prevented those men from developing Manitoba just as Dakota and Minnesota have been developed. Sir, I say that it was owing to the intolerable railway policy of the government, that it was owing to the intolerable blunders of their land policy, that it was owing in large measure to their fiscal policy, that we see the miserable spectacle which we see to-day in Manitoba and the North-west, miserable, that is, compared with what it might have been, compared with what took place on the other side of the border. Sir, I stood myself in the Railway Committee room upstairs, and I heard the government of Canada deliberately refuse the settlers of Manitoba and the North-west the right to build a railroad at their own expense without costing the government of Canada one penny. What shall I say of the introduction of that mischievous and ill-considered measure, the checker-board system ? Who that has been in Manitoba who of all of us who knows that country, does not know that its great want is to have the population brought together, that the great difficulty is that the settlers are isolated ? Schools and churches are almost impossible when men are separated by great distances. What did the government do ? They deliberately introduced a system by which every man was kept at a distance of a mile or a mile and a half from his neighbour. The result was that settlement was slack, that people did not choose to go into the country and take up land when they were refused the right to build railroads at their own expense, and compelled to set themselves down at a distance of half a league or more from their nearest neighbour. I recollect at the time there were a number of Yankee capitalists, perfectly well acquainted with what had been going on in Dakota and Minnesota, who would have been only too happy to furnish the money for the purpose of constructing these railroads. But they were refused admittance, they were driven out, literally, they were pitch-forked out and what were the results ? Why, we lost the whole of these magnificent seed years, as I may call them, from 1878 to 1885. I am within the mark when I say that 20,000 settlers in southern Manitoba alone were expelled from Manitoba and obliged to take refuge in Dakota and Minnesota by reason of the policy of the government of the day. Nor, was there any relief found for that state of things until there had been one rebellion on the Saskatchewan and until the people of Manitoba had virtually risen in rebellion also. No wonder that I spoke strongly in my place in the House as to the way in which the future of the North-west was being sacrificed by these men. Had they simply let the matter alone, had they simply allowed the people of Ontario and the other provinces to go in, had they simply allowed them to build railways, simply allowed them to make the best of the opportunities before them—I say, and I speak with knowledge—that by 1885 there would have been 50,000 families of magnificent settlers settled in Manitoba, and that to-day in Manitoba and in the valleys of the Saskatchewan, in the districts of Alberta and Assiniboia, you would have had a population, not perhaps as large as that of Dakota and Minnesota, but a population in all human probability of 250,000 families, or a million and a quarter strong.

Now, think for a moment what that would have meant to Canada. Winnipeg to-day would have been a worthy rival to St. Paul and Minneapolis. Our provinces, and they are equally fertile, quite as good as the states that I have mentioned, need never have feared to enter into competition with Dakota and Minnesota. Sir Charles Tupper's vision of 600,000,000 of bushels a year might very well have been realized—it never could have been under his management—but it might have been if Manitoba had been left to the management of the late Mr. Mackenzie. But, there was a more excellent way and that was pointed out to my certain knowledge. The inrush of settlers might have been guided and utilized. The huge amount of money that was wasted in Manitoba in land booms might have been used to the advantage of that province. It was pointed out in this House that had the policy of Mr. Mackenzie's been adopted we would have seen to-day in all human probability not a million and a quarter but two millions of people settled in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. In making that statement I claim no more for us than was done on the other side of the border under greater difficulties. If the policy of Alexander

Mackenzie had prevailed in 1878 that would have been the result. Now, the time has come, and I gladly embrace the opportunity to do this scant justice to the memory of my old colleague. He has passed away, not unhonoured. At the time of his death I think Mr. Mackenzie's worth was recognized by all classes of the community, but he passed away hardly appreciated. It was the fashion among some of his own supporters to say that Alexander Mackenzie was all honesty and no policy, while Sir John Macdonald was all policy—I shall not finish the sentence. Alexander Mackenzie had his faults like the rest of us. He had his faults but he was honest and sagacious. What was his policy ? His policy was, like himself, simple, sensible and straightforword. He intended—the thing had been shaping in his mind for some time, he developed it partly on the floor of this House, he developed it to a greater extent in speeches which he made in my presence in the maritime provinces and in parts of Ontario towards the end of the campaign of 1878, and his policy had three grand features—he intended, in the first place, to reserve the land for settlers, to sell it to settlers only at low rates, and to give money only to promote the building of colonization railways ; he intended, in the second place, to construct a number of short line colonization railways radiating from Winnipeg, and he intended in the third place to use all the power of the government to keep the people together and form a solid state in and about the present province of Manitoba from which, afterwards, as a base, railways might radiate on every side. I have several times since discussed that policy with men of great ability and of experience in the North-west Territories, men of all political persuasions, and they have agreed with me that it was one of the greatest misfortunes that ever befell the North-west Territories that it had not been carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. Especially the water stretches.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And Alexander Mackenzie had intended to keep control of the railways and railway rates. In respect to the water stretches Mr. Mackenzie wisely used them to the utmost of his power and perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has forgotten that at the time he went out he was most busily engaged in pressing forward the construction of the railway from Winnipeg to Fort William. I say that if Mr. Mackenzie's policy had been adopted, and I say it with the knowledge which comes after forty years experience in public affairs, and with the knowledge of a man that has travelled Manitoba from end to end, not once but a dozen times over, if Mr. Mackenzie's policy had been adopted in all human probability you would to-day have had 500,000 families, or 2,000,000 of people settled in Manitoba, Alberta, Assiniboia and Saskatchewan, and a volume of trade and commerce not far from $1,000,000,000 a year. Let hon. gentlemen sit down and calculate what would be the result of a development such as I have spoken of. I will not say a development of two millions, but suppose we had a million, or a million and a quarter of people settled in that country, what a huge boon that would have been to the whole of Canada ! All that was within our grasp and all that we could have had by letting the people alone. We could have that by adopting the policy of Mr. Mackenzie. Hon. gentlemen have a good deal to learn from this census, we have a good deal to learn from it, the people of Canada have a good deal to learn from it, and one lesson I would like the people of Canada to lay to heart is the lesson of what Canada lost in 1878 by discarding Mr. Mackenzie. Had Canada allowed Mr. Mackenzie to remain in power and to carry out the scheme he was then devising for the development of the North-west Territories, I am quite sure that the people of Canada would to-day have been something like one thousand million dollars richer and they would have numbered 2,000,000 more than they do to-day. In place of 5,000,000 we would have had 7,000,000, and after all that would have meant simply that we would have kept our own people in their own country. And one thing more, had Mackenzie remained in power the people of Canada would have been spared that carnival of corruption which ran riot throughout Canada from 1878 to 1896, or at any rate to 1891. Sir, must I recall to these hon. gentlemen the events which marked the expulsion of Sir Hector Langevin from power under the charges brought forward by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works ? Must I recall to their recollection the comments which were made by the English press at that particular time as to the result of thirteen years of Conservative administration ? It is well that I should do so, because I know that a great many hon. gentlemen were not in this House at the time and these things very soon pass from peoples memory. I am not quite sure, but I think I am perfectly within bounds when I say that there is not one man in five out of the 213 who now hold seats here who held seats in 1891, certainly not one in four ; and what had the English press to say of our doings in 1891 ? Here is an extract from the 'Times' :

> Here in the mother country there can be only one feeling, that of deep regret for the wrong done to the fair fame of the eldest of her daughter nations by the lax morality of her politicians.

The London 'Daily Chronicle' said :

> It seems to be possible in the Dominion to secure the political support not only of individuals but of whole provinces by gifts of money. The locality is bribed as well as the member, and the consequent demoralization spreads through all ranks.

The 'Telegraph' observed :

Enough, unfortunately, is already known to make it clear that only the most resolute and drastic purification can redeem public life in Canada from the taint of corruption, the like of which we have not seen in our own country for hundreds of years.

The Birmingham 'Gazette' said :

Rascals out of office defraud the public in order to bribe rascals in office, and rascals in office prostitue themselves, sacrifice their honour and forsake their trust in order to keep on good terms with the rascals out of office.

And the London 'Echo' remarked :

No country can prosper where public departments are in league with fraudulent contractors, and where ministers are open to offers.

The London 'Graphic' declared :

It is no longer possible to doubt that corruption in its worst form is rampant in a large portion of the Canadian civil service.

The St. James 'Gazette' observes :

The existence of an organized system of corruption among public officials in Canada has been conclusively proved, and like everything else on the American continent the bribery has been colossal.

The 'Graphic Despatch' went on to say :

The secret of Sir John Macdonald's electoral victories is out. On this side of the water surprise has often been expressed at the patience with which our Canadian cousins submitted to the Tory protectionist rule of that prince of political intriguers. There is now, alas, no difficulty in explaining that curious situation. Sir John's government rested on a stupendous and all prevailing system of bribery and corruption. Even Tammany Hall smells sweet and clean in comparison with the huge stink pot of Sir John's government.

And so forth *ad infinitum*.

I am not bringing these disagreeable matters up for nothing. Let the House also remember that these expressions were used long before a great deal more which I subsequently brought to light in respect to the dealings of Sir Adolphe Caron in certain counties had been made manifest. Only a corner of the veil was lifted, yet that was the impression produced on the public opinion of England by the result of that small exposure ; and remember also that not the half no, not the tenth part of what might have been disclosed has ever yet been made public. It would have given me very little trouble if I had so chosen to have duplicated and quadruplicated the exposures which I caused to be made in Sir Adolphe Caron's case a matter of eight or nine years ago.

And if the House wants to know why I spared further exposures my reasons were these. I thought that quite enough had been done to show future historians in what sort of fashion Conservative rule was maintained from 1878 to 1891. It used to be said that there are certain anatomists to whom, if you show a bone of any given reptile, they are able to construct the entire animal. It does not require a political Owen or a political Cuvier to construct the collossal scheme of corruption which prevailed in these years from the evidence which myself and the Minister of Public Works have caused to be put on record. Sir, I might, no doubt, have sent a dozen or two Conservative heelers to the penitentiary or at least to share Mr. McGreevy's cell, but I did not think it was worth my while. However, if hon. gentlemen dispute the truth of my statement ; if hon. gentlemen desire further information ; if they are filled with a burning desire to know why the Langevin block cost something over a million dollars ; if they want to know why Quebec harbour stands in our books for $3,700,000 ; if they want to know why the St. Charles branch, a matter of thirteen miles of railway has cost close on $2,000,000—some $200,000 or $300,000 more than the acquisition of the Drummond Railway cost altogether I believe—if they want to know that ; if they want to know what became of the subsidies for the St. John Railway ; if they want to know what happened in the case of the subsidies for the Temiscouata Railroad, it won't be very difficult to obtain the information for them.

Why, Sir, these were days in which the mere camp followers of the Conservative party were allowed to plunder the people to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Has the House forgotten the exposure I made of that eminent gentleman Mr. John Charles Rykert, then a member of this House, when I showed and proved that for $2,000 he had been allowed to purchase from the government a part of the public domain which he sold afterwards for $200,000 ; when I showed and proved—and so did other gentlemen here—that Mr. Robillard, another camp follower and also a member of this House, had been allowed to obtain property belonging to the Indians for $316, which was sold within a few months for $55,000 hard cash. Well indeed might Mr. Rykert say when appealing to his electors : It was very hard I should have singled him out when I knew—and he spoke the truth there—while I knew that there were scores as guilty as himself who had sat in judgment on him.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How much did seats in the Senate bring in those days ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What did my hon. friend say ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I asked you what was the price of seats in the Senate in those days ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman chooses to inquire he would not have much trouble in ascertaining. I have heard very considerable sums named.

Mr. BENNETT. $10,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have heard a much more considerable amount put down as the price of a seat in the Senate under the Conservative regime, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) desires it, the information on that subject may be forthcoming at no distant date.

Sir, when I contemplate the collossal corruption that existed at that period and the fashion in which those huge sums of money were acquired and used, upon my word there is only one man in the whole lot for whom I feel the slightest commiseration, and that man is Mr. Thomas McGreevy. Upon my word, Sir, when we reflect on what that man did and what that man suffered; when I reflect that he was beggared and broken hearted; when I reflect on what he did for the party and how the party requited him, I will say to these hon. gentlemen that if they are moved to atone for the sins of their predecessors; if there is any true repentance in them, let them go to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, and I will back their request; let them beg a plot a little way from the left of these parliament buildings and let them erect there a monument to Mr. Thomas McGreevy, and I will supply the inscription. That inscription will be:

'To the memory of Thomas McGreevy, victim and martyr, who did more than any other human being to put the Conservative party in power in 1878 and keep them in power regardless of expense for thirteen years. Who was imprisoned and bankrupted by them.

'Had he served his country as faithfully as he served his party leaders, the name of Thomas McGreevy would have stood high on the roll of Canadian patriots.'

Now, Sir, why do I recall these things? I recall them for one purpose and for one alone. I want that future historians and the people of this country may know what sort of a price the people have to pay when they choose to substitute plausible charletans for able and faithful public servants. Further I know things are very apt to slip from the public mind. I know very well that the co-temporary history of all things is the least known by the men of to-day. We are constantly forgetting what has happened in our own time. Ordinary business men and ordinary professional men really know nothing of the co-temporary history of their own time, and even in our own House members succeed other so fast that all recollection of these things is apt to pass away within a very short time. But, Sir, I think the House should understand one thing; it would be well that hon. gentlemen and it would be well that the country should understand one thing and that is this: That protection (at any rate as they practiced it) and corruption are practically convertible terms. I do not mean to say that a government may not be corrupt and yet not protectionist. That may be. But I do say that human nature being as it is, it is almost impossible for a government to be protectionist and escape being corrupt. And I will add this further; I will add that while I think protection and corruption are practically inseparable; I will add that I likewise believe for my part, that protection and true freedom are all but absolutely incompatible. On that I will give you words of another more eloquent than any I can utter. Here are some remarks which are very much indeed to the purpose. The gentleman whom I quote says:

> I come to expose to you the policy of the Liberal party. Let me tell you that policy may be resumed in the good Saxon word 'freedom' in every sense of the term; freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of religious life and civil life, and last, not least, freedom in commercial life. . . . . .
>
> In the American Republic you have the line of cleavage which exists between the Liberal party and the Conservative party—the question of free trade. We stand for freedom, they stand for restriction; they stand for servitude; we stand for freedom.
>
> I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage; yes, bondage, and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which the American slavery was bondage; not in the same degree perhaps, but in the same manner. . . . . In the same manner the people of this country, the inhabitants of the city of Winnipeg especially, are toiling for a master, who takes away, not every cent of profit, but a very large percentage, a very great portion of your earnings for which you toil and sweat. . . . .

Mr. TAYLOR. Is 35 per cent protection?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. 35 per cent may or may not be protection. 35 per cent may be high revenue tariff or it may be a grossly protective tariff. It depends entirely on how applied. 35 per cent as against American goods is a high revenue tariff and as against British goods it would be a protective and prohibitive tariff. This gentleman from whom I am quoting goes on to say:

> I do not tell you that we must have no taxation, but I do say that the government has no right to take a cent from you or me except for the necessities of the revenue, and if the government takes from you any portion of your earnings, whether the portion be large or small, to give to somebody else that government is as much a robber as the highwayman who puts a pistol to your forehead and says: 'your purse or your life.'

Admirable sentences, admirably expressed with that force and eloquence with which my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) usually puts the case before his audience.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is that a warning?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. A warning to you.

Mr. MACLEAN. A warning to your leader.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I hope it is a warning to you, but I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is not greatly inclined to take it. I say that if you wish to see Canada ten years hence as Canada was ten years ago when the British press was ringing with those sentences I lately read, you have only to return to the Conservative government and to the good old Conservative ways of a protective tariff.

Now, Sir, I turn to a more pleasing side of the question. We cannot undo the past; we cannot recover our lost legions; we cannot regain our lost opportunities; and it may be that we have lost more than we are aware of, because at this moment there are other formidable competitors springing up whom we may soon have to face. I have noticed with considerable interest the enormous development now taking place in Siberia. It may be that in wheat and other kinds of agricultural produce that country may enter into a formidable competition with the people of North America, especially the people of Canada. But although nearly a quarter of a century has been thrown away, although Canada has done little more than mark time for a generation, I believe that the chances are coming back to us again. Great fertile areas are lying open to us, and we must bring people to them. The process has well begun, indeed no sign of the times is more wholesome and hopeful than that which I mentioned a little while ago, that the number of immigrants coming from the United States to Canada has risen from 700 to 17,000. I warn our people to beware that they do not check the progress now going on. It is no idle dream to say that if we do as well within the next decade as Dakota and Minnesota have done, we may look for a population of two millions, or at the lowest a million and a half, in the valleys of the Saskatchewan, the Red River and the Assiniboine, and in the vast territory that extends towards the Peace River district; and we may double the volume of our trade. I do not altogether agree with some of the demands of our friends in the Northwest; but I heartily sympathize with them in the view they take of the great future that awaits Canada if she will only stretch out her hand and seize the opportunities that present themselves to us there. And let me say further to the people of Canada; if you are desirous of entering into a controversy or a commercial war with the United States, the true way to conquer them is to show them that you have a population increasing faster than theirs, that you have a volume of trade far in excess of theirs. Then indeed you may reasonably hope in a comparatively short space of time to have them knocking at your door. This is for Canada the true path to greatness, the true path to wealth. Let us not turn our backs upon it. Let us lay the lessons of the census to heart. I say it was a national disgrace that the increase of Canada during those twenty years was far less than what took place in the same period in old and long-settled European countries. I have heard it said by hon. gentlemen opposite, and even by some friends of mine, that Canada is a dumping ground for American manufacturers. I have heard plaintive wails that heathen Yankees, not having the fear of God or of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association before their eyes, come to Canada and actually have the audacity to sell goods to Canadian consumers at a lower price than that at which they sell them to their own people. It is even said, though this lacks proof, that they sell them at less than cost, in their greed to monopolize so profitable a trade; and it is said that there are many Canadians so unpatriotic, so dead to all lofty feeling, that they will actually purchase American goods for no better reason than the fact that they can obtain them better and cheaper than they can similar goods in their own country. It is a very sad state of things, no doubt. But to my mind it is a much sadder thing that Canada should be, as Canada was for eighteen years under the national policy, no better than a breeding ground for people of the United States. Here is where Canada was landed in 1896—in depopulation and stagnation, utter incapacity to utilize her vast territory, and with political corruption practically reduced to a fine art. Now, I counsel the people of Canada no more to copy Yankee vices. I do not want them to imitate the Yankee fiscal policy or Yankee political methods. I desire, like hon. gentlemen opposite, that Canadians should think for themselves and act for themselves; and if they will imitate the people of the United States, I advise them to imitate their good qualities, not their bad ones. Let them imitate their pluck, their patriotism, their energy, their push, their skill in developing and utilizing their waste territory. If they will do that, Sir, I have no fear for the result. Take it all in all, I say that the record of the last four years is a grand record, a credit to the country and a credit to the government. The progress of our trade in that period has been very great, and if I am correct in the statements I have made to-night, the recovery of our people in population in the last four years has been relatively as great as the expansion of our trade. The government invites criticism; it invites the closest scrutiny; the facts will bear out my statements. Sir, I repeat the assertion with which I commenced. I say that the best test of a nation's progress, at least a nation like Canada, with enormous quantities of fertile land wholly untouched, is the increase of her population; and I say that Canada can stand that test now, and she will be in a position to stand it infinitely better ten years hence. If we do our duty, our shame will then be wiped out, our

national humiliation will be effaced, and Canada will be in the van once more. She will have a larger trade in proportion to population than the United States, a faster growth, a better distribution of wealth, better security for life and property, a better fiscal system, and infinitely more freedom.

Sir, I am not given to idle gush, as this House knows; but I believe that our resources have been barely scratched. I believe we have enormous resources, the extent of which we have scarcely begun to realize. With half a continent unexplored, we can only imagine what possibilities yet lie before us. After what we have seen in the Klondike, who shall say that the barrenest region in the arctic zone may not contain riches equal to the Rand? Who shall say that the region of Hudson bay or the region of Labrador, or the region of the Mackenzie river or the great Slave lake—all these regions which are only geographical expressions to-day, may not become household words to-morrow? But there is no need of talking of possibilities. The Red River valley, the Saskatchewan valley, the Assiniboine valley, the Peace River valley, are realities; and the progress which the western States have made is a reality too. We have room for a population of at least fifty millions. We have marvellous water powers, the value of which we are just beginning to realize. We have immense mineral resources. We need but men, capital, fair-play and freedom, and if we are true to ourselves and persevere in the path we have entered upon in the last five years, I believe that the record of the next ten years will surpass that of the last five, good as it has been, as much as the record of the last five years has surpassed that of the preceding fifteen.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I have just been wondering where we are. I have not been in this House long enough to carry my memory back to the subjects which we have had discussed for the last hour and a half. I thought we were going to have a discussion of matters which are of interest to this country to-day. We have scarcely a word from the hon. gentleman dealing with events that are within the personal experience of the great majority of the members of this House. Instead of dealing with the facts of the day, he harked back to ancient history, he revelled in old scandals. He in fact shouldered his political crutch, fought his old political battles, and made his old political speeches over again. And where he did not deal with events that have disappeared in the archives of the past, he deluged us with a dry array of figures, despite his promise at the outset that he was not going to weary the House with statistics. Well, if the hon. gentleman has any more figures than he has already given to us, we have reason to be eternally grateful to him for keeping them to himself.

Referring to the speech of the leader of the opposition, the hon. gentleman said he could shut his eyes and imagine that he had heard all that before. Well, I do not think that it is necessary for any one to shut his eyes or draw on his imagination at all to come to a like conclusion with regard to the speech we have just heard. One would require to close one's eyes very tightly indeed and make a considerable draft on one's imagination to come to the opposite conclusion. It would require a considerable effort of the imagination to make one believe that he has not heard over and over again the arguments and the appeals to which the hon. gentleman has been treating us during the last three hours.

I jotted down a few of the things upon which the hon. gentleman appeared to lay some stress. One of the first was his admission that the cost of living under the present government has largely increased. In that respect I do not think any one will contradict him, but whether that is something which the present government has a right to be proud of, I leave to the House and country to decide. He then took credit for the reduction in the postage rates to Great Britain, but we have the admission of the Postmaster General that only one-seventh of the mail matter which leaves Canada is carried in Canadian boats or through Canadian channels, and that six-sevenths are carried in foreign channels. If that be a point on which the hon. gentleman thinks he is entitled to some credit, I am willing to gratify him to the utmost extent.

Then my hon. friend could not forbear loosing one of the shafts of his satire at his hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He referred to a vision of Hades which that hon. gentleman had at one time and of which he gave a vivid description. But if my recollection serves me right, the Hades which the hon. member for North Norfolk described was merely a vision, whereas the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had been plunged, not into an imaginary, but into a real political Hades from which his friend, the member for North Norfolk (Mr, Charlton), had to extricate him. The policy of the Minister of Trade and Commerce had failed to meet the approval of his electorate, another Reformer was ambitious to get his place, and the hon. minister was doomed to political Hades and would have become for ever politically extinct, had it not been for the help of his friend (Mr. Charlton), who got him out of the shades of death. And this friend the hon. minister does not now hesitate to throw over.

In all the time during which the hon. gentleman laboured through his argument,

he made no reference to any question of the day, no reference to the policy of his party, no reference to the enormous growth of expenditure, no reference to the increase of public debt, or to anything of live interest to the country. For nearly an hour and a half he spoke of the census of 1891 and the census of 1901, and he assumed that the former was fraudulently taken. His whole speech was simply drawing a red herring across the track in order that public attention might be taken away from those things which are of importance to Canada to-day, from the shortcomings of himself and his colleagues since they have been in office, and directed to matters of far minor importance. He spoke of the immigration to the North-west. He pictured the rush that took place into that country in 1881 and 1882, and tried to draw the inference that had free trade prevailed, that country would to-day have been settled up and we would have had a million or a million and a quarter population there now. But I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman is sufficient of a business man to know that the reason why population did not continue to flow into the North-west was because the price of wheat had fallen from $1 a bushel to about 40 cents or 45 cents per bushel—a price at which it was almost impossible for farmers to make a living out of it. He quoted Dakota and Minnesota as illustrations of how countries fill up with great rapidity, but he omitted to tell us that these two states flourished under the highest protective tariff known on the earth.

He gave us also figures from the census returns of Toronto and Manitoba, to show that up to a certain period these localities were depressed and are now flourishing. But he omitted to draw our attention to the fact that these places were suffering from that most disastrous thing which can befall any community—a land boom. Toronto suffered from that evil and is hardly over it to-day. So did Manitoba, and is only just now recovering from it.

He drew a glowing picture of what would have happened had the policy of the late Mr. McKenzie been carried out. I tell you, Sir, that had that policy been continued, the whole of the trade and the products of that western country would now be tributary to the United States. It may be possible that a larger population would be there now, but our North-west would not belong to Canada, and there are few members who will agree that it were better that Manitoba were more prosperous at the cost of not belonging to Canada and Great Britain.

Another point on which the hon. gentleman dilated was the vicious system of granting government bonuses to railways. Had that system not be entered upon, had the railway companies been forced to enter the country and build for themselves, we should have had that country built up without railway bonuses. But surely the hon. gentleman could not have been in earnest in this argument. Has he been asleep these ten or fifteen years and just woke up? Is he not aware the policy of granting railway bonuses is the same to-day as it was under the late administration? And there is not to-day the same reason for that policy which existed in the past. Yet notwithstanding that the North-west has been settled since ten or twenty years and that there is no longer the same reason for granting bonuses, we find this government continuing the policy of granting large bonuses to railways in the North-west. And we find this government continuing the same checker board system of reserving each alternate section which the hon. gentleman denounces as an evil. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman finds it impossible to disassociate himself from the past and cannot refrain from denouncing the same things which he was won't to denounce in the days of old, although he is to-day the member of a government in which these very same practices continue to flourish.

But talking of the policy of the late Mr. McKenzie and the policy of the late Sir John Macdonald, one of the men who is very high up in the political scale in this country, the Hon. George W. Ross, had the manliness to admit publicly that he was mistaken in his judgment of the policy of Sir John Macdonald in connection with the settlement of the North-west. He is the only man of the late chieftain's opponents who has had the manliness and the honesty to make this admission; and I tell you, Sir, that that admission appealed to the sense of fairness of the people of Ontario and did more credit to Mr. Ross than any act of his life.

If we examine into the heaps of figures which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce piled upon us during his speech, we will find that there is not a clean-cut statement among them all. They are all based upon assumptions, and his conclusions flow from mere assumptions. He takes the figures of the census, puts them together in his own fashion, and then draws his own conclusions, and treats those assumptions as facts. They are figures drawn up by a man who looks at only one side of the question, who is choosing his figures and making them tell the story exactly as he wants it told.

It is a very interesting spectacle to see how thoroughly the members of this ministry are in accord with one another. They cannot keep their little grievances at home, but the spite that is shown between the members of the administration is made known to the House and to the world. The hon. member who preceded me said that he was not going to trouble the House with figures—and he wearied the House for three

hours with figures. We have had figures for two days. And for that reason, although I have many figures here, I shall leave most of them out.

Look back for one moment to the Speech from the Throne, for a government of business men, of wonderful men, that was a great production. Here was a Speech from the Throne, and in it was supposed to appear the questions upon which Canada was vitally interested in one of our most interesting years, a year of great prosperity, a year when great works are going on and when great schemes might have been expected to be outlined by the government. And what have we in this speech ? Outside of the ordinary platitudes, and an expression of thankfulness for the visit of Their Royal Highnesses, we have a reference to only two wonderful things. This government, so great, and so powerful, in their great wisdom saw fit not to prevent an inventor landing on the soil of Canada and carrying on experiments. It would have been a very sad thing for Canada and for the world if the government had seen fit to order that inventor off the soil of Canada. The government take great credit to themselves for having allowed Mr. Marconi to come and experiment here, and they tell us they are going to give him $80,000. Now, that is a very serious and very important item to put in the Speech from the Throne. The next thing the government take credit for is for not having refused—for it was in their power to have done so—to allow a private company to spend $20,000,000 of money to be raised from its own shareholders, and to be used in improving its road-bed, its rolling stock, and so on—expenditure that will be a benefit to Canada. The government in their great wisdom have decided to allow that company to increase its capital stock. These are the only two things in the speech. It completely bears out what I had the pleasure of hearing the Prime Minister saying at a luncheon of the Industrial Exhibition Association in Toronto, that there was nothing to reform in Canada, that everything had been done. Even the Senate is reforming itself without the aid of our wise men ; so we hear no more of the great reforms that were to take place in the Senate. Let us come down to what we in this House think worthy of discussing. We ought to take the question of our finances, the question of what this government has done for the good of the country, and how it has fulfilled the promises made before it came into power. In 1895, in a speech on the budget, the present hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), discussing the expenditure of that time, $38,000,000, said :—

To-day we are called upon to pay the interest, and the 10 or 12 million dollars a year, which we have to pay through the medium of the government, is only a small part, only a part, at any rate, of the total sum of interest which Canada has to pay. Sir, have we got value for our money, had that money been invested in works which were really useful and which really added to the productive powers of Canada, the case would not have been so bad. If it had been possible for us to have borrowed $800,000,000 or $1,000,000,000, if you will——

The hon. gentleman was dealing in large figures.

—and we should have been able to pay the interest largely out of the profits arising from those works. But it is only too well known to any one who knows anything of Canada that an enormous amount of money which was borrowed has been wasted, aye and worse than wasted, for a very considerable part of it has gone to debauch and corrupt the people of Canada.

Now, that is the platform on which the hon. gentleman stood and which he enunciated in this wonderful article of his that has been referred to by the leader of the opposition, that the money spent had been, in great part, spent on works that were not for the benefit of Canada but for corrupt purposes. In 1895-6 we had a revenue of $38,041,700. According to the present Minister of Trade and Commerce that was about $4,000,000 too much. In 1901, the revenue was $57,000,000, and, according to the Minister of Finance it is a revenue that is a great deal too small and will be increased considerably during the present year. In 1896, our debt was $258,497,000 ; to-day it is $268,480,000, and this notwithstanding the fact that during that period, something like $39,000,000 additional have been taken out of the pockets of the people. The platform on which the government came into power in 1896 is the platform by which we must judge them to-day. I quite admit that an increase of expenditure is necessary for an increased population and an increasing trade. But the $4,000,000 by which the revenue under the Conservative administration was too much should have been quite sufficient to provide for the necessary expansion during the five or six years that the present government have been in power. The government came into power on the policy of economy, reduction of taxation and reduction of the public debt. They remain in power to-day in consequence of extravagant expenditure, a large increase in debt, increased taxation, and an expenditure exactly and precisely on the terms to which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has referred, whereby the people of the country are debauched and corrupted. We heard that hon. gentleman the other evening, speaking on a proposed item in the estimates of absolutely useless expenditure, defended that expenditure on the ground that it was making up for the injustice that Conservative governments had done to his friends. In other words, not because the Conservative party had spent money, but because they had not spent enough money, as he put it, corruptly, for the purpose of debauching the country.

Now, Sir, Canada being a great and growing country, it should be the business of statesmen to cast about and find how they can direct the trade of that country into the best and most profitable channels. But what has this government done in any shape or form to bring about such an end ? They have talked and talked about improving the navigation of the St. Lawrence. They have proposed to spend money upon it, they have admitted that we must have a better outlet for our produce and grain to the sea; and yet we cannot find, on inquiry, that they have taken one single step towards realizing that end. We are spending money in all manner of ways, we are spending money all over the country, frittering it away, in little driblets here and there; but as for relieving the pressure of our western grain and providing the farmers with freer and better transport to market, this government has absolutely neglected to do anything.

The question of a fast Atlantic service, like some other large questions, has been before this government, but they have shirked it and put it on one side, until now it is almost forgotten. Yet we find that mail subsidies have gone on increasing, and last year alone they increased by $112,000. What has this government done towards solving that great question? Sir, in my opinion the transportation question is the most important question before this House and country to-day. It was discussed a great deal last year, and aroused a good deal of interest, but nothing has come of that discussion. We do not know yet whether it is Montreal, or Quebec, or that new port at Sorel, that is going to be the seaport for our Canadian grain. We cannot tell whether our grain will eventually come by the St. Lawrence, or whether it must go by United States ports. It is admitted on all hands that we ought to get some of the grain that comes to Buffalo, some 300,000,000 bushels, that part of that grain ought to find an outlet by way of the St. Lawrence. But people forget entirely that two-thirds of that grain is consumed in the New England states and never reaches the seaboard. Nevertheless one of the great questions that should engage the attention of the government is how to improve our transportation facilities. The government are now spending large sums of money on the upper lakes and on all the ports, but so far they have not taken a single step towards relieving the pressure in the North-west caused by lack of facility for bringing that grain east, no more than if such a question never existed. On the other hand, the government are constantly devising schemes to spend money in the various constituencies where it will do them the most good—solely and only for that purpose. We see item after item in the estimates where the minister charged with it is not aware whether it is wanted or not; but if it is wanted, he will take care to look after it and see that the money is properly spent. I notice the Minister of Justice, in speaking the other day at Montreal, referred in concise business terms to this question of transportation, and acknowledged the necessity of solving it, but he had no suggestion to make, and not a single step has been taken by the government towards finding a solution.

There is another question that ought surely to have engaged the attention of the government if they are to help on our marine, and that is the proper lighting of the coasts of the St. Lawrence and of our inland lakes. Now, we have spent very little comparatively on that important matter. If you look at the map of the American upper lakes you will find lighthouses dotted all along the coasts, but if you look at the map of our own shores you will see that we have only a miserable light here and there; and many of those lights, I believe, are so poorly maintained that they will only last half the night, and unless a man gets up in the middle of the night to replenish them, they go out before morning. Surely that is a question worthy the attention of the government; and I expected that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, during his three-hours and a quarter oration, would have devoted some little attention to it. But he does not seem to realize that he is not living twenty years ago, when he used to talk about free trade and protection, and of the terrible misfortunes that would happen to the country under a protective policy.

Now, I come to another point which I wish to treat briefly, and that is the Intercolonial Railway. The government have increased the capital of that railway by eight to nine million dollars since they came to power. They have also leased a line into Montreal for which they pay a large yearly rental. Now, it is very amusing to hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce and a previous speaker saying : It is quite true we have spent money, but our revenue is increasing. Yes, their revenue is increasing, but their expenditure is increasing in a still greater ratio. Every year their deficit it getting larger; and I am bound to say that if their accounts were kept properly, if a proper proportion of their expenditure for rolling stock and like things were charged up against the Intercolonial Railway, the deficit would be probably twice as large as it shows to-day. Now, Sir, the condition of the Intercolonial Railway is rather humiliating in the face of the fact that there is not an old one-horse railway on this continent that has not picked up during the last year or two, that is not paying its running expenses and showing a little surplus. Not a solitary instance can be pointed out on this continent, with the exception of the Intercolonial Railway, which does not show an improved condition of affairs, an increasing revenue, a decreasing expenditure, or, at all events,

making both ends meet, and leaving something for the stockholders or the bondholders. The Intercolonial Railway does not charge one cent for the interest of capital expended on it. The Minister of Railways and Canals is increasing its capital expenditure year after year, apparently without any thought as to a limit, and yet deficits are pilling up year after year under the mismanagement of the present government. It would almost seem as if the government were in league with those portions of the community who do not believe in public ownership of public franchises, because, surely the exhibition of the Intercolonial Railway and what the government are making out of it is so humiliating that no advocate could be found of public ownership in the hands of such management. There is no other railway on this continent that shows such a lamentable state of affairs. The government do not give us its earnings and expenses in such a way as to enable us to check what its rates are. I cannot find out from anything that is published as to the rates charged on the Intercolonial Railway. The freight rates, at all events, are as high, and probably higher, than the rates on either the Canadian Pacific Railway or Grand Trunk Railway for similar service and similar distance. We are not able from the government returns to ascertain that, and I think it is a great mistake that such returns should not be published in the government railway reports. The reports are drawn up as far as it is possible in such a manner as to prevent anyone from arriving at a correct statement of the figures as to the expenditure and revenue. Capital and ordinary expenditure are so mixed up that it is impossible to come to any conclusion.

Now, the burning question, to-day, and it evidently is a burning question between the different members of the ministry, is the question of protection and free trade. It was generally thought in the country that the ministers were pretty well coming round to be of one mind. It was suggested that there had been an anti-free trade vaccine imported into the ministry and that the importer of the vaccine was quietly administering it to all his colleagues and administering it also to his followers. We saw that this had a very startling effect and that it had taken very strongly upon one member of the government, the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). I think that it has taken fairly well upon the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) and I think he is showing very good signs that he has had a proper dose of vacccination. Upon some of their followers the anti-free trade vaccine has taken so strongly that they are baring their arms all the time and showing the public that they have been vaccinated against the evils of free-trade. I have an impression that the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has been vaccinated, but he has his shield on yet and his arm is pretty sore if you go near it. As to the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I think he would be vaccinated if he saw any necessity for it. I think he would bare his arm and cheerfully submit if his colleagues thought that the best thing for him to do and that it would ensure him his political health. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) absolutely refuses the vaccine. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has drawn for us a very doleful picture of what will take place if we do not return to good old simple free trade. What would free trade mean for Canada ? It would mean the closing up of every factory we have from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It would mean that Canadians would be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the great American manufacturers. What has been the effect of free trade, to some extent, already ? It has driven away our bright young men who are educated in our schools of practical science and other institutions of learning. These young men have gone off to join our neighbours and take an interest in the development of the large manufactures in the United States. These men have been replaced in this country, how ? We have been sending away our brightest young men. We must send them away unless we can give them employment in this country and exercise their skill in all manner of manufactures and enterprises. We are sending these men off and how are we replacing them ? We are replacing them at the government expense with Galicians, Doukhobors and the lowest class of labour. We are sending away from the country our brightest young men and bringing into the country a class of men who are lower than any we have in the country already. That is how free trade acts. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I do not propose to quote all my array of figures, my remarks will be much shorter than I had intended them to be, because I know the House is weary of figures. I think we will have figures in detail many a time during the next week or ten days, but I want strongly, before I sit down, to emphasize one point which we should keep constantly before the country. We should keep before the country the fact that this government ame into power pledged to economy, pledged to reduce the expenditure, which was then $38,000,000 to some $3,000,000, or $4,000,000 below that sum. We now see hon. gentlemen opposite glorying in an expenditure of $57,000,000 and we hear the hon. Minister of Finance saying that the expenditure is to be very largely increased during the coming year. We see that they have increased the debt of this country by $10,000,000 or within a few dollars of $10,000,000, and at the same time they have taken out of the country an amount of $39,000,000 more taxation than the average taxation of the year in which they came into power. These

are the questions that are of interest to this House and of interest to the country and it is on these questions that this government must be judged. There has been no attempt made towards a reduction of the debt. Hon. gentlemen are simply revelling in spending money and their policy seems to be: While we have money coming in, we will spend it and trust to luck when it stops coming in. There is no attempt at economy; there is a glorying in expenditure. There has been no important undertaking in the interest of the country. These are the points that I think should be held up before the country. These are the points that the government should discuss and the members of the government should intelligently defend, not the points raised by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in his three and a quarter hours speech. The hon. gentleman did not refer to a single matter that occurred less than five or six years ago. That is not the kind of discussion of public affairs that we want. It is simply dragging a herring across the track, hoping that people will not understand and will not see the iniquities that this government is perpetrating; the breaking of all their promises; the breaking of all their pledges; the increasing of the debt of this country, and the encouragement of corruption to a degree that was not known and not even thought of before the Liberals came into power. These are the questions that are engaging the attention of this House and of the country, and it is not a live issue when the hon. gentleman talks of figures and of contracts, the men concerned in which have been dead for years.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). Mr. Speaker, owing to the very lengthy discussion we have had on this question to-day, I presume it would be gratifying to both sides of the House if it were brought to a close now, and I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, the House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 19, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Agreeable to notice given the other day, I wish, Mr. Speaker, to move in reference to the third report of the standing committee on Public Accounts. A great deal of attention has naturally been turned towards the management of the Intercolonial Railway and the general government railway system, and among other matters which engross the attention of members of the House at this time is the working of that road. The committee on Public Accounts have taken cognizance of some of the facts, and certain members who are interesting themselves in the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee, asked to have a certain witness summoned to appear and give evidence. The motion was opposed by the minister interested and other ministers present, and in the end was negatived by a majority vote. Under these circumstances, there was nothing left for those prosecuting this inquiry but to appeal from the committee to the House. I have looked into the question with the view of discovering what precedents I could find bearing on it, but so far I can find none whatever. The rule seems to be, as laid down in the authorities:—

> No witness shall be summoned to appear before the committee and be paid his expenses unless a certificate shall have been first filed with the chairman of the committee, by a member thereof, stating that the evidence of such witness is, in his opinion, material and important.

Technically speaking, that was not done, but a motion for the summoning of the witness was made by a member of the committee, seconded by another member of that committee and supported by verbal explanations in the course of which these gentlemen stated that they considered the evidence of such witness material and important to the investigation. I have looked to see if I could discover any precedent for the action of the committee in rejecting this motion and can find none. Apparently nothing of the kind has ever occurred before in the history of this parliament. On no occasion has it ever been necessary for any member of any standing committee to appeal to the House against a decision of the kind to which I am now referring. In the opinion of those who are prosecuting the inquiry before that committee, which naturally has a majority under the control of the government, there is nothing left for them but to appeal to the House from its decision and ask the House to instruct it to summon the witness in question.

I do not know that I need go into a full explanation of why this investigation is now proceeding. I may say briefly that the figures in the Public Accounts, Auditor General's return, and the report of the Minister of Railways, seem to show that there are matters which the public advantage requires should be looked into, and in reference to which it would not be at all surprising to find that serious deviations from the course

of good government and honest management have been made during the past year.

But, to summarize, I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the amount spent this year, on the Intercolonial Railway, a work which has already cost the people a large sum of money, is very great indeed. Under the head of capital expenditure, we find that nearly $4,000,000 has been expended on that work which must have been regarded very many years ago by the people of Canada as a completed work. Of course, the figures I give include the Prince Edward Island Railway—the whole system which is under the management of the Minister of Railways. The actual figures as given in the returns of the Auditor General is $3,941,466. Now, that is not all the Intercolonial Railway has cost the people of Canada this year. We find that, under the system of book-keeping adopted by the minister, or under his direction I presume, there is suspense accounts by means of which $213,000 which should have appeared, and which would have swollen that expenditure above $4,000,000, has been carried into the following year. That, of course, must be added to the expenditure of the year of which I am speaking. In addition, there is a deficit in the working expenses of the road of this year of $348,-186. There is a deficit on Prince Edward Island Railway of $67,883. That is to say, the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway have cost the people of Canada, for the year ending June 30, 1901, the sum of $4,570,536. Such an enormous outlay naturally attracts attention to the management of the Intercolonial Railway. I believe, that, in the public interest, the inquiry should be made as thorough and complete as possible. Moreover, in the interest of the minister in charge and of the government of the country, that inquiry should be made thorough, searching, exhaustive and complete. But when we sought to go on with our inquiry, we are met at the first stage, almost at the very first witness, asked for by the gentlemen who were in the minority on that committee, and who, representing the minority in parliament and in the country, speak for those whose interests are to be protected by that minority, by a refusal to call that witness, though he is manifestly a competent witness, and though the minority declared him to be most material, important and necessary witness, if the inquiry into the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway is to be made what it ought to be. I do not criticise the action of the Minister of Railways and Canals in opposing the calling of that witness. That is not my business. I suppose he acted in the manner which he thought would most properly conserve his own interest, perhaps his own reputation. That is a matter for himself. But I would call the attention of the House to the fact that he is, so far as I can discover, the first minister whose conduct has been challenged or inquired into by the Public Accounts Committee, since Canada had existence as a country, who thought it necessary to refuse the request of a minority of the committee to call a proper and material witness. If he is anxious for a complete, exhaustive and satisfactory inquiry, I should think he would be glad to have any witnesses the committee asked for. I shall not go on and discuss the statement made by the minister before the committee, because I think that would be out of order, and, no doubt, he will make his own statement here and now. But, to my mind, that which should regulate and decide such a matter as we are now discussing is the one question, is it in the interest of the people of Canada, is it in the interest of the department whose management is being inquired into, that the witness should be called? It has not been the rule in the past, to inquire very closely into the scope of the evidence that a witness would give if called before the committee. It has, apparently, been the rule in the committee that the greatest latitude should be allowed by those initiating the inquiries, and they have been allowed to judge what value the evidence of the witness would have if called before the committee. In this case, the person the calling of whom as a witness is desired by members of the committee who happen to be in the minority, and whose attendance is refused by the committee under the direct instructions of the minister, happens to be the man, who, of all others in Canada, outside the office of the Intercolonial Railway and the Minister of Railways, knows most about the matter into which the committee is inquiring. He spent the greater part of his life in a most responsible position in connection with the road. He knows its working and every feature of importance that it is necessary for the committee to understand. He has an unblemished reputation as a railway man, and a magnificent reputation as a railway engineer; and there can be no doubt that the evidence he can give to the committee if he were allowed to attend and testify would develop no attack on the minister, but the truth and the whole truth in respect of those matters into which the committee thought it well to inquire. The matter is as I have stated. There has been gigantic outlay on the railway, and there is evidence to show that very poor management had been used in controlling the affairs of the railway. In the counties through which the Intercolonial Railway runs, it is a matter of common repute that the road is run more as a political and electioneering machine than as a railway; that, whenever it is necessary in the interest of the government of the day, the resources, the employees of that road are called to the service of the party in power. I could give evidence on that subject if necessary,

but I am not going further than to state that it is a matter of common repute in those counties that the road has been deflected from its purpose and converted into an engine of advantage and gain for the government of the day.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Was it so used by the Tory party ?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It cannot be of much service to the Tory party at the present time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BELL. We are inquiring into the working of the road at the present time and not in the past. But I say that if, at any time under Conservative rule, hon. gentlemen opposite had chosen to pursue such an inquiry as we have proposed, I cannot believe that they would have been met at the very first step by a refusal in the part of the late government to allow the attendance of a competent witness. In fact, the record of the commissions held during the existence of the late government go to show that the government was most anxious that every possible witness should be had.

I do not think it necessary to go further than this. I hope I have made it plain to the House that here is a matter which suggests the necessity for very careful and thorough inquiry. The minority of the committee charged with the duty of inquiring into such matters have asked for a witness whom they described as one having the fullest knowledge and one of the highest competence. They are refused the presence and assistance of that witness, apparently upon grounds which are absolutely without precedent in this country. I can discover no precedent, and I am satisfied that none exists, that would justify the minister, or the government if the government chooses to support him, in the course that has been taken in this matter. I therefore move, without speaking further on the subject :

That the third report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented to this House on Thursday, March 13th, be referred back to the committee with instructions that Mr. P. S. Archibald, C. E., of Moncton, be summoned to give evidence before the said committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair): I think, Mr. Speaker, I shall have no difficulty in showing that the hon. member (Mr. Bell) who makes this motion has furnished us with no sufficient reason why his motion should pass. I do not intend, however, to be drawn this afternoon into a discussion of the general policy of the government and of parliament, in making the appropriations it has hitherto authorized for the improvement of the Intercolonial Railway. The amounts which have been authorized in these appropriations have not, as the public accounts will show, been exceeded by the administration; and I take it that if there was a monstrous and outrageous sum of money expended upon the railway during the past year, it was a most monstrous sum of money for parliament to have voted; and I wonder that the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House had not made his voice heard on this question when the several items which constitute the total sum were submitted for the consideration of parliament. I shall not be drawn, either, into discussing other matters to which the hon. gentleman has referred, but I will endeavour to confine my attention to the subject which is properly before the House, and which I think the hon. gentleman has not treated in any effective or sufficient manner.

I understand that the Committee on Public Accounts has been authorized by parliament to investigate and to inquire into the expenditure for the past year. I understand that in constituting that committee, parliament has invested it with certain discretion as to the manner in which it may conduct that inquiry, as to the witnesses it may summon, and as to the manner in which those witnesses may be called. I apprehend therefore that the hon. gentleman is in duty bound to show, before he can successfully appeal to parliament to reverse the decision at which the committee has arrived, and before he can ask parliament to pass any resolution reflecting upon the action of that committee, he is bound to satisfy the mind of parliament that that committee has failed in its duty, and has had such evidence presented to it as would compel it, in the proper exercise of that duty, to summon the person whose name he has mentioned in this resolution. Sir, I say unhesitatingly, that no cause was shown to that committee why we should go outside the line and the course of procedure which the committee was taking, why we should break into the examination which was then being proceeded with, and why we should summon somebody, not an officer of the Intercolonial Railway, not a man who was responsible in the slightest degree for the expenditure of public money, not a man who had any direct connection with the railway, and who, for the past six years, has had no relation whatever with us. I take it, Sir, that before parliament should undertake to pass a reflection upon the committee for the exercise of the discretion with which it has endowed the committee, parliament ought to be convinced that there is good reason why such a course should be taken. The hon. gentleman entirely failed to show any such reason, he entirely failed to produce any facts which would justify his motion.

What is the business of the Railway Committee ? Its business is to examine into the

expenditure, to ask explanations from the officers as to how, when, and under what circumstances, and by what warrant, any expenditure was made. Is not that the business of the committee? And if, as a result of the inquiries which they make, they think that there is any doubt of the integrity of any person connected with the government, or of any of its officials, any doubt that they have not acted in accordance with their duty, or that they have committed any corrupt act, then it would be proper enough for these gentlemen, perhaps, to go outside to get further light upon the matter, and to obtain any evidence that can be gathered to bring home this wrong-doing to the parties guilty of it. It would be time enough when a charge has been preferred for these hon. gentlemen to go outside and to cast about the country to find, if they can, somebody who has a sore head, and who has been spying around in order to discover something derogatory to the administration of the department.

Sir, who is this gentleman whom the hon. gentleman now asks this House to instruct the committee that they may summon? The gentleman that he refers to is Mr. P. S. Archibald, who was six years ago chief engineer upon the government railway. He has not since been in the employ of the government, he has since had no part or hand in the transaction of the government's business. I do not know what his business is, I do not care what his business is. I understand from the hon. gentleman that he has been busying himself about the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway. If he has done so, he has done so of his own free will, and no doubt acting on a very high, patriotic and public-spirited impulse. I have no doubt that Mr. Archibald, when he comes up to Ottawa, if he should come here in consequence of the action of this House, will come here for some purpose. What will he come for? Will he come here to exonerate anybody against whom reflections have been made? Will he come here for the purpose of throwing light upon transactions, explaining this or explaining that? I take it that he will come here with a little prejudice in his mind against the officers and men in consequence of whose action he is no longer in the employ of the government, and no longer chief engineer of the government railway. He is not coming here with any other object or any other purpose than to establish a foregone conclusion in his own mind that the people who turned him out of office are not competent or qualified to continue any longer in the administration of the government railway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me call the attention of the House for a moment to the way in which this inquiry was being conducted. The hon. gentleman first called the Auditor General, who did not know very much about what was going on, but who knew about auditing the accounts as well as any gentleman could be expected to know whose business it is to audit all the accounts of this Dominion. But the hon. gentleman kept plying him with questions containing reflections upon the management of the railway, and conveying, as far as he could, an unfavourable impression of the men who were managing that road, and of the officers under the administration. The hon. gentleman desired to proceed in that investigation when he knew thoroughly well that this gentleman had not the information he desired, but that there were officers in the employ of the government at the present time who could give him the fullest light upon the subject. Then we had Mr. Pottinger called. Mr. Pottinger had not been under investigation one session, he had scarcely touched, he had scarcely been allowed to touch, the threshold of the matters which have been referred to, when the hon. gentleman who has made this motion moved that Mr. P. S. Archibald be summoned as a witness. When that motion was made my predecessor in the department (Hon. Mr. Haggart) stated that Mr. Archibald had been here and had given him very valuable information which he thought that Mr. Archibald ought to be allowed to confirm personally before the committee. That was the hon. gentleman's statement. Mr. Archibald, then, has been up here, and it appears Mr. Archibald has been filling the ears of the hon. gentlemen, and they have availed themselves up to this moment of the information which Mr. Archibald has been able to give. But they had scarcely been examining Mr. Pottinger two or three hours before they found that Mr. Archibald had put them on the wrong track, and they wanted to get him back so that he might coach them again. They wanted him to act as prosecuting or advising counsel, and they thought it would be most convenient if Mr. Archibald should be summoned here before the Public Accounts Committee and should be kept at their elbow to pour distilled poison into their ears.

That is the whole purpose and object for which hon. gentlemen want Mr. Archibald here. Is it to get at the truth? No, the truth would not suit them. Is it to get the men who have paid out this money, who have made these contracts, who have been serving the public in these responsible positions, a very large number of whom were in the same positions which they occupy today under my hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Haggart). Is it for the purpose of having them exonerated if there is any ground at all for suspicion? Is it for the purpose of preventing them from having an opportunity of making those explanations before the committee which some one should give, or is it for the purpose of casting reproach upon their conduct in the positions which they occupy? No, that is not the object. The object, as anybody can see at a glance, is that this gentleman should be summoned

by these hon. gentlemen to be at their elbow and keep them straight. They have been working away but they have not made much progress. They have been looking into the accounts, but they have not seen anything that would be likely to be of service to them and they have come to the conclusion that the sooner they get their friend, this amicus curiae, the better it would be for the cause they have at heart. That is wholly the situation in which this matter stands. No person has said, the committee have not said, that if, at a future period, it was found necessary that Mr. Archibald, or anybody else should be brought here, he should not be summoned. The committee have not said that if it should be considered later, after we get the officers here, after we get the men who have made the expenditures here, after they have explained what they have done, if it is deemed necessary to go outside into the highways and the byways, the roads and the streets, to drag some one who may have something to tell before the committee and put him on the stand, it shall not be done. But, until we advance a little farther into the inquiry than we have yet gone, I submit that no sufficient case has been made out, that no sufficient reason for such a request as this can be furnished, and I do not wonder that my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) has been unable to find a precedent for it. Hon. gentlemen opposite would be the first to laugh to ridicule any proposition on our part made under such circumstances as these. If any one ever had the coolness, or the effrontery to make such an application before a committee on a previous occasion and it was refused, I do not wonder that it did not come before this House, because any one would know that the House would not, under such circumstances, allow the name of the committee to be used, for such a grossly improper, irregular and unprecedented purpose. As Minister of Railways and Canals I say that I am not afraid of any investigation which my hon. friend desires to make. Let him think what he pleases and try what he dares, I will be found, as a member of that committee, ready and willing to afford every facility for bringing before the committee all persons who have any knowledge of the dealings and transactions under consideration at first hand and not depending altogether on hearsay for what they may know. I am perfectly willing to have this 'enormous expenditure,' as the hon. gentleman characterizes it, thoroughly investigated, and I think I may prophesy that after he has exhausted his energies in this investigation, whatever mistakes he may find have been made by my officers, or by myself, he will be unable to attach any criminal wrong-doing to any of the men who have been filling these responsibile positions in the government service. He may be able to show that we have not exhibited the capacity that we should have exhibited, that we have not been able to watch in detail every item of expenditure, but he will not be able to show that the responsible officers of the railway, from those at Moncton to the head of the system, have not exercised their best judgment and capacity in the management of that railway system. Let me appeal to the House and to ask it whether it would be possible to conceive of anything lamer than the application which this hon. gentleman has made and the motion which he has founded upon it. Are we going to lay down this precedent in this House that any hon. member of a committee may jump up in his place, or that any three or four hon. members who want some friend of theirs brought here to attend any investigation that is going on and who cannot get along without outside assistance, and ask that anybody may be brought before that committee ? Are we going to establish a precedent that all these gentlemen have to do is to get up in the committee, call for somebody to be summoned and that the committee has nothing to say as to the time or occasion or manner of their appearance ? Whatever may be the hon. gentleman's hopes in regard to the passing or the refusal of this motion, I have no doubt we will hear a great deal in the public press about stifling investigation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We always hear that. Hon. gentleman always have the same kind of side cry when they have nothing more substantial to build their hopes on. Whatever course the House may take, I hope it will take a proper and regular course and lay down no principle of action which cannot be justified on the soundest precedent and on the best ground.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has given us a lecture as to how we ought to proceed in the conduct of an investigation before the Public Accounts Committee. My hon. friend (Mr. Bell) who moved this motion showed without doubt that never before had such a precedent been before the committee or before this House in connection with an investigation into an affair of the greatest importance to this country, because, I say it is a most important matter where the expenditure on a public work in this country was $4,500,000 and more in excess of the revenue, an expenditure which ought to alarm the whole country when taken into consideration with the expenditures that the hon. gentleman has made from the time he entered office to the present day. Our duty is to inquire into such expenditures as these, and in making that inquiry have we not to follow the precedents and rules which have been established and which have serv-

ed as a guide for every deliberate assembly, every committee, as well as for this House and the British House of Parliament ? An hon. member gets up and summons a witness. Another hon. member gets up and declares that to the best of his information and belief the witness he has summoned is prepared to give evidence. Now, we had the extraordinary proceeding of the minister who was on trial before the country entering an objection to the summoning of this witness. It is a matter of public notoriety in the papers of the hon. gentleman's own province and along the line of the Intercolonial Railway that if inquiries were pushed before the Public Accounts Committee as to the expenditure of public moneys on that road, such developments would be made—I am using the words of the papers—as would astonish the country. I am putting it in the mildest possible terms. We are exercising our duty of investigation and are we to be confined to the officials whom the hon. gentleman puts into office, and who, when he puts them in the box, have hanging over their heads the fear of dismissal, to whom the minister puts his questions and suggests the answers ? Are we to be dictated to in what manner we shall make this inquiry ? Yes, we have to examine these officials and every one else who is connected with the office, but we are not to go outside at all. We are to be confined to the officers of the department and to the hon. gentleman's officials. I venture to say that such a course was never before dictated to the committee of a free assembly having control over its own affairs. That committee is appointed for the closest investigation of the public accounts of this country, and we are told forsooth, that we must confine ourselves to an examination of the officials of the department. But the Minister of Railways has been taken down. Some of his supporters in the committee had mental reservations in supporting him, notably the member from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) who hoped that some time in the future the minister might change his mind and that the witness we needed should be summoned. Ashamed of the proceedings in the committee he now promises to the House that after the officials have been examined, then if it is necessary Mr. Archibald would afterwards be summoned. What we demand is that the committee shall have full power to call witnesses, and that when a member states that he believes that a certain witness is able to give information which shall be valuable to parliament, that that witness shall be summoned. Who is the witness we desire to summon in this case. He is a gentleman who was chief engineer of that railroad for a number of years up to 1897, and against whose honour and record for ability never a word could be said. He was dismissed from his office. What for ? Was it because he was an inefficient engineer in chief ? Not at all. He was dismissed because he would not serve the political purposes of the present Minister of Railways, and because he was too honest and too honourable to do that. We are told that this man is to coach the opposition and that if he was brought up here he might give us some information. Well, it is information we want, and that in itself is sufficient reason why he should be summoned. If the House votes now to sustain the Minister of Railways, it will establish a precedent which will not be in the interest of this country. The Minister of Railways has introduced new manners into this old parliament of Canada, to which this House has been a stranger hitherto. He is bringing in the fashion of dragooning, which I suppose he learned in his little operations in New Brunswick, where it may pass current, but it will not do in this parliament of Canada. There is too much honour in this House for that. The members on the opposite side of the House know very well that what we demand here is simply fair-paly. No precedent can be brought for the House refusing to summon this witness. In England it is said to be necessary that a person should state in writing the reasons why a witness should be summoned before a committee, and I offered at the last meeting of the committee to give my reasons in writing, but the chairman of the committee said there was no necessity for that as the matter could be considered when the report was being considered in the House. The minister says he is not on his trial. He is on his trial. He is on his trial for capitalizing the amount which he paid to the Grand Trunk Railway ; he is on his trial before the people of this country for the enormous expenditure of over $22,000,000, made up of capital expenditure and deficits on the Intercolonial Railway since he took charge of it. Including the amount which he asks us to vote for this year and next year on capital account, his expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial amounts to nearly $23,000,000, which is more than the whole surpluses during the period the Liberals have been in power. That money which might have been expended in developing this country largely is being sunk in that sink hole by the Minister of Railways, and he now refuses to allow us to summon a necessary witness in order to inquire how his expenditures have been made. I appeal to this House ; I appeal to the country ; I appeal to the supporters of the Minister of Railways. It is the business of the opposition to investigate, and are they to be thwarted in their investigation ? Will this House of Commons sanction that ? And, Sir, if the supporters of the government refuse to do what is right there is nothing left to us but to appeal afterwards to the people of the country, who will, I believe,

insist on our getting fair-play, and insist on having the public expenditure of this country properly investigated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This is a little matter of business which we might well afford to discuss in a quiet businesslike way. I had not the good fortune to hear my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) throughout all of his remarks, but I had the good fortune to hear him in the committee, and I suppose I know his general view. I also know the view of the hon. gentleman from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and I observe that he has tried to cover up a weak defenceless position by introducing new and entirely unjustifiable matter. The hon. gentleman has treated this as a trial, the case of an accusation. He says that the hon. Minister of Railways. is on trial. If the minister be on trial, who is his accuser ? Which one of these gentlemen opposite accuses him ? The hon. member (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is an old parliamentarian and he knows the procedure. Let him stand up and put his charge in writing and let us know what it means.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have made the charge here publicly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has made no charge. The hon. gentleman dare not make a charge. The hon. gentleman and his associates have been fishing for a fortnight in the hope of finding some kind of a charge and they have utterly failed. I draw attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman has treated this as a charge and one hon. gentleman in the committee said : there is a charge and whoever heard when a charge is made of any restriction upon the calling of witnesses. There is no charge, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentlemen opposite are no doubt courageous, and they would willingly make a charge if they had any ground for it. But when we see at this very moment that notwithstanding insinuations and suggestions, not one of them has dared to make a charge against the Minister of Railways, I think the House will understand the position which we occupy to-day. Now, what are the facts ? Sometimes it is necessary to translate a motion. What does this motion say ? It says that if John Smith shall stand up in a committee meeting and say, I move that John Brown be summoned, that motion must pass. That is the whole situation. The hon. gentleman has attempted to add reasons and explanations, and all sorts of things, some of which did not occur in the committee at all, I take the responsibility of saying.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What explanation did I make that did not occur in committee ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman at a second meeting of the committee began to tell what he meant to have said on a previous day ; but meantime the record was down, and in reply to that I simply said that the record would speak for itself, and the House would judge on the record. I have the record in my hand :

Moved by Mr. Bell, seconded by Mr. Barker, that P. S. Archibald, C.E., Moncton, be summoned to appear as a witness before this committee at its next meeting.

There was no reason given, no explanation, no charge. It was simply as if any man stood up in the committee and said, I move that John Brown be summoned.

Mr. BELL. Will the hon. gentleman permit me ? That of course was the formal motion ; but was there not in addition to that a statement made by me, and repeated afterwards by Mr. Haggart, that the witness should be called because his testimony in our opinion would be important ? That, of course, does not appear on the record, for this reason, that the shorthand writers who made that record were instructed to put down nothing but motions and the evidence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman is correct, he would be bound to state in his motion his reasons for making it, so that it would be a matter of record, and not a subject of dispute in this House. I do not think my hon. friend made the statements he says he made.

Mr. BELL. If my hon. friend will pardon me, the authority which I read in the course of my remarks states that no witness shall be summoned unless a certificate shall be first filed with the chairman of the committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was that done ?

Mr. BELL. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then the hon. gentleman, according to his own authority, did not lay the necessary foundation for his motion.

Mr. BELL. What I say is that the hon. gentleman is not correct in saying that the motion before the committee should contain a statement of the reasons for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say that at the time the motion was made there was no statement, no charge, nothing at all but a huge blue-book containing a large number of accounts ; and if a man gets up in the committee, and says I move that John Brown be summoned, and a couple of days afterwards says I believe that John Brown can give useful information, that is no ground whatever for summoning him. My hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) afterwards said : 'I wish you would report to the House that there are thirty or forty men in my county who could give useful information, and who would like a trip to Ot-

tawa; why not summon them?' There would be just as much reason for summoning these persons as for summoning the man whose name was mentioned, and who had no more relation to the investigation than any other man you could imagine. The hon. gentleman talks of the magnitude of the expenditure. The expenditure is larger than it was, undoubtedly; but that has nothing to do with the question. What we have to consider is whether there was anything before that committee which required the summoning of this gentleman. We were at the first stages of the inquiry—I do not say investigation, because there was nothing to investigate—into the public accounts. Hon. gentlemen opposite, who thought they knew a good deal about railways, but have since discovered that they know precious little, thought they had something to investigate; and they spent two days in asking the Auditor General about matters of which he confessed he knew nothing. That was the first stage of their investigation. Then they had the General Manager of the Intercolonial summoned, and he was waiting. They had another officer of the Intercolonial Railway summoned as well as several other witnesses. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a fashion of getting a lot of witnesses summoned at the expense of the country, and keeping them dangling around Ottawa two or three weeks, and then not calling them after all. Now, I quite admit that circumstances may arise in which they might connect this gentleman, either as an expert or in some other way, with the business of the Railway Department. If they can disclose anything which seems to be a reasonable matter for investigation, then let him be called; but at a time when no charge was made, no ground alleged, and when the hon. member did not comply with the rule which he himself quotes, I submit that there was no foundation whatever for calling this gentleman. I was one of those who voted that he should not be called. I say now that if hon. gentlemen can show any reason in the world, after the examination of the principal officials, for supposing this man can give any useful information, I am prepared to call him. Nay, more, if they are prepared to make any accusation respecting the honour or honesty of the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and this gentleman or anybody else can give any evidence in support of their accusation, I am ready to call him. But when we have no charge before us or anything to investigate, and a gentleman stands up in the committee and says, I move that John Brown be called, and two days afterwards some one else says, I think John Brown knows something about this matter, I submit there is no proper ground laid for calling him. If Mr. Archibald can give any useful information, I shall be glad to hear it, but on the grounds which the hon. gentlemen have laid down, they have not a shadow of right to call him. If we are to observe the practices and rules of the House, then we will not undertake to call witnesses until a fair and reasonable ground is laid to show that such witnesses can give some useful information bearing on the public accounts before the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, what a delightful exhibition the hon. gentleman has given us of a quiet, business-like discussion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thought I was exceedingly quiet.

Mr. BORDEN Halifax). A most delightful exhibition of what he says should be the mode of discussing this question. The hon. gentleman has had some experience in the same kind of business in the province of Nova Scotia. A gentleman made a charge with regard to the distribution of road allowances in that province when my hon. friend was premier of the province; and witnesses were allowed to be summoned when it was convenient, and certain witnesses who were not perhaps thought to be very agreeable to the hon. gentleman were not allowed to be brought; and the investigation was dealt with by my hon. friend's government in such a way as seemed best adapted to serve not the interests of the country, but the interests of my hon. friend's government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend will permit me, he lays the foundation that there was a charge, which I deny; and in doing that he lays down different conditions from what exist to-day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I am pointing out is that there was a charge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no charge here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There were distinct charges in the province of Nova Scotia on that occasion and they were dealt with in exactly the same way as this matter was dealt with. I think my hon. friend ought to think before he speaks.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We settled all these things in Nova Scotia.

An hon. MEMBER. Thirty-six to two.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Thirty-six to two.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On that particular occasion?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On nearly all occasions. We do not have to count very closely down there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is a most delightfully satisfactory answer to the question as to whether or not we are to have this witness. The answer is—thirty-six to two; call in your members.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we did not call in the members; we called in the people.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is not only attempting to violate the rules of the committee but the rules of the House by interrupting me without my consent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will not interrupt the hon. gentleman without his consent, but when he interrupts me I will call his attention to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have the floor at present. The hon. gentleman must remember that although he is a very great man no doubt, he has to observe the rules of the House, if he does not observe the rules of the committee. If he desires to make any special remarks that are pertinent to this debate, I will sit down and give him the opportunity.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I have made them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Regarding the remarks which my hon. friend has made, I desire to mention that I have attended sessions of that committee for five years, and have never before seen any occasion —although party strife was sometimes strong, although matters were keenly debated in that committee—when that committee refused to summon a witness after a member of this House on the committee had stated, on his reputation, that he believed the witness to be material. On the contrary, the rule laid down in the Public Accounts Committee and the Privileges and Elections Committee and every committee on which I have had the honour of sitting was that if any gentleman of that committee or any member of this House would stake his reputation on the belief that a witness was material, that witness was called, as a matter of course. And naturally so. Because any gentleman, any member of that committee who took it upon himself without sufficient cause, to ask that a witness be summoned, after stating that witness was material, took his reputation in his hands, and perhaps more than his reputation. I would like to know upon what other basis are we to act in a matter of that kind. What is considered sufficient justification to any hon. gentleman for asking for an investigation? Is it not that he stands up in this House and stakes his reputation on the truth of the charge which he makes? Does he not practically assume the same position when he stands up in the committee and states that he, as a member of that committee, believes that a certain witness is material?

The Minister of Railways and Canals took a rather singular way of dealing with this question. He adopted a rather singular mode of argument. He wanted to know if this witness was coming for the purpose of exonerating some one. He seemed to think that unless a witness was coming for the purpose of exonerating some one, he should not be called. He seemed to think it was a dreadful thing that a witness should, as he expressed it, post the opposition. Well, in the interests of this country, is there any particular reason why the opposition should not be posted on the methods of hon. gentlemen opposite? I wonder if all hon. members on that side, I wonder if all the hon. gentleman's colleagues are not of opinion—some of them at least—that it would be a fair thing to have the methods of the administration of the Intercolonial Railway fully investigated? Is there any reason which the Minister of Railways and Canals or the Minister of Finance can suggest why the opposition should not have every possible means of sifting to the ground every transaction of the government?

The hon. gentleman says that this witness is not an official. Well, I have seen something of that hon. gentleman's mode of examining officials before a committee of this House, and I do not think it is a valid reason for not calling a witness that he does not happen to be an official of this government, because the hon. gentleman is somewhat intense in his manner with officials, when examining them. I have noticed that more than once, and I am not quite sure that possibly we could not get evidence out of a witness more clearly and more fairly, if that witness did not happen to be an official of the Department of Railways and Canals.

I do not know what my right hon. friend who leads the House thinks about this. This is not a question merely of dealing with a few items in the estimates or the Public Accounts respecting the Intercolonial Railway. This is the setting of a precedent. Are we to have the precedent set for all time to come that although a dozen gentlemen, members of a committee, may stand up in that committee and say that they stake their reputation on the materiality of a witness, the minister in charge of the particular department concerned, shall call on his followers, who are a majority in that committee, to vote down the motion just because he happens to think that it will not suit his interests, and upon such reasons as the Minister of Railways has indulged in this afternoon.

These items, Mr. Speaker, relating to the Intercolonial Railway will be investigated. Let not the Minister of Railways imagine for one moment that by preventing the summoning of this witness, he is going to prevent a most thorough investigation into every item of that expenditure. He may delay the proceedings or protract them, but I venture to say that my hon. friends behind me will see that these proceedings are not completely burked. Even if this material witness is not permitted to us, we will endeavour to get at the proof in some other way, and I assure my right hon. friend that I think it will be in the best interest, not only of the government of this

country, but of all of us in this House, if he would exercise some pressure on the Minister of Railways and Canals and see that any witness, as to whose materiality any hon. gentleman on that committee stakes his reputation, is not kept from that committee by denying the issue of a summons. I am not saying this in any spirit except that which prompts me to believe that we on this side are bound to see to it that these accounts are investigated in the most thorough manner and that we are doubly bound to see to it in this particular instance on account of the action taken by the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Finance, the latter of whom, as the guardian of the treasury of this country should have been above the position which he has ventured to take.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I hasten to assure my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that he will find in this House no intention whatever of burking the inquiry in the Public Accounts Committee. Since he has appealed to me, I am bound to tell him that I shall hope that in the future, as in the past five years, nothing will ever take place in that committee which will disgrace this government, such as took place under late administrations. We shall endeavour to meet all charges as they are brought, but I want to call my hon. friend and the House to a proper sense of the rules of the House. There is no occasion for any display of passion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is none at all, and my reasons may apply as well to one side as to the other. I was surprised at the manner in which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) discussed this question. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that this is purely and simply a matter of parliamentary procedure. The rule is well laid down and will be observed on the floor of this House, and will be observed also upstairs, that all matters connected with public expenditure shall be investigated to suit the opposition or to suit anybody else. In this matter, however, how do we find the case brought to the House? This is an appeal from a decision reached a few days ago by an important committee of this House, the Committee on Public Accounts. Now, I appeal to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I appeal to my hon. friend the member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), who is an old parliamentarian, to support me when I say that the rule which is invariably followed on the floor of this House is that the House maintains the decisions of committees unless adequate cause be shown to the contrary, and unless cause be shown on the record, and not upon the ipse dixit of this man or that man. There is a rule which has been departed from in this procedure, and a rule the wisdom of which has been shown by the example which we have had on this occasion, that there is to be no discussion in this House of what has been said in one of the committees. There is a rule that the report of the committee must stand by itself, and that it is not allowed to refer to what may have transpired in the committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Until the report of the committee has been presented.

The PRIME MINISTER. And then we are bound by the report of the committee. If we are allowed to refer to what took place in the committee, what have we in this very case but a statement made on one side and contradicted on the other side? Here we have two such honourable men as my friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) not exactly agreeing on a statement of fact. I say that if the decision of the committee has to be appealed to the House, it is the bounden duty of the hon. gentlemen who wish to make an appeal to place before the House a complete record, so that the House may judge from that record. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) thought he was not properly treated by the committee in not having the witness summoned that he desired. I shall come to that presently. But I have to say to my hon. friend that if he wanted an appeal taken to the House, his bounden duty would have been to have the record so prepared by the committee that the House would be in possession of the facts. We have here the bare fact that request was made to summon a witness and the committee would not allow it. What were the committee's reasons for that decision? They may have been good or they may have been bad. We must assume that they were good. There is nothing before the House to show that they were bad. If the case was that request was made that a certain witness be summoned at once, and the committee said: We will not summon him to-day, there are other witnesses to be heard, would that not be a reasonable thing? And why should I give my vote to reverse the decision of the committee? If the hon. gentleman had taken the precaution to say: This is a material witness, and I wish to summon him to give evidence on this or that point, and give the reason, and, if, then, the summoning of this witness had been refused, he would have a complete case. But how do I, as a member of the House, know the reasons that actuated the committee? I have not the honour of being a member of the committee, and I do not know what took place. It is not reasonable to ask me to take the word of any member of the committee or anybody else. As a member of the House, and speaking for the whole House, we have a right to have on record the reasons which led the committee to act as it did. If the

decision of the committee was a good one, the committee ought to be supported, if not, the decision of the committee ought to be reversed. But how are we to carry on the business of the House unless the safeguards which surround our procedure are maintained as sacredly as they are maintained in Great Britain? I will go one step further and refer to what I said in the first instance. The opposition have a right to investigate expenditure. It is not only their privilege, but I say without hesitation, it is their right. Let them make application to the committee, and if they do not get justice there, let them come before this House with a case that we can deal with, and, for my part, I will pledge the majority of this House that they will receive the justice that is their due. But my hon. friend from Pictou, who has a logical mind and understands these rules, must see that it is not possible for the House to take action upon the appeal that he has made. The record is too bare. You have nothing of the reasons which were given to the committee for summoning the witness. It is not even stated that the rule of the House which my hon. friend has quoted has not been observed in this instance. We have only, as I gather from the conversation which took place a moment ago across the floor of the House, a statement that such and such a thing was done. I advise my hon. friend to go before the Committee on Public Accounts, take the necessary procedure, if he wants this witness summoned, and, certainly, if he puts himself within the rules of parliamentary procedure, he will be entitled to all necessary support in making his investigations. Let me say one word more to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. I would have preferred that he had not held out any threats against us. We will not be threatened. We are prepared to stand by our rights, as we are prepared to stand by the rights of the opposition. We are prepared to do our duty whenever the appeal is made to us upon grounds which enable us to see what that duty is. But no threats will be listened to.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman a question. Suppose that the majority of the committee refused to put the reason of the refusal in the report of the committee?

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, I would expect that there would be a minority report laid before the House.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Although the question before the House is, on its face, a very simple and unimportant one, yet, there being a principle involved, it is very doubtful if a question of greater interest or importance to the people of this country will come up during the present session than the question now before us. There seems to be great difference of opinion between hon. gentlemen on the other side and hon. gentlemen on this side as to what that principle is. Speaking my own view, not presuming to express the opinions of gentlemen on this side—I think, however, they will agree with me in this presentation of the case—whenever matters are referred to the Public Accounts Committee, they do not go before a court for the trial of any individual. The committee has no machinery to try any individual. And, even if any member on this side were, on his responsibility as a member of parliament, to make charges against the Minister of Railways—to make all the charges that are at present floating in the air—and even if those charges were proved before the committee, that committee has no machinery to pass any sentence and no machinery to punish. It would be utterly without force in acting upon the evidence laid before it. As I take it the functions of the committee are simply these: The people of this country raise a large amount of money every year, taking it out of their own pockets, and they have appointed certain gentlemen as their trustees, with the function, among others, of disbursing these moneys. When the representatives of the people come to Ottawa, among our duties is that of seeing to it that the moneys disbursed by our trustees are honestly, economically and wisely disbursed. When we go before the Public Accounts Committee, we go not to charge that the minister has acted in a manner forbidden by law, we go not pretending to know that there is anything wrong in his department. We do not attempt to make a charge; and if we had a charge to make, the committee would not be the proper place to make it. We go there as representing the people of this country to investigate the accounts on behalf of our constituents, and to see whether those items are properly disbursed. Going then as a committee, and trying to use the common sense which I am sure every member of this House possesses, it must be assumed that the members on this side of the House are more likely to investigate those accounts carefully than gentlemen sitting on the other side, who perhaps have more confidence in the hon. gentlemen making the disbursements than we have on this side of the House. Naturally, I say, the people of this country expect gentlemen on this side of the House to investigate these accounts more carefully, and to show whether the moneys are properly disbursed. Now then, if that duty devolves upon us there must be surely some power belonging to us to enable us to carry out that high duty.

But the reason I rise is to enter my protest against the principle laid down by two ministers of the Crown to-day that there should be a charge made, or that, as the Minister of Railways and Canals expresses it, witnesses should not be summoned before that committee unless some wrong was proved, that is to say, that after the necessity for the witness being called had passed, then we could call him. Perhaps it will

not be out of place to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that when a day or two before a member of the committee asked that two officials of the railway should be called, they were promptly called, not a word of objection. I would like to ask what right had members on this side of the House to call on those two officials of the railway ? What conceivable reason could be given for any member on this side calling for those witnesses, or any witness ? There must have been some reason, or the Minister of Railways and Canals would not have consented to these two witnesses being called. These witnesses were called, and on a subsequent day precisely the same right was invoked, the member who had before exercised his right desired to exercise it again, and if a member had a constitutional right to call those two witnesses, how can he be refused the constitutional right to call another ? Now, the premier called attention to the fact that the record should show the ground on which this motion is based. I submit that the record does show the ground. I submit, and I think my argument is sound, that there is an inherent right in every member of that committee to name a witness whom he wishes to call. That, I submit, is the prima facie right of every member of the committee, though the regulation of that right rests in the committee, so that if any member abuses his right, then that member in future will forfeit it, and the committee will refuse him the privilege of misusing a right which, nevertheless, he certainly possesses. Now, I think it was hardly fair to this House that, when so important a question was raised, when so much money was at stake, the Minister of Railways and Canals should rise in this House and, after saying that no witness should be called unless a wrong had been proved, and after an inquiry had been made, that he should say, why should Mr. Archibald be called unless to exonerate the minister ? Is a witness only to be called after a charge is proved, and even then only if his evidence will tend to exonerate a minister ? I say it was rather beneath his dignity and unworthy of his place in this House to say : I am not afraid—boldly challenging all criticism. Of what should he be afraid, after his committee had refused to call the witness we wished to call ? I could not help wondering if, when the hon. gentleman spoke, there was not running through his mind these lines of an American poet :

In short, I firmly du believe
In Humbug generally,
Fer it's a thing thet I perceive
To hev a solid vally ;
This heth my faithful shepherd ben,
In pasturs sweet heth led me,
An' this'll keep the people green
To feed ez they hev fed me.

Now, Sir, I shall not take up any more time, because the only point I wish to insist upon is the right of every member of that committee to call any witness whom he thinks proper to be called in the public interest; and if hon. gentlemen opposite are to lay down a contrary doctrine, it is just as well that this House should understand, it is just as well that the people of this country should understand, that when we, the members on this side of the House, who are upon the Public Accounts Committee, desire to investigate the finances of this country, in the course of our investigation we are only to be allowed to call those witnesses that hon. gentlemen opposite approve.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). As a member of the Public Accounts Committee, and having been a member of it for nine or ten years, and having been present on the occasion referred to, I presume it would be proper for me to make a few remarks in respect to some of the observations made by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I cannot but think that perhaps more heat has been evolved from this discussion than the intrinsic merits of the case demanded; but perhaps that heat has been evolved in obedience to a well known scientific law that heat is evolved in proportion to the momentum and weight of the two bodies which come into conflict. As a reason for adopting the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), it has been stated that large sums were involved, that there was great extravagance, and that dangerous principles were being established in the management of the government railway, that the Minister of Railways and Canals was upon his trial, and that, to a certain extent, the political party which supports him was also upon its trial. I think this is wandering rather far afield, and making the matter of greater magnitude than a calmer consideration would allow. If any body is on trial it is the Public Accounts Committee, and from that standpoint alone I propose to view the situation. As the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has remarked, after the vote was demanded which decided that the gentleman named should not be summoned, I ventured to remark to the committee that I presumed this would not prevent us dealing with the matter later. That point seemed to be generally accepted by the committee. Following the observations made by other hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this side of the House, I cannot see that any considerable grievance can be complained of by hon. members composing the minority of that committee. Certainly I think it was not very becoming for my hon. friend the leader of the opposition to intimate that any sort of terrorism should be exercised against the majority of the House by threatening to prolong the session if his wishes were not complied with.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I made no such suggestion.

Mr. FLINT. I accept the hon. gentleman's disclaimer, but it appeared to me that there was an intimation that the session might be prolonged in consequence of this refusal of the committee. Any standing committee of this House has certain discretion as to the order of its procedure. It is true, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) stated, that there is no precise precedent for a case of this kind, but I can call to mind during my recollection of proceedings in this House, many occasions on which the summoning of witnesses has been deferred until other proceedings were taken, until a more opportune time had arrived on which to hear their evidence. Moreover, when a question of fair-play towards the opposition is raised, we have also to remember that there may be a question of fair-play to the administrators of the government, a question of fair-play to the officers in the employ of the government, who are conducting the various public affairs in the outlying portions of the Dominion and expending large sums of money. Certainly the committee charged with such investigations should follow a reasonable and fair course of procedure towards both parties, especially when it is claimed that a minister or any other person is put upon his trial before that tribunal, and necessarily before the country. We have officials on the Intercolonial Railway spending hundreds of thousands of dollars, covering a vast variety of subjects all of which are subject to investigation, to differences of opinion; and it is the right and duty of that committee to investigate all these points carefully, to see that the vouchers correspond to the accounts, to see that the proper procedure has been taken, that no extravagance has been committed in the operations of the road. As a mere matter of procedure before the committee, it is proper that officials of the road should first be examined as to their expenditure of the money placed at their disposal before any outsiders are called to explain discrepancies or improprieties in the expenditure. I think it was not fair for the leader of the opposition to intimate, as he did, that there was any improper terrorism exercised by the minister towards his subordinates before that committee. I am certain that I never have, and I do not believe that any hon. member of that committee has ever seen the slightest scintilla of any such spirit shown on the part of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals towards the men who are under him and who have been before that committee. If that should be maintained, every one could easily understand that the result would be that the evidence given by these men, many of them men of eminence and high standing, would be discredited, and I do not believe that a charge affecting the integrity, the courage, and the fearlessness of these men ought to be entertained by this House, or by the committee. We all agree that examinations before the committee should be thorough and exhaustive, but, I think we must all agree that these examinations should be systematic and based on some fair and reasonable principle, not perhaps on the strict legal principle which would be followed in the trial of an action at law, but, perhaps, corresponding to that, because there must be some regularity in order that the gentlemen of the committee who are not familiar with these details should be able to make up their minds. There are two kinds of committees which are mixed up in the minds of some hon. gentlemen here, and they have spoken as if the procedure before any committee should be of precisely the same character. There are the regular standing committees of the House, which have large jurisdiction, and there are committees of inquiry, which are appointed for the investigation of particular charges. The latter class of committees are special committees appointed by this House based upon charges laid and formulated before the House and sent to the committee for special examination. In such cases specific charges are made, and a gentleman formulating these charges and being desirous of establishing them through the evidence which he has in his possession, it is easy to see that it would be only fair that he should be given more latitude and ready facility for subpœnaing his own witnesses. But, the committee of which we are speaking is a committee formed in a different way. Its operation is not based on specific charges, it is a committee with large powers of inquiry and of procedure in a particular direction, and the discretion to be exercised by such a committee would be somewhat larger and ought to be exercised in a broader spirit than the same discretion would be exercised by the majority of a special committee. This matter was discussed in the House of Commons many years ago, and the late Minister of Justice (Sir John Thompson) made some observations upon it which may be proper to be read at this time. Speaking of the powers of the Committee on Public Accounts and its course of procedure, that eminent gentleman made these remarks :

> No one can deny, and certainly on this side of the House we do not pretend to deny this afternoon, that, in the investigation of any reference made to the committee by this House, it is entirely proper for the committee to hear evidence which may be adduced, no matter what consequence may ensue to any member of this House. It matters not, therefore, in the least whether the committee finds that an item in the account which is before it for investigation affects the credit and honour of a minister or of a private member of this House. The one claim I should make, if it were necessary to do so—but it is not necessary, because there is nothing to the contrary in this resolution—would be that it shall be the duty of the committee carefully to see that the proceedings

before them is not searching for evidence, fishing for evidence, a proceeding for the purpose of affecting the honour and credit of any member of the House or a member of the government, but that the evidence shall be pertinent and relevant to something which the committee has been instructed by the House to investigate. Further, I say that the moment the committee—I speak of the present committee, and I will refer to future committees in the same way as long as I have a right to say anything on the subject in this House—the moment the committee is satisfied and evidence is adduced which is relevant to any inquiry which this House has asked the committee to undertake, that inquiry should be continued, no matter how fatal it may be to any member of this House. The one safeguard which, I say, it is unnecessary to insist on, should be contained in this resolution, because it contains nothing to the contrary, is that the committee shall not be made use of by outsiders for the purpose of attacking the honour and credit of members of this House.

The House to-day is under the same line of argument. This is the case before this committee. An enormous volume of public accounts relating to expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway is before the Committee on Public Accounts. I ask the intelligent members of this House, and particularly the members who may be members of that committee, what course they would like to see pursued for their own information. They are not experts. They are waiting patiently for such an exhibit of evidence as will enable them to form their opinions and make up their minds as to the propriety of any suggested procedure. Is it not natural and fair to assume that the first men they would like to hear are the leading and important officials of the road who are concerned in the expenditure on this road, and that after they have been heard and searchingly examined by gentlemen on both sides of the committee, and by gentlemen particularly interested, perhaps —although all the members of the committee are interested—in the more thorough probing of the public accounts, the committee would be willing to hear the evidence of other gentlemen who are not officials of the government and who may be called to throw light upon matters which have been brought forward in the previous testimony. Any other course would strike me, as I am sure it would strike other members of this House, as being decidedly unfair. I think it would be only fair that prima facie evidence should be given first of the officials of the road, and if there is to be any rebuttal of their testimony, or if matters upon which they have been examined have not been satisfactorily explained to the committee, then, any member of the committee would be justified in summoning outsiders to atend upon the investigation and contradict or deny the evidence given by the proper officials. I cannot but think that our hon. friends opposite have been premature in bringing forward this resolution, and that if they had been content to wait a little longer and lay their reasons before the committee why this witness should be called before the committee, I am as certain as I can be certain of anything, that the committee would be willing to accede with alacrity to their request, but, while men employed in connection with the railway had been summoned and are on their way to Ottawa, I think it would be permature to ask for other witnesses to be summoned here. I think hon. gentlemen opposite have thought that this might be a good opportunity for making some political capital.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is what we are here for.

Mr. FLINT. Apart from the importance of the evidence, hon. gentlemen no doubt imagine that they can divert the attention of the House to another point, by trying to make it appear that this committee was endeavouring to stifle inquiry. I, for one, as a member of that committee will join them at any time to prevent any attempt at stifling inquiry. It would be suicidal, politically as well as economically, on the part of my hon. friends to do anything of the kind. It would be injurious in the interest of the party responsible for the management of the railway to cover up one item of folly or extravagance, and I, as a member of that committee, as, I believe the majority of the committee, will assist the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and assist the opposition in that committee to examine most thoroughly and in detail every item of the accounts which the hon. gentlemen opposite desire to have examined. But, we must have some procedure, some form, some fair-play, not only for the government and for the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, but for the officials who may be charged with wrong-doing. I support the action of the committee under the circumstances, and I believe this House should, in justice to the committee, throw out the resolution of the hon. member for Pictou.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the very fervid declaration from, I think, every hon. gentleman who has spoken upon the other side of the House of the fact that he is actuated by the most honest and most sincere motives. From what has taken place one would imagine that if that declaration had not been so explicit, there might be some reasons for doubting it. As a young member of this House I would not be very much impressed with the desire of the government or the desire of the supporters of the government to have a full, fair and impartial investigation of the public accounts, judging from what has already taken place in the committee and in this House. Without wishing to be offensive to the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) I may say that he has added nothing to the debate, and that his chief success was

in getting further away from the issue than any other of his friends who have spoken. He says that this motion is premature, and that if delay is allowed then we may get the witness we require. It is the first time, in a rather long experience which I have had of investigations in the course of my profession, that I have ever heard that the party prosecuting should be directed by the other side as to the manner in which he shall conduct his case. It is a good sound rule of law that those who have the conduct of an investigation are the best judges of how to array the evidence in support of the contention which they set up. So much is this the case that even the judges do not interfere with counsel as to the order in which he shall call witnesses. It would be a most extraordinary stretch of prerogative if when we are investigating the public accounts of Canada, the government should dictate to us as to what witnesses we should call, and in what order we should examine them. This is not a question with us of begging for something. It is not a question of: By your grace or by your leave. We are here to maintain our rights as representing the electors of Canada, and it is our right to call this witness now, and not to delay until some future time when it may suit the convenience of the government to call him. I am learning all the time I am in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. I am getting experience all the time.

Mr. HOLMES. You need it.

Mr. LENNOX. I echo back to that hon. gentleman: So do you need it. I may tell that hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) something that he and his friends do not seem to understand; I tell him that when I came to this House I understood that the parliament of Canada was above all things a deliberative assembly. I understood that it was an assembly to which men came, not to vaunt wild opinions in extravagant language but to reason calmly and deliberately upon the great questions affecting the people of Canada. I am glad and yet sorry for what has taken place in the House to-day. I am sorry that so many of the ministers of the Crown lost their temper, and I am glad that the First Minister of the government of Canada saw fit to give them a very just and very merited rebuke. The violence of the Minister of Railways was such, that although I understand he is a prominent counsel, I would have wanted nothing better than that he should make such a exhibition before a judicial tribunal, if I were arguing the case against him. But, after all his violence and after all his proclaiming that he had nothing whatever to fear, that he was scathless, harmless, and innocent, he wrapt himself up behind the committee and said: I won't let you know anything about these accounts. When the Minister of Finance commenced his speech I thought we were getting back to a deliberative assembly again. He began in a very mild way and said it was a pity that we could not approach this little matter of procedure in a quiet, calm, and business-like spirit, but he had not proceeded far in his speech when he outdid the Minister of Railways in violence. If the violence of the Minister of Railways echoed to the roof, the thunders of the Minister of Finance went loftier still. Is that his idea of the discussion of a business-like question in a calm and judicial spirit. What is the meaning of such conduct on the part of the ministers, when all that we on this side of the House ask is, that we shall have an opportunity of ascertaining how the money of the people of this country was expended. And who is asking for this right? Why, the Minister of Railways grows eloquent, and if he does not grow eloquent he grows violent, in declaring that the members of the committee, who demand, shall not have an opportunity of examining Mr. Archibald. The Minister of Railways asks: who is this Mr. Archibald? I will tell him. Mr. Archibald is not a hireling of the government. He is an independent man who can have no motive for prevaricating or colouring his evidence one way of the other, and he it is whom we want to examine. The Minister of Railways tells us in effect that no member on this side of the House, that even the whole opposition have not the right to call Mr. Archibald as a witness. Well, we differ from him in that. We may have no right per se, but we are the representatives of the people of this country who want to know how their money has been expended, and as the representatives of the people we have that right. I can tell these hon. gentlemen opposite that whether or not they vote down this motion, the people of Canada will know how this money was spent. The First Minister told us that there was not sufficient record upon which to order a reference of this matter back to the committee. Let us see if there is not. In the first place it is known to all the members of this House, that when such a motion is made in the committee the reasons alleged in its favour by the mover or seconder are not taken down in the reporter's notes. That was very fully explained the other day in the committee.

But do we want any further record than we have? Mr. Speaker, we have this record: We have the fact that the public accounts are being investigated; that is the first step in the record. We have it on record that witnesses are being called to give evidence on those accounts. We have the further fact that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) asks that a witness be called. For what purpose? For the purpose of throwing light upon these accounts. Is not the hon. First Minister splitting a hair, endeavouring to draw a red herring across

the trail, when he tells us that we have not a sufficient record of the transaction ? I have the greatest respect for the hon. First Minister—great respect for him as one of those gentlemen that can get around a corner by plausible and eloquent language about as well as any one I ever knew ; but I had not to-day such profound admiration for him as a counsel learned in the law. When I listened to his special pleading—that nice skill which not only splits the hair, but if necessary walks along the hair without disturbing it in the slightest degree—my admiration for him as a lawyer of the old school, which flourished in those bygone days when special pleading was in vogue, rose very high indeed.

I say that the people are waiting for us to get to work to investigate these accounts and let them know whether they are correct or not. Not that we want to try to make out that they are false or fraudulent; but we want to know whether they are correct or not ; and that being the case, hair-splitting comes with bad grace from the hon. First Minister. Hon. gentlemen opposite want to know what it is all about. I will tell them. We have admittedly an enormous deficit in the transactions of the Intercolonial Railway, at a time when we should not have expected it, when the circumstances of the country and the buoyancy of trade justified us in expecting the reverse ; and in the face of that fact the necessity is imposed upon us of inquiring whether there is any leakage. When we come to investigate these accounts, what do we find ? We find that at the time the general elections were coming on there was a most unprecedented purchase of ties—ties to bind the voter and the government together. There were 1,300,000 ties purchased at a time when we had a surplus of 127,237 ties on hand from the previous year, making in all 1,427,237 ties for the financial year ending June 30, 1901. These ties were bought at twenty-eight cents apiece. The estimated requirement for the year was 650,000 and the actual requirement was 495,000. Thus we had a surplus of 932,237 ties over what was necessary—not a surplus of the ties which were necessary to bind the public to the government at that time, but unnecessary for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway. We have the fact, therefore, that there was a purchase of three times the actual requirements of the railway ; and, that being the case, and an enormous deficit occurring at the time, is there not good reason for saying that the people should be on the alert, and that we of the opposition would be recreant to the trust reposed in us by the people of this country—and we represent the very best people in this country—if we did not say, we will investigate until we find out the facts ? Now, we have found out a great deal. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about fishing. I think it was a gentleman from Yarmouth who talked about fishing. I suppose there is a good deal of fishing down there. But I think we have fished to some purpose. We have this fact, that in the face of this surplus of ties on hand, a contract was made with the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company for 2,000,000 ties at twenty cents apiece. By this first transaction, therefore, the government incurred a loss of $80,000 of the money of the people of this country.

Now, with regard to the question whether Mr. Archibald should be called or not, he is a man who has had a large and valued experience in connection with railway matters. We have already elicited the fact in the committee that that large purchase of ties was a very unwise transaction, because a great many of those ties are now being worn out without being put into use, and because a very large proportion of them were not suitable for the purpose. For the edification of the House, I will read a portion of a letter received from a gentleman at Campbellton who knows the facts to which I am referring. Speaking of the ties he says :

> So many ties were got out during the last campaign that they are now, and have been ever since, piled up along the Intercolonial Railway between Campbellton and Moncton as a monument of mismanagement and corruption. A large proportion of them are of no use except for firewood.

They have served their purpose, I presume, pretty well.

Mr. COWAN. Is that letter from a defeated candidate ?

Mr. LENNOX. I will relieve the hon. gentleman's mind by giving the rest of the letter :

> This is patent to every person travelling over that section of the railway, and if Mr. Pottinger has not seen these huge piles of sleepers rotting it is because he had his eyes closed. This state of affairs has been commented on by travellers who had no interest whatever in our country. As soon as it was decided to appeal to the country in 1900, a number of the boss heelers seem to have got carte blanche, to get as many sleepers as they deemed necessary, to purchase votes, and at the same time to allow themselves a handsome commission. In my canvas through this country, I saw piles of ties here and there, newly got out, consisting of cedar, spruce, fir, and even ash; that was not the only objection. Some were rotten, some crooked——

They were like some of our hon. friends opposite in that particular and probably the gentleman who has been interrupting me.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to apply the expression 'crooked' to any member of this House.

Mr. LENNOX. In deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the expression in the fullest degree, and hope that the hon. gentleman, after this withdrawal, will not look crooked.

——and a large quantity were undersized. I took the trouble to get out of the wagon on one or two occasions and examine some. They were so plainly defective that one could not help taking notice of them. Any person who was in the market could get work on the railway line or get a contract to get ties throughout the whole campaign. When these ties were brought out they were taken without any objection—it would not do to make any enemies at that particular time.

We have here, whether from a defeated candidate or some one else—and let me remind the House that sometimes a defeated candidate ranks quite as high as those elected—this fact, which bears out what has already been shown in the committee, that Mr. McManus' inspection of ties was such that the country has suffered an enormous loss. These are some of the facts and circumstances which necessitate a careful investigation. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, who were somewhat premature in their applause of the heroic utterances of the Minister of Railways this afternoon, to reflect before taking action. They talk about precedents, why, what precedent is required for the plain exercise of a plain duty ? When a different government was at the head of affairs, they wanted no precedent because they never refused any reasonable demands, and if honest square dealing is to prevail it is hard to see how the motion before the House can be rejected. Let hon. members not look at this thing in a narrow carping spirit, but decide it on its merits. Otherwise they will be simply giving the country reason to believe that they suspect the Minister of Railways of not having efficiently managed the railway under his control, and are afraid to have his maladministration exposed to the light.

I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite for another reason. If they create a precedent by refusing to summon this witness, is their decision not likely to recoil against themselves ? If the indications are to be trusted, at no distant day they will have to change places with hon. members on this side, and the precedent they are now creating may be then quoted against them. I would ask them to rise to the level of their duty by supporting this motion to have the report referred back to the committee with instructions to procure this witness, in the interests of an honest administration of the affairs of this country.

Hon. D. TISDALE (South Norfolk). I am at a loss to understand on what grounds the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and the hon. Minister of Finance object to this motion. Each one gives a different reason why it should be rejected. It seems to me that the whole question is whether we should retain or abrogate one of the most important rules of this House, and whether the opposition should consent to forego its right and its duty to insist on being given every facility for an investigation into the administration of public affairs. The Minister of Railways wanted the name of somebody who was making a charge. The Minister of Finance based his objection on the fact that there was no certificate that the witness required was material. But he did not deny that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) had offered in the committee to give such a certificate and to give his reasons in writing, and that seems to me to entirely dispose of the objection of the hon. gentleman. The only objection that had any point was that which was raised by my right hon. friend, the leader of the House. He said that the record was not complete—that there was nothing in it to show that the hon. member who asked to have the witness summoned considered that witness material. But if not, who was to blame ? If that is not in the records, it is due to the fact that the majority in that committee directed the shorthand writer not to take it down.

If we take the reasons given by the three hon. gentlemen who spoke, except the Prime Minister, we find, not only is there no answer, but such reasons as they attempt to give do not agree. The Prime Minister makes an argument upon the question. If I understood him aright, I do not hesitate to say that I am glad that he spoke as he did, because it makes the issue clear. While this government exists, for three years to come, at all events, we are not to have a different view from that which we have hitherto held of a well known rule of this House. If I understood the Prime Minister, he agreed with the hon. member for South Lanark that, if any hon. member of that committee stated that he believed that a certain gentleman could give evidence of value to the committee, he had a right to have that witness called. If that is the Prime Minister's direction to his followers, I agree with him. If the view to be taken is different from that, I regret it, and hon. gentlemen opposite will regret it. I would like to know from the Prime Minister if I understood him aright.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) appeals to me, I have no objection to tell him my view. Any member of the committee has a right to ask for the examination of a witness. I do not mean to say that there must be a charge. But, if a member of the committee desires to investigate a matter connected with the public expenditure of the country, he has the right to ask for the examination of witnesses. But it is the right of the committee to ask him upon what he wishes to examine the witness, and to see that that is relevant.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I agree with the Prime Minister in that. If hon. gentlemen on the other side will take that interpretation, they will find hon. members on this side agree with them. Now, the question arises whether under the circumstances of this case the House shall uphold the ruling

of the committee in refusing to call a witness. The Prime Minister states, very fairly from his standpoint, that the whole case should appear upon the record. But it is not gainsaid here that the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Haggart) sought to comply with all the requirements that the Prime Minister has laid down, but was prevented. If the right hon. gentleman says that the fact that the case does not appear upon the face of the record is to be held as a bar to my hon. friend, notwithstanding that the committee would not allow it to be put upon the face of the record, then I cannot follow him. If it had not been for that, I am frank to say that I would not disagree with the Prime Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) permit me to say that I dissent from his statement of fact. I do not admit that that statement is correct. I merely express this dissent, but do not wish to take up time, having already spoken.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Do I understand the Minister of Finance to say that what the hon. member for South Lanark states is not true ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not wish to contradict anybody. But if the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) says that the hon. member for South Lanark stated in the committee the purpose for which he wanted that witness and the committee prevented that being put upon the record, he is misinformed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps I may be allowed to explain. What I stated was this: I offered to put in writing the reasons why I wanted the witness called and wished to have that embodied in the report. This was during the second day's proceedings. But the chairman said that perhaps it would be as well that the report should go in as it was. The committee did not refuse to have it put on the record. I never said that it did.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That occurred the day after.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes. The first day, I went to the trouble of going into details to show why I wanted this witness.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg the hon. minister's pardon. I think the rest of the committee will bear me out, and so would the chairman if he were here. I stated that I wished to examine the witness in reference to the ties, in reference to the braces, in reference to the bridges—I gave half a dozen reasons. I stated that I had had a conversation with the gentleman, and I thought he would be able to give evidence on these particular points which would be of use to the committee.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. What the hon. member for South Lanark states as to this matter being excluded from the record does not bear out what I stated in the words I used. But I say that what passed between him and the chairman was sufficient to cause him to believe that, though it was not incorporated in the record, it would be treated by the chairman as part of the report when it was brought in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was after it was adopted. You could not change the record then.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. But the report had not been brought to the House, and such a report is not completed until it is brought to the House. I am surprised that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) should engage in mere hair splitting. He is an older parliamentarian than I am, and he knows right well that such a report is not completed until it is brought down. The very fact that the committee discussed it a second time shows that, under the rules of order, it was still open to discussion. But, so far as I am concerned, the point made by the Prime Minister is an important one. I am glad to hear from the Prime Minister that he is not going to allow his ministers in these committees to do as they please. If the Prime Minister had been there, according to the rule he has concurred in to-day, we would not have had this rule treated as it was.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not a fair statement.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I am in the judgment of the House in what I say. What was the hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. Blair's) speech ? I have already stated that I was disappointed in it, and I repeat that statement. There was nothing in his speech. He even wandered off into talk about what the witness might say. He knows as a lawyer that that was quite irrelevant. Therefore, I think I am not severe in saying that he would take the same course in the House as in the committee, and that he should not be sustained in it. I am glad to be able to say, after hearing the Prime Minister, that there is no dispute about the rule and that we know where we stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Withdraw the motion.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. So far as I am concerned I would have no objection to withdraw the motion, after the statement of the Prime Minister, and if the Prime Minister will agree that the witness shall be called if he is asked for in the proper way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is within the discretion of the committee.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. After the Prime Minister's statement, he having corrected his minister, and having stated his position frankly and willingly, I, for my part, would not object to the withdrawal of the motion. I think all the useful services of the motion have been to a great extent accomplished, and that the general acceptance of an important rule is of more benefit than any other question connected with the discussion.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I ask the indulgence of the House once more, as I have done on many occasions, to condemn the practise of having a political head over the government railways of this country. When our own party was in power years ago I stood up in this House and opposed the principle of placing government railways under a political head. Sir, the doubts I had then as to the wisdom of that adminsitration are greatly strengthened to-day. The Minister of Finance stated that we should discuss this question quietly and on its merits. Well, surely when we find that a large portion of the public press are saying that improper expenditures have taken place on the government railways, are we not discussing the question on its merits ? Now, Mr. Speaker, suppose the government railways of this country were taken away from a political head and placed under some independent body that would be responsible to the Crown for the proper expenditure of all public moneys on the government railways, I ask whether any hon. gentleman in this House, whether he be a supporter of the government or a member of the opposition, would rise and say that notwithstanding the fact that the public press are condemning the expenditure on this government railway, we should not have an investigation into such charges ? Supposing an independent commission were to use these words of the Minister of Railways and Canals : We are not afraid of an investigation, any investigation that may be made—would any hon. gentleman in this House burk an inquiry into charges made against that commission such as have been made by the press of this country against the administration of the government railway ? Why would they not oppose such an investigation ? Because it would be a business transaction, it would be their duty to investigate the affairs of that railway in the interest of the people whose money was being expended.

Now I am not going to charge hon. gentlemen opposite with the mismanagement of that railway, any more than I made such a charge against my hon. friends when they were in power; it is the principle of the matter that I am discussing, it is the administration of government railways by a political head that I am opposing. But discussing the question now before the House in the interests of the people of this country whose money is being expended, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, is it not a fact that those of you whose constituencies are located alongside of the government railways, have at one time or another approached the general manager of that railway, or approached the Minister of Railways and Canals, asking him for certain favours on behalf of your constituents ? In many cases perhaps he may have refused your request, and in consequence of his refusal, no doubt threats were made and dissatisfaction engendered. Taking that view of it, then I say if, instead of a political head, you were to approach an independent body and ask them to put on more men than are really necessary to conduct the operations of the railway, why, that independent body would simply say to you in a business way : The department in which you wish us to place more men is already filled up, and we have no need for any more at present. That would be the end of it. We should not see, as we see now, and have seen in years gone by, more men employed than were required on the railway, thereby placing upon the people a heavier expenditure in order to satisfy political friends. For that reason I am opposed to this method of conducting government railways.

Now, we have a general manager, and Mr. Pottinger's name has been mentioned. I am not in a position to judge of his merits, I am not in a position to say whether he is well qualified or not. But since the Minister of Railways and Canals has stated that the officers of the government railways have exercised their best judgment in the administration of that railway, I question his statement in view of the fact I have just explained, that the manager of that railway is not left alone to use his best judgment in its administration, he has been subject to political influences from one quarter or another, and by reason of that undue influence it would be unfair to judge him on his merits as an administrator. The other day I attended that Railway Committee, and I observed another reason why the railway should be taken from under a political head. I found that certain questions were asked a witness in that committee, and the opposition members were eager and willing to obtain the information they wanted from him; and I also observed a disposition on the part of the supporters of the government to burk the evidence given by that witness which would tend to injure the government, But would hon. gentlemen take that course if they were investigating the management of the country's railway by an independent commission ? Certainly not. It is of great importance that the railways owned by the people of this country should be administered on business lines, the same as those on which other railways are ad-

ministered throughout Canada and the United States, that is to say, on business principles.

Now let me examine some of the objections of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the motion that is before the House. He says he objects to Mr. Archibald being summoned because he is not an officer of the railway, and because he is not a contractor for the railway. Now are these reasonable objections? I have not heard one hon. gentleman in this House say that Mr. Archibald is not a competent civil engineer. No fault has been found with that gentleman so far as his profession is concerned. Now if he posseses the qualifications to give an expression of opinion as to what ought to be done in the interests of the people in the administration of that railway, then I consider it to be our duty as members of this House to ascertain whether he thinks, according to his judgment, that the railway has been properly administered, and he should go upon the witness stand before that committee for that purpose. Another objection made by the minister is that Mr. Archibald is a sore head. Surely that is not a sufficient reason. Suppose that any hon. gentleman in this House were a stockholder in any other railway of this country, and that he happened to be in a minority on a question of managing the railway. Suppose a motion was made concerning the administration of that road, I would like to know from the Minister of Railways and Canals whether he does not think that a man in the position of Mr. Archibald would not be one of the very first persons called upon for information to ascertain whether the road was being properly administered. Why, Sir, he is one of the very best men to have before that committee for the purpose of securing information of that character.

Now, the hon. gentleman asks, does the minority of the committee want Mr. Archibald for the purpose of getting at the truth? The hon. gentleman said in the first place that he was not afraid to have any investigation made into this matter. Surely, if he is not afraid, if there is nothing to hide, nothing to expose detrimental to himself, or to the officers of the railway, what objection can he have to Mr. Archibald being present? Surely he can have no objection at all. As to the truth or falsity of the statements made by Mr. Archibald that would be outside of the members of the committee, but, certainly, the people of the country would have an opportunity of judging as to the truthfulness of the statements made by Mr. Archibald. These statements would go broadcast throughout the Dominion of Canada. They would not go entirely through the west where there is no government railway, but, they would be circulated along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, through the eastern part of Canada, and those who are living alongside of that railway and know something about its management would know very well whether the statements made by Mr. Archibald were true or false.

Now, the question has arisen between hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House as to the propriety of the reasons why Mr. Archibald should be summoned before that committee. I am not a member of that committee, but I have paid some attention to the last two meetings and I distinctly heard the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) say that on a date previously he had given the reasons why he wanted Mr. Archibald summoned before that committee. The records were referred to but the shorthand reporters stated that they did not make a practice of including anything in the record other than the evidence given before that committee and by reason of that the statement made by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was not included in the evidence given before the committee. Now, he rose up afterwards and stated why he wanted Mr. Archibald summoned, and really and truly I did not think it was necessary in the interests of the people of this country that my hon. friend should be placed in the position of a lawyer and be under the necessity of complying with the rules of procedure in so far as that he must place his bill of particulars before the other side in order to secure a witness. I did not think the people of this country required anything other than that he should frankly get up and state the reason why he wanted Mr. Archibald before that committee. He stated that he wanted Mr. Archibald for the purpose of inquiring into the cost of ties, of braces, and of bridges, and who will deny that this gentleman has the knowledge necessary to give information to the committee of very great importance? Nobody can deny that. Having said that is that not a sufficient reason why the committee and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should have him summoned? But the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, who, for the time being is at the head of the government railways of this country, called upon his supporters to vote it down and as a matter of fact his supporters did vote it down. Now, let me ask that hon. gentleman: Would he do that if there were no politics involved in securing Mr. Archibald before that committee? He certainly would not do it although I do not say that, perhaps myself, even, or perhaps, my friends might have done so in days gone by. I do not think that I ever did in my life, and I am quite satisfied that the Conservative members of this House never in their lives, opposed the securing of the evidence of a witness who would give important testimony. Now, there is a strong feeling throughout the country that government ownership of railways is a proper

thing for this country to adopt. If there is a gentleman in this country who believes in the administration of government railways on the principle of administering them as we have it now, then, I call upon him to change his views and denounce any such proposition, because the proposition as we have it now is not in the interests of the people of this country. So long as I am a member of this House I will protest against any political interference with the management of that railway. Here is another reason why Mr. Archibald should be called upon to give evidence before that committee. We had the general manager of the road before the committee and we had his statement that he was the one who prepared the estimate for the large number of ties necessary for that railway. Shortly afterwards he was asked the question: What class of ties did you purchase? And he was subsequently asked: What are the lives of the different qualities of timber that you purchased? He could not tell the committee the lives of the ties that he had been using for years. I want to say that I do not like to reflect upon the general manager of that railway, but, if he says honestly under oath that he cannot tell the life of a railway tie, then, he is unfit to manage the government railway or any other railway. How can any man sit down and estimate the number necessary unless he knows the lives of the ties and unless he knows too the age and number of old ties which had been put under the rails by which matters he arrives at his estimate, and on which his estimate is based? If we cannot get a statement of that character from the general manager should we not have a statement from a man like Mr. Archibald who does understand the life of a railway tie on this or any other railway? I do not intend to take up any more of the time of the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, I can quite understand why some of my hon. friends say 'hear, hear.' If they will go before their constituents I will venture to go before their constituents with them and I venture to ask their constituents if they are in favour of administering this railway under a political head, or through an independent body which will not be subject to the whims of every member of parliament, and I will undertake the responsibility of saying that 99 per cent of the average Grits or Tories in the country will support me in my contention, because, instead of having large deficits on our government railways as we have to-day, the expenditure will be something within the revenues instead of the expenditure being in excess of the revenues owing to the improper management that we now have of the government railways of the country.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe in the government ownership of railways in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear, and after the speech of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) and after the speech of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) last night, in regard to the same question, I wish to set myself right and I especially wish to set right the views of those who believe in the government ownership of railways. I believe in government ownership and I also believe in a political head who is responsible for the administration of the road in the way that a certain amount of political responsibility goes with it, but I do not believe that there should be any partisan administration of government railways. The two things do not go together, and only last session, when I brought up the question of the public ownership of railways, I brought it up in the way of presenting a motion to the House declaring that the administration of the Intercolonial Railway should be depoliticalized. I was laughed at for that proposition by hon. gentlemen opposite. There is no connection between the two things. The Intercolonial Railway to-day can be administered as the peoples' railway without any partisanship in it, without any interference, as there is to-day by members of parliament and party heelers from one end of the road to the other. In Australia, a colony somewhat similar to Canada, where they have public owned railways, they have a responsible chief in parliament, but they have the administration of the road placed in the hands of commissioners as was outlined by the hon. member for East Elgin to-day. I take this opportunity of putting myself right and of asking others in the country who believe in public ownership to put it fairly before their fellow citizens that we say that partisan administration of a state owned railway is not a necessary adjunct to it.

House divided on motion of Mr. Bell:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Kidd,
Avery,	Lancaster,
Ball,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Lavell,
Blain,	Lefurgey,
Borden (Halifax),	Lennox,
Boyd,	MacLaren (Perth),
Brock,	Maclean,
Cargill,	McGowan,
Carscallen,	McIntosh,
Clancy,	Morin,
Clare,	Northrup,
Clarke,	Osler,
Cochrane,	Pope,
Culbert,	Porter,
Earle,	Richardson,

Ganong,	Robinson (Elgin),
Gilmour,	Roche (Marquette),
Gourley,	Rosamond,
Hackett,	Sherritt,
Haggart,	Simmons,
Halliday,	Smith (Wentworth),
Henderson,	Taylor,
Hughes (Victoria),	Tisdale,
Ingram,	Vrooman,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Ward,
Kaulbach,	Wilmot,
Kemp,	Wilson.—56.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Lavergne,
Archambault,	LeBlanc,
Bazinet,	Lewis,
Beith,	Logan,
Belcourt,	Macdonald,
Blair,	Mackie,
Borden (King's, N.S.),	MacKinnon,
	McColl,
Bourassa,	McCool,
Bourbonnais,	McCreary,
Brown,	McEwen,
Brunet,	McGugan,
Bureau,	McIsaac,
Calvert,	McLennan,
Campbell,	Madore,
Carbonneau,	Malouin,
Carroll,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Champagne,	Martineau,
Charlton,	Matheson,
Christie,	Maxwell,
Copp,	Meigs,
Costigan,	Mignault,
Cowan,	Morrison,
Demers (Lévis),	Mulock,
Douglas,	Murray,
Dugas,	Oliver,
Erb,	Parmelee,
Farquharson,	Paterson,
Fielding,	Puttee,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fitzpatrick,	Ross (Ontario),
Flint,	Ross (Rimouski),
Fortier,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Gallery,	Rousseau,
Gauvreau,	Russell,
Geoffrion,	Schell,
German,	Scott,
Gibson,	Smith (Vancouver),
Girard,	Stephens,
Gould,	Stewart,
Guthrie,	Sutherland (Essex),
Harwood,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Heyd,	Talbot,
Holmes,	Tarte,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Thompson,
	Tobin,
Hyman,	Tucker,
Johnston (Cape Breton)	Turcot,
Johnston (Lambton),	Turgeon,
Kendall,	Wade,
Lang,	Wright.—101.
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Fraser,	Bell,
Horsey,	Pringle,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Russell,	Monk,
Lovell,	Kendry,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Bruce,
Riley,	Hale,
Davis,	Sproule,
Sifton,	Casgrain,
Tolmie,	Tolton,
Bernier,	Roddick,
Bickerdike,	Seagram,
Roche (Halifax),	Robinson (Northumberland),
Préfontaine,	Bennett,
Proulx,	Calvin,
Galliher,	Birkett,
Bruneau,	Broder,
Edwards,	McLeod,
Ethier.	Léonard,

Mr. EMMERSON. I beg to withdraw my vote Mr. Speaker. I am paired with the hon. member for Kings, New Brunswick (Mr. Fowler).

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I am paired with the hon. member for Two-Mountains. If I were not, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. TOLMIE. I am paired with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Tolton). If I were not paired I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) has not voted.

Mr. BELL. I was paired with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). If I were not so paired I would have voted for the motion.

Motion (Mr. Bell) negatived.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Strait of Canso Bridge Company.—Mr. McLennan.

Bill (No. 52) respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Tisdale.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 58) in amendment of Criminal Code 1892.—Mr. Cowan.

QUESTIONS.

I. C. R.—PURCHASE OF SHIMS.

Mr. EMMERSON asked :

1. What quantity of shims were purchased by the Intercolonial Railway during the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1901?

2. What were the prices paid, and what the total amount paid out during that year for shims ?

3. Of what class of wood or lumber were the shims so purchased made ?

4. Were any of such shims made in the railway car repair shops at Moncton ; and from what kinds of wood or lumber, and what was the cost of such lumber or wood so used, if any ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. 587,150 shims were purchased by the Intercolonial Railway during the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1901.

2. The following prices were paid for shims that year :—

			Cts.	
¼	inch	100 in bundle	25	per bundle.
½	"	50 "	15	"
¾	"	40 "	14	"
1	"	30 "	10	"
1¼	"	25 "	11	"
1½	"	20 "	10	"
1¾	"	15 "	8	"
2	"	10 "	8	"
2½	"	5 "	4	"
2½	"	5 "	4	"
2¾	"	5 "	6	"
3	"	5 "	6	"

The amount paid out during the year for shims was $2,389.46.

3. These shims were made of maple, beech, yellow birch and elm, principally yellow birch.

4. None of these shims were made in the railway shops at Moncton.

THE PRICES FOR BINDER TWINE.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

When will the prices for binder twine be given to the public for the year 1902 ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll). As soon as the spring trade in that class of supplies opens.

WORKS AT RICHIBUCTO, N.B.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who were the tenderers for the reconstruction of North Pier and Groynes, at Richibucto, N.B. ?

2. What were the amounts of the different tenders ?

3. Who received the contract for the work, and at what figure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1 and 2. Viau & Lachance, Hull, P.Q., $22,900; Lyons & White, Ottawa, Ont., $22,900; Jas. & John Jardine, Jardineville, N.S., $24,500; Burns & Loughran, Ottawa, Ont., $27,700; C. J. B. & B. L. Simmons, Gibson, N.B., $31,144; Robert A. Irving, Buctouche, N.B., $47,760.

3. Viau & Lachance, at $22,900.

PURCHASES OF STEEL RAILS.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many tons of steel rails have been purchased for the Intercolonial Railway since the contract was entered into with F. H. Clergue ?

2. What was the price per ton, delivered at Intercolonial points, and by whom were they manufactured ?

3. Has the contract with F. H. Clergue been cancelled ? If not, has the time of delivery been extended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. Fifteen thousand tons.

2. (a) 3,000 tons at $25.65 gross ton c.i.f., Pictou; (b) 3,000 tons at $24.90 gross ton c.i.f., Montreal; 2,000 tons at $25.70 gross ton c.i.f., Pictou; (c) 7,000 tons at £5 6s. sterling gross ton c.i.f., Pictou or Mulgrave.

Manufactured—3,000 tons by the Barrow, Hematite Steel Company, of Barrow-in-Furness, England; 5,000 tons by Charles Cammell & Co., Limited., of Sheffield, England, and 7,000 tons by Charles & Co., through Jas. Watson & Co., Limited, of Glasgow, Scotland.

3. The arrangement has not been cancelled, nor has the time been extended.

THE STEAMER 'SCOTIA.'

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What was the contract price of the steamer 'Scotia,' ordered for the ferry between Mulgrave and Point Tupper ?

2. When was the steamer delivered at Mulgrave ?

3. Has this steamer been in service the past season ; and if not, why not ?

4. What amount has been expended on this steamer to date, over and above the original contract price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. The contract price for the steamer 'Scotia,' was £47,000.

2. On September 28, 1901.

3. No, this steamer did not arrive until late in the season; moreover, the landing stages at Mulgrave and Point Tupper were not ready nor are they yet fully completed; the vessel also sustained some damage while being navigated by the builders from Newcastle-on-Tyne to Port Mulgrave.

4. The amount that has been expended on this steamer over and above the contract price to date is $7,690.

CONFISCATION OF FISHING GEAR.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. What was the number of confiscations of fishing gear made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in Prince Edward Island in the year 1901 ?

2. In which of the counties of the province were the confiscations made and the locality (as exact as possible) ?

3. What amount was realized from the sale of property so confiscated, and the names of parties to whom sold ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). The officers of the department inform me that

there is no record of any confiscation of fishing gear in Prince Edward Island in the year 1901.

RAILWAY STATION AT ALBERTON, P.E.I.

Mr. HACKETT asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to build a new and suitable railway station at Alberton, Prince County, Prince Edward Island, this year?

2. If so, will they have the new station so placed as to avoid the 'Y' nuisance there? If, not, why not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). No, it is not the intention of the government to build a new railway station at Alberton, P.E.I., this year.

THE CLIMATE OF CANADA.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked:

1. Has the attention of the government been called to the reply of Right Honourable Joseph Chamberlain to the deputation from the Welsh Patagonian Committee, as reported in the 'Times' (London, Eng.), of February 19th, as follows:—'It struck me while you were speaking that the change of climate—from a very hot country to the terrible region of the Canadian winter—might be rather a danger to face'?

2. Is it the intention of the government to endeavour to disabuse Mr. Chamberlain's mind of his mistaken views respecting the winter climate of Canada, (a.) by sending to him a copy of Hon. Mr. Sifton's Atlas of Western Canada; or (b.) to request the Canadian lady teachers when passing through London, en route to South Africa, to wait upon the Colonial Secretary, and furnish him with data showing the delightful nature of the winter climate of Canada?

3. Is it the intention of the Prime Minister, on his approaching visit to England, to further endeavour to remove such erroneous notions?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The attention of the government has been drawn to this matter through the public press; but, as the Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain is a remarkably well-informed man in all colonial affairs, I am bound to believe that this must be a newspaper mistake, and that he never could have made use of the language attributed to him. If any of the remedies suggested in the hon. gentleman's question are to be made use of, I think that the visit of the young ladies would be the most agreeable and pleasing to the Colonial Secretary, if he is like other ministers.

BREAKWATER AT NORTH HEAD, N.B.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

What is the estimated cost of a breakwater at North Head, Grand Manan, N.B., from survey recently made by the government engineer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). If built of native timber, $91,000; if of partly creosoted timber, $143,000.

PORTLAND CEMENTS.

Mr. OSLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

Have any tests been made by the testing department of the Department of Public Works or by the Railway Department of the various brands of Canadian and foreign cements? If so, what is the result of such tests?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte):

1. Yes.

2. That Canadian Portland cements give better satisfaction than imported cements. For the past fourteen years tests have been made regularly by this department of all available cements, even though not sent to the department for that purpose. During the past two years 900 tensile and crushing tests have been made besides hot water, air, cold water, specific gravity, setting, sieving and chemical analysis of each cement.

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS — CENTRAL BLOCK.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. What is the total estimated cost of the addition made to the Central Block of the Parliament Buildings, Ottawa?

2. What is the superficial area of this addition; what number of rooms does it contain, and to what purposes are these rooms devoted, or to be devoted?

3. What appropriations have been made by parliament towards the expenditure on this work?

4. What is the total amount expended to this date?

5. Were tenders called for?

6. How has the work been executed, by contract or otherwise?

7. The names of the contractors?

8. What is the cost of the alterations and improvements made in the attic of said block?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte).

1. Cost of addition, including heating, lighting, &c., $30,000; elevators, taking down walls, cutting floors, building foundations and brick walls for elevators and the electric elevators, $12,000; attic rooms over old parliament building, new roof, iron skylights and finishing rooms, $8,000; granite columns, new doorways in entrance hall to elevators, painting main hall and staircases, &c., $4,000; minor works, changes Commons post office, changing stairway to public gallery (Commons) and messengers' rooms, fitting up rooms for Senate, &c., $2,500; total, $56,500.

2.

	Area.
Ground floor 26 x 60..	1560
First floor 26 x 70....	1820
Attics 40 x 70....	2800
Total area.....	6,180

Ground floor devoted to 'Hansard' staff, first floor, one room for Mr. Monk, M.P., one for Mr. Stewart, and apartments for Deputy Speaker, House of Commons.

3. $35,000.
4. $35,167.47.
5. Tenders were invited for the elevators.
6. Partly by contract and partly by day labour.
7. The Fenson Elevator Company, of Toronto, for the elevators. The Forsyth Granite and Marble Company, of Montreal, for the granite columns.
8. $8,000.

According to the first plans prepared for the addition, the elevators were shown to be placed directly opposite the main entrance door of the parliament buildings and the estimate was made from the first plans. Had the elevators been placed as shown by the first plans, less accommodation would have been got than there now is, and it would not have been possible to get the large committee room that there is now in the attic.

After careful examination, it was found the elevators could be placed in the space they now occupy. Where now placed they are more convenient than if placed where originally intended. Owing to this change, the cost of the alterations was considerably increased ; further, in order to get the additional attic rooms over the old part of the building, the old roof had to be removed and a new roof constructed and iron skylights put in. The roof trusses had to be remodelled and iron tie rods put in, as also a concrete floor, heating, lighting, &c. The changes named are the reasons why the original estimate has been exceeded.

NORTH BAY PIER, INGONISH.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. Did the government do any work during August and September, 1901, to further protect the pier at North Bay, Ingonish, in the county of Victoria, N.S.; and if so, what was the nature of the work ?
2. What sum of money was paid for such work ?
3. Was the work done by contract or by day's labour ?
4. If by contract, has the contractor been paid ; and how much ?
5. If by day's labour, have the labourers been paid ; if so, when and how much ?
6. What is the name of the overseer of the work, and what was his remuneration ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte).

1. Yes, placed a stone talus on seaward side of breakwater.
2. No money paid yet. Cost of work, $951.36.
3. By day labour.
4. See below.
5. See below.
6. D. M. McDonald, $2.50 per day.

Work was completed on 12th September. Mr. Milliege asked Overseer McDonald to forward paylists; these were not sent in until 16th January, when they were returned for correction and forwarded to department on 12th February. The overseer was altogether responsible for the delay.

OYSTER LICENSES.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. During the year 1900, were licenses issued entitling the persons named therein to fish for oysters on the beds planted by the government in the harbour of Shediac ?
2. To whom were the licenses issued, and on what dates were they respectively issued ?
3. By whose authority were they issued in each instance ?
4. Were such licenses, or any of them, cancelled ? If so, how many, and on what date ?
5. For what reasons were such licenses cancelled ?
6. What quantity of oysters were secured under such licenses during the period they were in force ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Jas. Sutherland). Nearly 200 licenses have been granted. If my hon. friend will move for a return I will have the information brought down. It is too long for a question.

HOPEWELL CAPE PIER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. How much has been paid to the contractors for the new pier under course of construction at Hopewell Cape, Albert County, New Brunswick ?
2. What is the date for completion of this work, according to the contract, and what is the likely date of its completion, according to the present progress in construction ?
3. What arrangements have been made for the building of a road to the pier ? What is the amount to be paid for this road ; and with whom has a contract been made with respect thereto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte).

1. $3,360.
2. Date of completion, 8th October, 1901. Chief Engineer recommended extension of time for one year.
3. A right of way was purchased in January, 1901, from H. J. Bennett, for the sum of $85.

The contractors are W. Downey and E. W. Linds, of Hopewell Cape.

CANADIAN AND FOREIGN CEMENTS.

Mr. OSLER asked :

Has any tests been made by the testing Department of Public Works or by the Railway Department of the various brands of Canadian and foreign cements ? If so, what is the result of such tests?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). Tests have been made of a number of brands of cement by the Department of Railways and Canals at the

Superintending Engineer's offices on the several canals, but the results of these tests are not on record in the department.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Is the government aware of the relations existing between the warden and deputy warden of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary ?

2. Does the government know that the deputy warden is in open conflict with the present warden, thus lessening the authority that the chief of such institution should have ?

3. If not, does the government intend to inquire into it ?

4. If yes, has the government taken measures to cause this state of things to cease, and to maintain the respect due the chief of the institution.

5. What are the measures taken ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll). The answer to the first question is : Yes.

To the questions 2, 3, 4 and 5 : No.

The deputy warden is not in open conflict with the warden and the relations existing between them are not of such a nature as to lessen the authority of the warden.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Has the honourable the Minister of Justice written or caused to be written a letter to the warden of the penitentiary, relating to the conduct of certain employees during the last election in Laval ?

2. If so, will the honourable minister communicate it to the House ?

3. Does the government intend to inquire from the warden of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary concerning the conduct of certain employees of that institution, especially of Oscar Beauchamp, deputy warden, during the said election in Laval ?

4. If so, will the government do it immediately, and report it to this House ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) :

1. No, but the minister has issued instructions to penitentiary and territorial jail officials and employees regarding their future conduct.

2. Copy of circular attached.

Ottawa, February 12, 1902.

Dear Sir,—It is in the best interests of the institution under your charge that when a man enters the service of the government he should refrain from actively interfering in political contests. Will you be good enough to inform the officers of the penitentiary, of all ranks, that while perfect freedom to vote in conceded to every employee, all interference in political contests is forbidden, and the officer found guilty of breaking the rule is liable to immediate dismissal.

Yours very sincerely,

(Sgd.) CHARLES FITZPATRICK.

Sent to Warden Platt, Kingston ; Warden Duchesneau, St. Vincent de Paul ; Warden Kirk, Dorchester ; Warden Irvine, Stony Mountain ; Warden Whyte, New Westminster ; Jailer MacIvor, Regina ; Jailer Kerr, Prince Albert.

3 and 4. No charges of misconduct have been made against any of the officers or employees of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary.

LAND GRANTS TO SOUTH AFRICAN CONTINGENT.

Mr. SCOTT asked :

Is it the intention of the government to make grants of lands to members of the military contingents which went from Canada to South Africa ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). The matter has not yet been considered by the government.

LONDON DRILL SHED.

Mr. SHERRITT asked :

1. In the new plans of the London drill shed, what accommodation by way of armouries and rooms is being allotted :—

(a.) The 26th Middlesex Regiment, and

(b.) The 7th Fusiliers of London ?

2. Is accommodation being provided for any other corps ?

3. What are the relative strengths of the 26th and 7th regiments ?

4. What is to be the total cost of the drill shed ?

5. When will it be ready for occupation ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). I beg to reply :

1. (a) Armouries for two companies 26th Regiment, near London.

(b) Armouries for eight companies, commanding officer's and orderly room, and quartermaster's stores, 7th Fusiliers.

2. Yes. Armoury for two squadrons, 1st Hussars at London, 185 all ranks.

Gun shed and harness room, quartermaster's stores, commanding officer's office and orderly room, 6th Field Battery, 101 all ranks.

Armoury and stores, Army Service Corps, 35 all ranks.

Army and stores, Field Hospital, 24 all ranks.

Accommodation for all corps in drill hall—officer's mess, sergeant's mess, lecture room, band room, and offices for district officer commanding, lavatories for officers and men, rifle range and caretaker's quarters.

3. 7th Regiment. Total all ranks, 277 : 26th Regiment. Total all ranks, 367.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—ALLEGED SMALL-POX AMONG TROOPS.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (North Victoria). Before proceeding with government business, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the government to an item which appears

in this evening's 'Citizen,' to the effect that small-pox has developed among our boys in South Africa. The item is as follows :—

Small-pox has developed in the second section of the Canadian mounted rifles, and the troops are said to be in quarantine at Durban, and likely to remain there for three months.

Relations, in Ottawa, of boys with the contingent have received no word of them since they left and the fact goes to confirm the rumour that they are in isolation pending the stamping out of the disease.

I would ask the government if they have any information on this subject ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). So far, I have no information beyond what has appeared in the newspapers. I wish to point out that the transport ships were Imperial ships and were under the control of the Imperial naval and military authorities from beginning to end ; the Department of Militia had nothing to do with the ships, and consequently was not responsible. Of course we are very anxious to know the actual condition of things, and I shall endeavour to get all the information possible, and shall make it known at the earliest moment.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance :

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had the pleasure of listening to the reply of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to the speech of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) also to the reply of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) to the leader of the opposition. And the friends of the Minister of Trade and Commerce desire to congratulate him upon his manifestation of his old time vigour which has so often electrified the House. We are pleased to see him still so vigorous, and congratulate him on making one of the best speeches, that we, his friends, have ever heard delivered in this House. We also had the pleasure of listening to a reply, or supposed reply, by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) to the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The hon. member for West Toronto opened with an expression of regret that the Minister of Trade and Commerce had revelled in old slanders. From the manner in which the Minister of Trade and Commerce presented his case I am not surprised that the hon. member for West Toronto was sorry, and I can well imagine that that sorrow was shared by every hon. member on your left, Mr. Speaker. I can realize that, were I a follower of the men who were responsible for the condition of things that the Minister of Trade and Commerce so eloquently depicted, I also would have experienced feelings of regret ; but, combined with those feelings would have been a feeling of shame. It is not well for our friends opposite to forget what took place in this country in days gone by. It may be an old story, but it is an old story that will bear repeating, and the people of the country should not be allowed to forget it. For, on the other side of the House there is still a remnant of the old guard. It must not be forgotten that like begets like, and that, if the country were left unwarned, the old conditions of affairs might again result. The hon. member for West Toronto should have regretted these statements of the hon. minister because they were ancient literature. I am sure the hon. minister had an excuse for going back ten years, after having listened to the leader of the opposition, who, when finding fault with the expenditure of the present government, had to go back sixty years in the history of the United States to tell us that, at that time the expenditure of the United States was only one-third as great as the expenditure of the present government of Canada. Sixty years is a long time to go back in order to gain arguments, particularly when those arguments had no bearing on the case, the conditions being entirely dissimilar. At that time the exportations of the United States amounted to the huge sum of about $9,000,000. But it is not to that part of the speech of the hon. member for West Toronto that I object to so much. What I object to is the inaccuracies that he injected into his speech, the positive misstatements that he made—or my reading of Canadian history has been incorrect. As will be remembered, when the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce drew attention to the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and his scheme of development of the North-west, he passed a glowing eulogy upon the character of our departed friend, and still insisted, as he had insisted twenty years ago, that, if the schemes of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie had been carried out, the interests of Canada would have been better promoted than by the schemes that were afterwards adopted. Here is what the hon. member for West Toronto said :

I tell you, Sir, that had that policy been continued, the whole of the trade and the products of that western country would now be tributary to the United States. It may be possible that a larger population would be there now, but our North-west would not belong to Canada, and there are few members who will agree that it were better that Manitoba were more prosperous even at the cost of not belonging to Canada and Great Britain.

Where does our hon. friend from West Toronto get the idea that, even had the desires of Alexander Mackenzie been grati-

fied, we would have lost that great territory to the north and west of us ? How could we possibly have lost the North-west and Manitoba ? · The discussion which took place here on that very question last night convinced me still more clearly that Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was right in his contention. I have often attended banquets and have heard the glowing eulogies by our Conservative friends taking credit to themselves for the work of making the Canadian Pacific Railway. I rejoice with them that it is a magnificent piece of work. I am willing to confess that the expectations which I had with respect to it have not been realized. I had the pleasure of going over it, and I found that it was, from end to end, a thoroughly modern and well equipped road and a credit to the people of Canada. But, in saying that, I do not mean to say that the scheme of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie would not have answered the purpose of the people of Canada equally well. And our friends who are so willing to discredit Alexander Mackenzie's memory, and to speak of the 'water stretches' which were part of his scheme, had evidence the other night in the speeches of our friends that represent that western country that these same 'water stretches' that have been so decried still offer the solution of the problem that is before us. It is now the purpose of the government, and has been for years, to utilize these same 'water stretches' which were to have been a part of Alexander Mackenzie's scheme. And it was because there was no means of using this water communication that the recent glut took place in the North-west.

As I understand it, and I do not think I have forgotten, it was the intention of the Liberal party at that time to construct a railway from Port Arthur to Winnipeg and use the water stretches to get to it. These same water stretches have still got to be utilized in order to make of the Canadian Pacific Railway that benefit to the people of Canada that they have a right to expect. So far as being an available means of moving the products of the western farms to the places of export in the east, that narrow line that passes through New Ontario down to Montreal is absolutely useless.

But we might excuse our hon. friend for going back himself into ancient history if he was absolutely correct in telling us what he found. But I take it that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) made a great mistake when he began to touch the trade questions of the country. If I wanted advice as to the quality or judiciousness of an investment, I would be willing to take the advice of the hon. gentleman. On matters of business of that kind I acknowledge his superior skill ; but when we read statements emanating from him such as the one I am about to quote, we have to revise our opinion, I have looked into his speech, and I find he says this :

> The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has drawn for us a very doleful picture of what will take place if we do not return to good old simple free trade. What would free trade mean for Canada ? It would mean the closing up of every factory we have from the Atlantic to the Pacific. . . . . What has been the effect of free trade to some extent, already ? It has driven away our bright young men who are educated in our schools of practical science and other institutions of learning.

I was not aware, Mr. Speaker, that the free trade of Canada had driven our bright young men out of the country to seek homes in a foreign land. If that has taken place, the Minister of Trade and Commerce proved last night that it took place at a time when we had anything but a free trade tariff ; and if it took place during the past five years, it certainly has not taken place during a period of a free trade tariff. The hon. gentleman was entirely wrong in introducing the question of free trade. We have not got free trade now. We did not have it during the period of the national policy, neither did we have it at any time during the history of this country with which I am familiar. In 1896 and for the fifteen years previous to which the Minister of Trade and Commerce alluded, the average rate of duty on dutiable products was thirty per cent. Surely he does not call that a free trade tariff. The average rate of duty to-day after the preference has been granted to Great Britain, based upon the valuation of goods entered for consumption in this country, amounts to twenty-seven per cent. Surely no hon. gentleman, much less a financier of the standing of the member for West Toronto, will say that a tariff which gives a protection of twenty-seven per cent is a free trade tariff, and that because of a free trade tariff our bright young men are leaving this country to make homes in the United States. I am surprised that our hon. friend made such a mistake. After two or three specimens such as I have given you of the errors into which he fell, I will be excused if I do not devote any more of my time to his speech.

Now, I desire for a few moments to confine myself to the amendment that has been presented by the leader of the opposition. We have had in former years amendments to the Budget resolutions in various forms. They all vary slightly, but the resonant note in them all is that we must have increased protection. That amendment starts out by saying :

> This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory.

Now, I am quite willing to admit that in certain details, or in its practical operation as regards certain industries, it is unsatisfactory to the proprietors of those industries. But to ask this parliament to affirm that the present tariff is unsatisfactory is to ask us to deprive ourselves of our reasoning faculties and to say that white is black or black

is white. Now what are the actual facts of the case? What evidence did our friends give us to prove that this tariff under which the country has made such wonderful progress, is an unsatisfactory tariff? Is there any evidence of it any where in this country from the Pacific to the Atlantic ocean? What are the facts of the case during the past five years? Our friends on the other side say they want to get back to that old national policy under which this country made that marvellous progress of which the Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke last night. But we do not need to take opinions on matters of that kind. There are facts accessible to prove whether the tariff as a whole is unsatisfactory and has been injurious to the people of this country, or whether on the other hand it has been advantageous. I do not want to weary you, nor will I do so, by giving you a long procession of figures; but there are a few facts that I desire to present to the House to-night that will be probably welcomed by some who have not given that phase of the question the consideration that it deserves. We had the national policy for some fifteen or sixteen years before the present government attained power.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have got it yet.

Mr. HEYD. If we have got it yet, then the very first statement in the resolution is incorrect, which says that the tariff is unsatisfactory, because then the tariff would be satisfactory. Now, which position does my hon. friend choose to take? If he says it is satisfactory, then it must be the old national policy; if it is not satisfactory, it cannot therefore be the national policy. Now, I notice that whenever our friends have got an object to gain, and that the present tariff can in any way be credited with any benefits, they say it is the same old tariff. But when they think they can make political capital by decrying the tariff, then they deny that it is the national policy. I would like our hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to choose to-night on which side he is going to stand. Is this tariff satisfactory or unsatisfactory? If satisfactory, it must be the old national policy; if not satisfactory, then it cannot be the national policy, and it must be a product devised and brought into execution by the present government. But what effect had it upon our trade during the past five years? And five years is quite long enough to test the efficacy of a tariff. Take the imports into this country in 1896; that is a pretty good test of the purchasing power of the people. We find that in 1896 the imports entered for consumption exclusive of coin and bullion, were $105,147,000. Five years before that during the operations of the national policy, or the tariff that our hon. friends want to restore, the imports amounted to $110,000,000. So our power to purchase the luxuries and the necessities of life from foreign countries had actually been reduced by $5,000,000. Since the introduction of the present tariff, satisfactory or not to our hon. friends on the other side, our imports have increased to $177,000,000, being $72,000,000 greater in 1901 than they were five years previously.

Measured from that standpoint, this tariff is not unsatisfactory. For the last five years of the old national policy the import trade of the country had diminished by $5,000,000, while during the first five years of the present tariff it had increased by $72,000,000, or over 70 per cent. Apply the same process of reasoning to the export trade of the country and has this tariff injured the producing classes of the country in any particular respect? If so, the trade returns do not show it. In 1896 our exports of the produce of Canada were $109,000,000. For the five years before they were $88,000,000, or an increase of $21,000,000 in five years. During the last five years, under the operation of this despised and much-to-be-amended policy that we have now, they increased to $177,000,000, or an increase of $67,000,000 in five years, or 65 per cent, the entire increase in five years, both in imports and exports, being $140,000,000. Measured on the basis of a revenue producer the conditions are also favourable. In 1896 the revenue was $20,000,000, collected on an average duty of imports of 19¼ per cent, while in 1901, the revenue was $29,000,000, based on a 16½ per cent tariff, an increase of $9,000,000, or almost of 50 per cent. Surely that does not prove that the country has been retrograding. The total revenue increased from $37,000,000 to $52,000,000, or by $14,000,000 a year. While the general trade of the country was so satisfactory, while the revenue has never been so buoyant as it has been in the last five years, what has been the effect of this policy on our trade? The discounts, the money loaned by the bank to traders and to the manufacturers of this country in 1891, amounted to $202,000,000; in 1896, five years afterwards, the amount had increased to $224,000,000, or an increase of $22,000,000, while during the past five years the discounts have risen to the magnificent sum of $318,000,000, or an increase of $93,000,000. When you come down to the real basis, that is, its actual operation, upon the individuals who constitute the people of Canada, you can measure it best by the savings of the people. In 1891 the deposits in the chartered savings banks and in the Post Office Savings Bank, amounted to $193,000,000. In 1896, after five years of the national policy in all its glory, the deposits had increased to $245,000,000, or an increase of $52,000,000, while in 1901, after five years of the application of the present much-despised tariff, the deposits of the people had increased to $390,000,000, or an increase of $145,000,000 added to the savings of the people. These are the financial and trade aspects of this tariff of ours which has given our friends so much trouble, and which they are so anxious to

amend. Now, I am quite willing to admit that I would like to have seen the government make some slight changes in the tariff, changes, that, in my opinion, would have been a benefit to some of the manufacturing interests of this country, changes, that, under the circumstances, I think they were entitled to, but, I realize what these figures mean when the hon. Minister of Finance sees the question staring him in the face and wonders to himself how a change in the tariff will be viewed by the various portions of this Canada of ours, which are not equally interested in that aspect of the question. There is another phase of this resolution to which I desire to object :

This House is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries, &c.

Now, I would not like, as far as I am myself qualified to speak, to be willing to express an opinion of this kind. I do not believe that the agriculturists of this country would endorse that opinion. When I look at the trade figures once more and I discover that our agriculturists are the greatest manufacturers there are in this country, that the agricultural interest is the greatest manufacturing interest there is in Canada, when I find that that industry exported last year, in animals and their products alone, $55,000,000, where five years ago they exported $36,000,000 worth, that in agricultural products they exported $24,000,000 worth, while five years ago only $14,000,000 worth were exported, I ask myself the question : Am I entitled to speak for that great agricultural class which has no interest in a high tariff, whom we cannot protect by a high tariff and whom we can only benefit by making life as easy as possible ? We cannot protect the agriculturists of this country. Neither have I been waited upon by any agricultural societies in the riding from which I come, asking me to seek increased protection for any product of the farm or of agriculture. I ask myself the question : Would I be justified in expressing the opinion that a declaration of protection will benefit the mining industry of this country ? That is an interest that does not appear to receive that calm consideration that its growing magnitude entitles it to. That mining industry of ours is going to become a source of enormous wealth to the people of Canada, which we, even in our day, have only a faint appreciation of. When we look at the actual facts of the case and see that only five years ago the exports of minerals from this country were $8,000,000, while, last year, they had risen to the munificent sum of $40,000,000, an increase of 500 per cent in five years, we can hope that when twenty-five years shall have elapsed the prediction made by Professor Bell, one of the most eminent geologists that we have in this country, recently in an address delivered in the city of Toronto, when he showed himself to be thoroughly conversant of the subject, that in twenty-five years Canada would export not $40,000,000 but $1,000,000,000 of mineral products, shall have been verified, and we are hardly in a position to say that by increasing the cost of mining machinery we will be advancing the interests of the miners of this country. That is an industry that can only be protected by making mining machinery cheap. The government have done what they could by removing the duty from mining machinery, and I do not therefore like to endorse this resolution even on behalf of the miners. Then, you take our fisheries; how can we give adequate protection to the fisheries ? They have no products we could give any protection to under the sun. The only protection our fishermen want is the protection of good harbours, good life-saving apparatus and the protection that markets easy of access will give to them. Any money in the form of protecting the fisheries expended to make the lives of the fishermen more secure and their occupation less hazardous and more agreeable, will be money well expended, and it will be the only kind of protection that we can give our fishing interests.

Take our forest products. I am aware that some who are engaged in the lumber industry, especially in British Columbia, are anxious that a duty shall be put upon lumber. But while that may be the case in British Columbia it apparently is not the case in Manitoba. As far as I am personally concerned—although I do not think it would do much good—I am in favour of putting reciprocal tariff on lumber as long as our friends to the South of us maintain a tariff on lumber. But that industry has not increased materially during the past three years as it has only risen from $27,000,000 to $30,000,000. Taking the five great national industries I have spoken of : The minerals, the fisheries, the forests, animals and their products, and agriculture, we have an export of $161,000,000. On that vast trade, by no method of protection can you encourage it to the development of a single cent. On the other hand we have the great manufacturing industries of this country ; industries that have grown up, some of them, with the country ; industries that sprung up under the fostering care of the national policy ; and it is this phase of this resolution that particularly appeals to me. Under this excessively high tariff which hon. gentlemen opposite desire to bring about, we would have again a condition of affairs such as we had some fifteen years ago when industries were established in this country that were alien to the country, that would never be self-sustaining, that would always have to be spoon-fed and always be a burden upon the rest of the community.

I, of course, have my own views on this question. I am regarded by some of our friends on the other side as being a pro-

tectionist. I am a protectionist in some things. I am a protectionist for all these industries that are indigenous, and all in relation to which there is even a remote possibility that they will develop into such a national growth as will enable them ultimately to become self-sustaining. I believe we have these national industries in this country of ours. I have seen grow around me, and grow in all parts of the country, industries that have been encouraged by the people of Canada ; industries in which the savings of a life-time have been invested, and my sympathy—even if my judgment does not—my sympathy compels me to assist the promoters of these industries whenever I have an opportunity, to preserve the savings that a life-time of frugality and of self-denial have enabled them to acquire. Even the manufacturing industries—however, they may complain of the present tariff—have prospered as a general thing during the past five years, and we have the same method to go by in order to measure the extent of their prosperity. Five years ago our exports of industries that were to be ruined by the free trade Liberal party as our friends choose to call them, and as the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) calls them ; five years ago we exported $9,000,000 worth, and last year we exported $16,000,000, an increase of $7,000,000, or almost 80 per cent.

I recognize the value of manufacturing industries to this country. I realize that no country has ever grown great that was a purely pastoral, or fishing, or mining country. I realize that the home market is of tremendous benefit to the province of Ontario and to the province of Quebec. The condition of our farmers in Ontario is entirely dissimilar to the condition existing in the North-west and Manitoba. To all farmers living within 25 miles or 30 miles of the city of Brantford, the local market makes their farms more valuable, makes living easier, makes life less arduous and decidedly more pleasant. That condition prevails throughout the province of Ontario, and realizing from the experience of other countries that we must have a manufacturing development in this country to take advantage of these great sources of wealth that a benevolent providence has bestowed on our people ; to enable us to develop those great timber resources that we own and these mining resources that are just beginning to make their appearance ; I say it is absolutely necessary to develop manufacturing industries in Canada. I take the stand now, and I have always taken it, that wherever we have a natural product that is capable of development by encouragement, in the way of a subsidy, or of a bonus, or in the way of even protection if you like ; I am quite willing to go with you in that. I endorse the bounties that were given by the present government to our iron industry. It is said that these bounties will cost us some $800,000 this year. I do not care what it costs. Some people are getting frightened that it will cost $8,000,000 before the period shall have expired during which the bounties shall be granted. I do not care. If it cost $8,000,000 all the better. I would rather it cost $8,000,000 than $5,000,000. The mere fact that it does cost $8,000,000 is an evidence that it is an industry that is not alien but native to the soil, and that ultimately will redound to the welfare and the prosperity of this country.

The iron industry particularly, is regarded by almost all nations as the barometer of their prosperity. Wherever the iron industries are prosperous that country is bound to prosper, and, therefore, I endorse the attitude of the government in respect to the bounties on iron. But I see before me conditions arising which will require—whether the government are willing or whether they are not willing—a readjustment in this tariff. If the Canadian manufacturers are going to use Canadian iron there will have to be a readjustment of the tariff in such a way that not only the iron producers themselves, but the man who is engaged in converting that raw iron into its varied manufactured forms—all those cognate interests that are associated with it—will have to be also encouraged in various ways. Although this may result in a temporary increase in protection it will mean in the end the establishment of industries in our own country, and the providing of a home market which after all is the best and surest market that any country can possibly have. That is my view on that question. As one who is familiar with financial and trade questions, I see that the government have almost insuperable objections to make to any change. But looking at it from my standpoint, I do not agree with them in the attitude they take with respect to the slaughter market.

I listened last night with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) who alluded to some of his friends as being slightly tinctured with the virus of protection. I included myself in that category. Probably I was egotistical in thinking that he alluded to me, but I thought that if what he said be true, namely, that the people of Canada have no reason to complain that they are buying cheap goods in the slaughter market ; that those of us who differ from him in that opinion are at least in good company, because we remember that only recently a conference was held in Europe, at which this great question of the slaughter market was forced upon the powers of Europe who had been bonusing beet sugar that was exported from these countries.

Great Britain stood by until her sugar refineries were driven out of existence. She consoled herself with the fact that in their

place she had acquired jam makers who had captured the markets of the world. But notwithstanding the fact that their jam makers had bought cheap sugar in England, the British government entered its protest, and said to the continental beet-root sugar producers: Unless you cease making Great Britain a slaughter market, we shall have to put a countervailing duty on your sugar. The result is that the bounties granted to beet-root sugar production will only be paid a short time longer; and the slaughter market which Great Britain has been for years for the bounty-fed beet-root sugar producers of Germany and Belgium will soon come to an end. Therefore, if I am not egotistical in including myself among those friends of the Minister of Trade and Commerce who object to Canada being made a slaughter market, I can at least console myself with the reflection that we have the government of Great Britain along with us on that particular question.

The Board of Trade of the city of Brantford passed a resolution objecting to unfair competition, and I believe the government could have justified an attempt to prevent that unfair competition. I instanced a case in which a deliberate attempt was made to stifle a Canadian industry on the plea that for a short time the consumers of cutlery would be able to buy it cheaper than they otherwise would. But I am convinced, they are convinced, we are all convinced, that when this industry is stifled out of existence, the price of cutlery will go back to its old position. These men did not ask for increased protection. They simply wanted this cut-throat competition from the United States put down. They wanted the government to raise the duty, in order to prevent these men flooding our market with cheap American cutlery, and to make such a rebate to Great Britain as would leave the present tariff of only 20 per cent. We must remember the importance of that industry. It is an industry that is cognate with the iron industry. It is an industry that is made up entirely of Canadian labour, because 14 cents worth of raw material, after Canadian labour and Canadian intelligence is expended upon it, is converted into $8.50 worth of finished razors. That is the kind of industry we ought to encourage in this country. A dozen shears worth $6.12 in the open market are made out of raw material that only costs 78 cents. It is too late to talk to these men after their industry is stifled. It is no use to tell them then that stability of the tariff is a desirable thing. I recognize that stability of the tariff is a good thing; but there is no use offering a stone to a man who is hungry or a straw to a man who is drowning. These men want to be protected now, not after their industry is stifled; and in these particular lines, I think the government might well listen to the plea that has been made.

The claim made by the carriage men is also one entitled to consideration. They do not ask for more protection; they simply ask for the Canadian market. They want the valuation of a slop-made buggy increased to $50, so as to prevent the country being overrun with a quality of buggy that is of no use to the purchaser and is likely to injure an industry capable of conferring great benefit on the people of this country.

We have other industries in South Brant in the same condition, such as the hammock industry and the pottery industry. Yet I am not in favour of making the violent change in the tariff which our friends of the opposition demand. During the operation of the tariff we have had in the city of Brantford alone six new industries started. They knew the competition they had to meet, and they will be able to hold their own unless an attempt is made to stifle them through the medium of a slaughter market. It was only the other day, since I spoke to the House on the question of shears, that an increase was made in the price in the United States market of 10 per cent, while a reduction has been made in the price in the Canadian market of 17½ per cent. In the United States shears are sold at $5 a dozen, which in Canada are sold, less duty, at less than $3 a dozen. No industry, however well conducted, or however honest may be the men who are behind it, can stand a competition like that, and I would have stood by the government if they had said: We will set our faces against the slaughtering of the products of the United States in the markets of Canada. The producers of the United States are so hedged in that they are not subject to competition from foreign countries. I realize the position they occupy; and although I am not very friendly to the United States, I also realize that we live alongside of them for 4,000 miles. Whether we like that or not, we have to put up with it; we have to subject ourselves to those natural conditions by which nature has surrounded us. I have heard considerable exception taken to the fact that we buy so much from the United States and sell them so little. That is true; but it is brought about by conditions which no government can affect. The United States is the producer of those raw materials which the people of Canada absolutely require, which they cannot produce themselves, except at an abnormal expense, and which they cannot get any where else in the world. Therefore it is that last year we imported $53,000,000 worth of raw materials from the United States; and we got them there because it paid us better to do so than to buy them any where else or to raise them ourselves. That is a natural condition that cannot be altered. Cotton, coal, India rubber and a hundred other products we must get there; and we cannot change that fact, however much we

would desire. Of the things that are even on the dutiable list, but that are absolutely necessary to the welfare of the manufacturers of this country, we have imported from the United States a large quantity. We have imported some $7,500,000 in metals alone; but these are the raw materials of many of our manufacturers. I hope through the development of our iron industries at Sydney, at Collingwood, at Hamilton, and at Sault Ste. Marie, we shall soon be in a position to be independent of that phase at least of our importations from the United States. But, try, however much we may, talk however much we like, we cannot change those natural conditions which will for all time make it necessary for us to go to the United States to buy certain raw materials; but holding the views I do, I am not willing, even for the benefits that might be conferred on Canada, or even in a desire to gratify a feeling of animosity to the people of the United States, to vote for the resolution that is placed before us, because I believe that a tariff that would give the protection which is absolutely necessary to make every manufacturer independent of foreign competition would not be in the interest of the people of this country. But, on the other hand, a tariff devised with skill and care, a tariff that would develop the natural industries of this country, that would discriminate in favour of them as against those which would always be a burden on the people, would ultimately result in the development of the manufacturing interests of this country to an extent that Canada has never yet witnessed.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (South Wentworth). Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have listened to the speeches of the three gentlemen on the other side of the House who have addressed us on this question, with some amusement and some gratification. It is said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery ; and the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down certainly ought to be gratifying to any member on this side of the House, if a good, sound protectionist speech on the whole can be said to be so. The fact is also amusing that the three hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House represent three different phases of the tariff question. First, we had the address of the hon. Minister of Finance, which was very wary. The hon. gentleman has had experience. He told us that he had been waited upon by numbers of deputations, representing different industries of this country, asking for increased protection, and he replied that he could not see his way clear at present. He held out a ray of hope for the future. He evidently remembered the lesson of twenty-five years ago, when the representatives of the various industries of this country waited upon the Finance Minister in the Mackenzie administration and asked that protection be granted our Canadian industries. He remembered the reply then given by the Finance Minister of that day (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) : 'Governments are but flies on the wheel ; I can do nothing for those industries. Go home, work harder, put more elbow grease into your work, and you will get along nicely.' And he remembered too the verdict at the succeeding election. Therefore the hon. gentleman was more wary than his predecessor in the Mackenzie government. He did not say positively, as Sir Richard Cartwright did twenty-five years ago, that the government were but flies on the wheel. He did not come out flat footed and squarely on the policy of free trade or revenue tariff, in which he is generally supposed to be a thorough believer. No, he put the manufacturers off with the plea that at some future day they might obtain the desire of their hearts. At some future day he was quite willing to abandon, even more than he has done already, those principles which, during so many years, he had advocated throughout the country. Evidently the desire to retain comfortable office had greater weight and power over him than his inclination to stand by his principles, and so he hedged on that question.

Then we had a speech from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and it sounded very much as if it were his last speech. He made such a gigantic effort, he spoke at such great length, three and a half hours, he sang so loudly once more the old songs, that he seemed to be concentrating all his remaining vigour into one great valedictory argument before leaving the theatre of parliamentary life. He evidently had a crow to pick with his colleagues, and in this, the closing effort of his parliamentary career, he determined to let them know where he stood. To every one in this House it must be evident that the hon. gentleman is far from comfortable. His memory no doubt harked back to twenty-five years ago when he regarded the proposal to raise the tariff from 17½ to 20 per cent, as the entering of the thin end of the protection wedge, and the contrast must have struck him with his position to-day when he is compelled to remain in the same cabinet with colleagues who have adopted a 35 per cent tariff against the importations from the United States and other countries. And this 35 per cent tariff, he is constrained to declare is a revenue tariff. The position of the hon. gentleman is certainly a humiliating one, and I do not wonder that he must look forward with dismay to the not distant day, predicted by the Minister of Finance, when the representatives of this government, who have all their lives been advocating free trade or a revenue tariff, will make a big rise in their tariff. It is not surprising therefore that the Minister of Trade and Commerce should have been anxious that this should be his last speech, and judging by the effort he made he evidently

felt that he was singing his last song and fighting his last battle.

The next gentleman who addressed the House was the representative for South Brant (Mr. Heyd). From that hon. gentleman we had quite a different tune. He started out determined not to commit himself, he made a huge effort to avoid declaring positively that he was a protectionist, as everybody knows he is, he made a desperate attempt to agree with the government in its tariff policy, but he had not gone very far when he gave up the attempt and broke into a good, sound protectionist's argument. It was indeed an amusing object lesson to see those three hon. gentlemen, who first addressed the House from that side on the Budget, taking each a different view of the tariff. What is the country to understand ? Surely the resolution of the leader of the opposition is a very opportune one. Surely the time has arrived when the government should pronounce itself definitely and distinctly on this tariff question.

What are the arguments advanced why this government should be sustained ? The only one was the prosperity of the country. Well, we on this side are glad to be able to admit that the country is prosperous and are just as proud of that fact as hon. gentlemen opposite. But to say that the country is prosperous is one thing and to credit that prosperity to the government is quite another. Twenty-five years ago the Minister of Trade and Commerce took entirely the opposite view. He then said that governments were but flies on the wheel and could do nothing for the interests of the country. Last night he admitted, nay, urged, that governments can do a good deal. That a wise policy well administered can do considerable for a country is undoubted, but has this government done anything to increase our prosperity ? In order to reply to that question we must go into details. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and those who followed him on that side have a very happy faculty of grouping together our imports and exports, and thus showing a very large trade in the aggregate, and comparing that with our trade five years ago they see a great gain. I do not know, however, that, with the exception of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, there is any hon. member of this House who would have the temerity to maintain that our imports in themselves represent prosperity. The Minister of Trade and Commerce did that last evening. But I would ask how is this country to be benefited by having large importations. Supposing we had large importations and small exports how long could that state of things continue. It could only continue as long as we can raise the money to pay the difference by mortgaging our farms and factories. Is that desirable ? Can anybody possibly contend that that would be a satisfactory condition of affairs ? What is the history of those countries that have exported more than they imported ? We have an example right along side of us. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that a country cannot export unless she imports, that in order to sell we must buy. That is the old theory, started doubtless at the time of Cobden and Bright, and the hon. gentleman must have been sleeping all these years. But we are living in a practical and not in a theoretical age. We look upon what is transpiring about us and judge by the actual results. What are these results ? Until twenty-five years ago the United States imported more than they exported. What was the condition of affairs then ? Not only millions but billions of dollars of British capital floated into that country to develop its resources. British capital owned the American railways, it operated the American factories, and the greater number of American industries. About twenty-five years ago these American industries became developed to a large extent and the United States began to export more than they imported. They became wealthier year after year. They have paid off portions of the capital they had borrowed, lifted the mortgages upon their farms and factories, and bought in the stocks of their railways. Year by year they became more masters in their own house, until, about five years ago, when the value of commodities rose very rapidly. Then their exports took a tremendous bound and their exports for five years past amounted to the enormous sum of $2,600,000,000 more than their imports. Has it made them poor ? Does it appear that the United States are in a deplorable condition because they are selling more than they are buying ? For twenty-five years they have been selling more than they have bought, and during the last five years their surplus of exports over imports has been enormous. And they continue to do it. Does anybody presume to say that they will not continue to do it ? What is their condition to-day ? Not only have they got possession of their own industries and their own railways, not only have they been able to pay off their mortgages and to relieve, to a large extent, their municipalities and states of debt, but they are reaching out all over the world to find places to invest that large amount of money they have made by exporting more than they have imported. They are coming into our country and buying our industries and our railways. They are going into London whence twenty-five or thirty years ago came the money that built up the United States and are buying industries there. They are going into France, they are going into Russia, into South American states, into Mexico—they are going all over the world, to find investments for the enormous sums they have made by exporting more than they imported.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Certainly.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the hon. gentleman tell me how it was that, from 1879 to 1894, during the national policy, the imports of Canada were larger than the exports every year ?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). That is an exactly similar state of affairs. Let these industries continue under a protective tariff, as is proposed by this resolution, and instead of importing $75,000,000 of goods from the United States, millions from Germany and from other countries, our own industries will be able to supply our market, and we shall be in the position of the United States, viz., by exporting more than we import. Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HOLMES. The hon. gentleman has not answered the question.

An hon. MEMBER. You are very hard to please.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Aside from the attempt to bolster up a bad cause by always speaking of the prosperity of the country, and pretending that it is the result of their policy, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce made some statements that are worthy of a word in passing. In contending that, under the policy of the Conservative administration the country had not developed and been as prosperous as it would have been had the policy he proposed been carried out, he referred to the case of Manitoba and the North-west, and argued that the Conservative policy had been injurious to the people of the North-west, and that if the policy that he and his government twenty-five years ago had adopted, had been continued, the development of the North-west would have been greater than it is to-day. Everybody must have been surprised to hear the hon. gentleman make such a statement, as we were surprised to-day to hear the hon. member for South Brant try to maintain that proposition, in the face of the well known fact that the government of which the present Minister of Trade and Commerce was a member over twenty-five years ago opposed, tooth and nail, the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the principal, almost the sole, means of developing the country. It was the Conservative party that, in the face of all difficulties and notwithstanding the criticisms and opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite, built the Canadian Pacific Railway. Hon. gentlemen opposite at that time maintained that this was a work far beyond the power of this country. They maintained that it would bankrupt the Dominion and that the road would never pay for the axle grease for the wheels. Yet, in spite of the determined opposition of the most powerful men in the Liberal party, the Conservative party carried out what they proposed to do, and finally built the road—not with 'water stretches,' but a railroad from one end of the country to the other. And everybody to-day, whether Grit or Tory, no matter what his politics may be, agrees that the Canadian Pacific Railway has been the great means of binding the provinces together and developing the resources of the North-west as they could never have been developed without it. How can these hon. gentlemen stand up and say, of all things, that their policy would have developed the North-west ?

The Minister of Trade and Commerce also had some criticism to make with regard to the number of people coming to this country. He said that under the late administration there were not so many immigrants as are now coming to Canada. I well remember reading—I was not then a member of this House—whenever these sums of money were asked by the Finance Minister in those days for immigration, and they were small sums compared with those that are now spent, hon. gentlemen opposite declared that it was useless to spend money to bring in immigrants to this country. The late government spent about $125,000 on immigration during their last year of office, but this government spends about $500,000. If the late government had spent equally large sums, no doubt they could have brought in a great many more immigrants than they did. It does not lie in the mouths of opponents of the late government to complain on this score.

Now, in order to show that this government is, in no measure, responsible for the prosperity we now enjoy, as I said before, we must investigate the different items. I have spoken only of imports. I do not think there are many people in this country that think imports alone bring prosperity. Now, I must confess that the government can do a great deal, not only with regard to the exports, but also with regard to the imports. What did the government preceding this one do ? Let us take an example. When they came into power we imported 7,000,000 pounds of raw cotton. Now we import over 40,000,000 pounds. What does that mean ? That means simply this—that there are employed in this country many thousands of hands manufacturing this cotton. And so it is in every line of industry that was protected in 1879. That is what that government did to build up the industries of this country, bring in population and retain in the country the people that we had.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce criticised the Conservative government for allowing immigration to flow from this country and so many Canadians to go to the States. I was wondering what would have been the result if his principle had been adopted and if, instead of having the protective tariff, which even hon. gentlemen opposite are bound to admit has built up this country, his policy of a revenue tariff had been carried out. How many more Canadians would have gone from this country to the United States ? Surely when hon. gentlemen opposite themselves

have been obliged to accept this protective principle, although they say they have cut off a little twig here and there, they must admit it would have been injurious to this country and that we would not have had so many people retained in this country from 1878 forward, if their policy had been adopted. They furnish us the proof themselves. So I cannot understand, no one can understand how, if from 1878 forward, any policy which the hon. gentlemen opposite have ever proposed had been carried out, the Canadians who have left this country could have been retained in it. Until they show that I contend they have not proved their case.

When I say that a government can do a good deal to make the people prosperous, I refer to the imports for the present, or rather the power the government exercise through the tariff in compelling the manufacture in this country of the large quantities of goods that are imported. In that way government can do a good deal in regard to imports. But what about exports? In regard to exports the government have limited powers. I am sure they will not contend that it has been through their instrumentality that we have got better prices in the old country during the last five years for our cheese, butter and various products of the farm. In what way then can they benefit industries and increase exports? I think that can be done to a limited extent by improving the facilities for manufacture, by improving the education of the people, and by giving better opportunities for production and providing better transportation facilities. Now, let us examine in detail what our exports have been; let us see what the government have been doing during the last five years to encourage larger exports. I find that for the fiscal year ending the 30th of June last, our exports increased over the previous year by $16,733,000. We find that the exports of gold amounted to $24,445,000 against $14,148,000 the year before, leaving $10,296,673 of gain in our exports of gold. Now in what way have the government been responsible for that increased export of gold? Is it not a notorious fact that the royalty levied by this government, and their exactions on the miners in the Yukon territory, have been greater and have made it harder for the miners there than in any other country? That has been a notorious source of complaint. I am not criticising the government for exacting this royalty, I am only saying that under those conditions they have made it harder for the miner to produce gold for export, and consequently they cannot claim any credit for those increased exports of gold. There is another fact, this $10,000,000 of gold does not altogether represent added wealth to this country, because it has been largely taken out of the country in the pockets of American miners who have gone with it. Then I find that the total exports of the mines have increased by $15,752,000; a part of that was gold, and that represents nearly the total increase of our exports for the past year. Now, in what way have the government made it easier for the miners to extract the gold? In what way have the government made the mineral products of this country more valuable? Can any one answer that question? The miners have to work harder, and larger quantities have been exported, but the government cannot in any way be credited with that increase.

Then our manufactures have increased about $2,000,000. In what way are the government to be credited with the increased production of our factories except that they have retained to a large extent the policy of their predecessors? The increased output of those factories, Mr. Speaker, is surely attributable, if it is to anything, to the policy of the predecessors of these hon. gentlemen. The policy that established these industries and made them able to manufacture and export is the policy that still exists to a considerable extent. It is the same story over again that we have seen in the United States. The adoption of a protective tariff in that country caused manufacturing industries to spring up, and they grew until they were able to export tremendous quantities of goods. In this country our industries were started in the same way, and had it not been for the tinkering of the tariff by these hon. gentlemen when they came into power, these industries would have been on a much better footing than they are to-day, and would have produced more for export. That is one source of complaint I have against the government, that whereas they adopted the principle of a protective tariff, whenever they touched it they touched it to its detriment.

They took off the duty on binder twine, and the result is that instead of manufacturing our binder twine now the major portion of it comes from the United States. If they had let it alone we would have had more manufactories in this country, more people engaged, and fewer going to the United States. They took the duty off barbed wire, and what is the result? Some of the barbed wire factories closed up, more Canadians gone to the United States to find employment. So I say that wherever they have tinkered with the tariff they have done so to the detriment of the industries of this country. Take the woollen industries as affected by the English preference, and what has been the result? The woollen industries would have been to-day much more prosperous, they would have afforded employment to many more men than at the present time if that business had been let alone. I find in looking over the different articles that we have exported nearly $2,000,000 worth of agricultural implements. Has the policy of the present government made it easier for the implement makers to manufacture for export? No, they get

a rebate on the duties on the steel and iron used in their machines, and they have the same conditions prevailing to-day that prevailed six years ago; therefore the government are in no way to be credited with this increased export.

The next thing is bicycles. Have they done anything to improve the exports of bicycles? Cotton fabrics, $381,000; household effects, $1,138,000. That is one of the exports of our manufacturers, household effects. Why, I thought the Minister of Trade and Commerce last night said that Canadians were not going to the States any more. Did these household effects walk over and set up housekeeping themselves on the other side? I imagine that there were some people who went over with them, and that Canadians are still going to the States in spite of the policy the hon. gentleman bragged about. Wood pulp, nearly $2,000,000 increase. What has the government done to increase facilities for the exportation of wood pulp? If the government would put on export duty of $2 or $4 a cord upon pulp wood, or if they would put a further export duty upon pulp itself going out of Canada and cause the manufacture of paper in this country, then it might be said they were doing something for the people of this country. But no, they allow all pulp wood to go out free, they allow the wood when it is made into pulp to go out, and do not do anything to encourage the manufacture of paper in this country. I do not see how they can claim credit for this export in any way adding to our prosperity; it rather represents an enormous loss. There was over $1,000,000 of manufactures of wood. Can hon. gentlemen point to anything that they have done to increase the export of these manufactures of wood? Leather goods, $25,000,000. Has the operation of their changes in the tariff made it easier for the manufacturers of leather goods for export?. No one will contend that it has. So all through the list of manufactures, not a thing has been done by hon. gentlemen opposite to assist the industries of this country in increasing their exports.

Now, let us take some other items of export. Let us take, for instance, cheese. We exported in the last six months $14,425,673 worth of cheese, and in six months of the previous year corresponding, $15,215,678, so that there was a shrinkage of $790,000 in our exports of cheese in six months. Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend that there was a chance for the government to have done something but a chance that they neglected and deliberately threw away. I brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture three years ago the fact that our steamship accommodation across the ocean was very deficient, that our apples were going across in a wretched condition and that the farmers of Canada were losing millions of dollars from this bad system of shipping apples, and I urged that something ought to be done. The hon. Minister of Agriculture gave some attention to the matter and he asked for a sum of money from this House to provide some sort of ventilation upon steamships for this purpose. That sum of money was quickly voted and a certain number of steamships were fitted up with fans so that fruit could be carried across the ocean in better condition. What has been the result? Did the hon. Minister of Agriculture do all that could be done under these circumstances? I say that he did not, that he has simply played with the question. Instead of taking hold of it in a whole-hearted fashion, instead of compelling every steamship that sails from the ports of Canada to put these fans in for the purpose of ventilating its holds in which these apples are carried, instead of making it impossible for the steamship owners to send their vessels across the ocean without operating these fans, instead of taking such means as would be a check so as to enable us to know that they did operate these fans, he did nothing of the kind. What has been the result? Professor Robertson came before the Agriculture Committee of the House a year ago, and stated that owing largely to the bad ventilation of these steamships our cheese, which is one of our largest exportable products and most valuable, had received a black eye in the old country market; that our cheese, which had stood at the highest notch, had received a set-back, and he prophesied that this year our exports of cheese would shrink in value by $3,000,000. He came very near the mark. The exports for six months, as I have said, have diminished by $790,000 instead of increasing nearly that amount, as in former years. That makes about $1,500,000 in six months, and if you take the total product for a year, it would amount to something over $2,000,000 that our cheese has depreciated in value, largely because the hon. Minister of Agriculture did not vigorously go to work and carry out what he had found on examination to be a serious state of affairs, such a state of affairs that not only were apples going over in bad condition, but he has found that cheese has been damaged to the extent of $2,000,000 a year by his neglect in not compelling the different steamships to carry this cheese properly. Why did this thing not occur before? Why was it that our exports of cheese had gone on increasing year after year and that this is almost the only year in which our exports have decreased? Simply because years ago we made a hard cheese and that hard cheese would carry in almost any kind of a steamer's hold. It did not matter so much whether it was ventilated or not, but of late years, in order to compete with other cheese producing countries, we must make a mild flavoured cheese, that mild flavoured cheese is softer, and cannot endure the hardships to which the hard cheese was subjected, and this cheese, being carried in unventilated holds,

was damaged and the country has suffered to the extent of over $2,000,000 a year. It will take many years to recover from the blow. What of our apples ? As I pointed out three years ago, and as I pointed out a year ago, in this House, we have lost in Ontario, and in Nova Scotia, many millions of dollars owing to this ill-ventilation of these steamers, and we are losing still. One would have thought that with his experience the hon. Minister of Agriculture would have gone so vigorously to work that by this time he would have had every steamer sailing from Canadian ports equipped in some fashion and would have enabled these ships to carry apples in safety. Have we found that to be the case ? No. We find that from the port of Halifax during this past winter there does not appear to have been a single steamer sailing from that port that was properly equipped. In Nova Scotia they had this year the only good crop of apples grown in the country, and the apple-growers of the Annapolis Valley, who had a crop that should have brought them in a million dollars, have lost $300,000 on last year's crop, because of the want of proper ventilation on these steamers. Who is to blame for that ? There was a chance where the government could have done something to increase the exports of the country, where the government could have done something to add to the prosperity of the country and they failed to do it. Let us see what the documents say as to the condition of affairs at Halifax this year. I will give an illustration or two from the record of the shipment of apples from that port. Part of the cargo of the steamer 'Grecian,' was sold on the 30th October. There were 873 barrels tight, 889 barrels slack, 68 barrels wet, and 28 barrels slack and wet, so that much more than half of the cargo arrived in a damaged condition. On the steamer 'Ulunda' I have a record of 779 barrels tight, 477 barrels slack, 24 barrels slack and wet and 18 barrels wet. On the steamer 'Damara' 414 barrels tight, 832 barrels slack, 407 barrels wet and 260 barrels slack and wet. What does this represent ? I turn to the catalogue of sales to see how these apples sold, those that were tight and slack, and slack and wet. Here is a man who had 60 barrels of No. 1 Blenheim that were tight and they brought 21 shillings a barrel. He had 197 barrels slack and wet and they brought 17 shillings 6d. a barrel, a difference of 3 shillings 6d. a barrel, or over 80 cents a barrel loss, whereas those both slack and wet sold at a loss of from $1.50 to $2.50 per barrel loss. You will see that over half of these apples arrived in a bad condition, and that there was more than 80 cents a barrel of loss on them. This same condition of things has been going on in Montreal for years and years. I will just draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the sale of apples that went in the unventilated hold of another steamship from Halifax, the 'Evangeline.' That steamship carried a cargo of 22,000 barrels of apples. One fruit-grower in the Annapolis Valley claimed that there was a loss of $30,000 on that cargo, while another man claimed that there was a loss of $22,000. Within the last twenty-four hours there has been a deputation of Nova Scotia fruit-growers in this House protesting against this condition of things and complaining because the government have neglected their duty. The apple-growers of Nova Scotia have suffered a loss of $300,000 on their apple crop this year, and if the hon. Minister of Agriculture had done what he might have done, he might have remedied this condition of affairs. Last winter the Nova Scotia fruit-growers met in convention. Last winter there were many meetings held in the Annapolis Valley and those who attended them were very indignant, and they passed a number of resolutions in regard to this very business.

Mr. Innes who is a prominent fruit-grower there and who took this matter up along with a number of other fruit-growers at different meetings, proposed the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted, which I shall read in order to show to the House the feeling of the fruit-growers in that province on the subject.

Whereas, the apple industry of Nova Scotia has of recent years grown to important dimensions, and is steadily increasing as young orchards come into bearing and are being set out ; and

Whereas more than two-thirds of the total production, which is now some half a million of barrels a year, are exported to Great Britain by a line of steamships which has secured a monopoly of the carrying business by the aid of annual subsidies from the Dominion government ; and

Whereas, our distance by rail from the seaboard is short, averaging only some 80 miles, and Halifax is some 500 miles nearer to Great Britain than any apple shipping port on this continent, and our apples are carried on subsidized steamers, yet notwithstanding all these advantages in our favour our transportation charges are higher than those paid by Canadian and United States shippers, and we are thus unable to market our product on equal terms with our competitors ; and

Whereas, the subsidized steamers have been in some cases unsuitable for business, and are in all cases unprovided with proper and sufficient ventilating appliances to ensure a continuous and even cool temperature, with the result that our apples, especially the valuable early shipments, have been delivered at destination in a slack, heated and damaged condition, thereby causing grievous loss to our shippers and serious detriment to our industry; and

Whereas this association has repeatedly made representations and passed resolutions with a view to induce the government to regulate the freight charges by the subsidized steamers, and inspect the vessels to ensure their suitability for the trade, but no action has been taken to protect our interests and industry and remedy the grievances complained of ; now

Therefore, resolved, that this association do hereby petition parliament to cause an investi-

gation to be made in respect to the matters herein referred to, and in respect to all matters connected with the exporting, transportation and marketing of our apples; and thereupon to enact a law to regulate the business in accordance with the facts and circumstances, and with such provisions as may be just and reasonable, and as will tend to remedy and remove the disabilities which have hitherto hampered and jeopardized a most important industry.

Here is another resolution passed at another meeting, and the newspaper report in connection with it says:

The matter of the ocean transportation of Nova Scotia apples was then taken up by Peter Innes, in a vigorous address in which he roundly scored the Furness, Withy Company for their criminal carelessness in handling our Gravenstein apples, and his words found a responsive echo in the hearts of every one in the audience, many of whom had been losers of a portion of the $30,000 lost by the exploit of the Evangeline in cooking 20,000 barrels of Gravensteins. On motion of Mr. Innes, seconded by Colonel Spurr, it was unanimously carried that;

This association do humbly petition parliament to cause an investigation to be made in respect to all matters connected with the exporting, transportation and marketing of our apples and thereupon, to enact a law to regulate the business in accordance with the facts and circumstances, and with such provisions as may be just and reasonable and as will tend to remedy and remove the disabilities which have hitherto hampered and jeopardized a most important industry.

This will show the sad condition of affairs in the Annapolis valley, where the industry was just getting on its feet, and where they can grow apples as good as can be grown in any part of the world. Three years ago the Furniss-Withy people had some boats that carried apples in good condition. I remember calling the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to a large shipment of apples which arrived in good condition, and in which there were only thirteen barrels slack. I then pointed out to the minister that although this steamer was only fitted up in a primitive fashion, yet that such care was taken of the apples on the voyage, that they were landed in England in prime condition. But these boats were taken off the service and others not so suitable put on—many of them subsidized by the government—and as a result the sorrowful condition of things which I have pointed out prevails. Let us see what are the conditions with regard to the port of Montreal. The minister (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has secured the placing of fans on a number of vessels sailing from that port, but it is one thing to put fans on a vessel and it is another thing to make sure that the fans are operated during the voyage. I remember very well that some fifteen years ago the apple shippers of Canada induced one line of steamers to put a few fans on some of their vessels. We found, however, that the apples were not carried in any appreciably better condition, and when we made an investigation we found that the boats operated the fans while in the harbour, but when they got out to sea they stopped the fans because it cost a little money. I believe that to-day this very same thing will account for the apples shipped from Montreal not arriving in a better condition on the English market. I believe that some of these vessels did operate their fans and did carry out the regulations, and as a consequence the apples arrived in good condition, but on the other hand some of these vessels did not operate the fans, and the result was very injurious to the shipment of apples. I took the trouble to write to a number of receivers of apples in the old country, gentlemen who handle large quantities of our apples and who are in the best position to judge of the condition in which the fruit arrives. I asked them about this matter, and I shall read an extract from the reply of one of these gentlemen which will throw some light on the question.

As far as the export trade to Europe is concerned unfortunately we cannot say as far as our own observation is concerned that the system of ventilation, and cooling chambers introduced upon steamers sailing from Montreal to Liverpool has been a success. As certainly the steamers that carried apples under the above systems did not land their fruit in as good condition, as steamers that were not ventilated by mechanical means. You must not take from this that we think mechanical means of ventilation should not be used.

* * * * * *

The trouble we think with the steamers from Montreal not carrying their fruit in better condition was that they did not work the system properly.

The writer has just been looking up averages made upon apples carried during the present month upon steamers with and without exhaust ventilation. Two steamers sailed from Boston within 24 hours of each other and arrived here within that length of time of each other, and their fruit was sold the same day. With result that on the apples we had on them there was a difference of fully two shillings per barrel in favour of the steamer that used exhaust ventilation. We, fortunately only had a very few on the steamer without exhaust ventilation, although we have considered her one of the best apple carriers sailing between Boston and Liverpool. We had a much larger quantity arrive the following week on a steamer of the same line, and a good carrier. Upon the one with exhaust ventilation we had 2,135 barrels which averaged 14s. 8d. per barrel while upon the one without exhaust ventilation we had 1,603 barrels and they averaged 11 shillings 11 pence per barrel or a difference in favour of the steamer with exhaust ventilation of 2s. 9d. per barrel. The fruit was packed almost entirely by the same men, and the quality of the apples on the steamer without exhaust system was if anything superior to the others, but they landed in a much worse condition, although they were stowed in the peak hatch, which is considered the best place on any steamer for carrying apples.

We are now using our best efforts to have the same system of ventilation introduced upon all steamers that carry apples, and have great

hopes of it being introduced in a number of steamers before another season opens. We certainly will not rest until it is accomplished, and have given instructions to all our representatives to favour the steamers that have introduced the system, and that give it proper attention, as we certainly think those steamers with the fans in, which sailed from Montreal to Liverpool were not properly attended to or they would have landed fruit in better condition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that what the Minister of Agriculture ought to do is first of all to insure that every steamer leaving Montreal or Halifax and carrying perishable products, whether apples, cheese, or any thing else, shall be equipped with apparatus that will secure a free circulation of air through the compartments in which the perishable products are carried. Then, having done that, the Minister of Agriculture has only performed part of his duty. It is very easy for these steamers to put in fans which will only cost a few dollars, but the minister must go further and he must take care that these fans are operated during the voyage across the ocean. That, the Minister of Agriculture can easily do. He can put a thermograph in each compartment of the steamer in which these perishable products are carried, and he can put another thermograph on the deck. He can lock these thermographs and when the vessel reaches England one of the number of officers whom he has watching the fruit business there, can unlock the thermographs and can see at a glance whether the fans have been worked during the voyage or not. If the fans have been operated the readings of the thermographs in the holds will be almost identical with the reading of the thermograph on deck. The Minister of Agriculture can have absolute and positive proof as to the working of the fans by this means. It therefore lies in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, to enable the farmers of Canada to export every pound of cheese and butter, and every barrel of apples to the old country in a sound and marketable condition. Thus preventing the great losses we have experienced in the past.

Let us touch on another item of our exports, that is, butter. In the last fiscal year we exported $3,355,197 worth of butter, or $2,074,366 worth less than the year before. Where is the hand of the Minister of Agriculture that our exports of butter have thus decreased instead of increased ? What has become of that magnificent system of cold storage which was to be established all over this country ? To hear the hon. gentleman talk in this House and out of it at different times, you would have thought that he had magnificent cold storage warehouses at all the ports of debarkation, and a chain of cold storage warehouses, as he called them, from one end of this country to the other, and that by this time, instead of exporting only $3,000,000 worth of butter a year, we would be exporting twenty or thirty million dollars' worth, as the little country of Denmark is doing. On investigation, this so called chain of cold storage warehouses turns out to be what ? The Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, when called on, furnish a refrigerator car and put ice in it for the purpose of transporting butter along their lines. These cars go along the different lines of railway picking up butter at different factories, and no doubt in most cases soon secure a carload, but the shipper in any case is charged less carload rate, which is a very good thing indeed for the railway companies carrying carloads of butter at less carload rates, and the government paying for the ice. That is what the government has done—made arrangements with the railway companies that these cars shall be provided. But that is not enough to justify the bragging about what has been done for the butter industry of this country. The arrangement is a good thing for the railroads and is of some advantage to the country ; but what has the Minister of Agriculture been doing that our exports of butter have decreased from $5,000,000 worth to $3,000,000 worth ? It seems that almost everything that hon. gentleman touches goes backward. Two or three years ago the hon. gentleman boasted a good deal about arranging with the United States to raise the quarantine against our cattle, so as to make it easier for our farmers to export their cattle to that country, where they might be fattened instead of at home. One might think that the result would be that our exports of cattle to the United States would increase. But I find that the farmers know their business better than the hon. gentleman, for instead of exporting $1,401,137 worth, as they did in 1900, they have had the good sense in 1901 to export only $891,300 worth to the United States, doubtless fattening them at home, and selling them for export at $60 to $100 per head, instead of $10 to $15 to the States as lean cattle or calves. These are some of the items with regard to which the government could have exercised some influence in increasing the quantity of our exports, and have benefited the farmers and the people of this country generally ; and I am sure that any one who investigates the subject without bias must come to the conclusion that the Minister of Agriculture has not done any small portion of his duties in these very important matters.

In the course of the argument of the hon. gentleman who preceded me, it was contended that the government was in some way responsible for the vast increase in our exports during the past five years, and ought to receive some credit for it. The truth of the matter is that our exports have not increased in quantity so much as in value. The volume of our exports has gone on gradually increasing from year to year, whether this government or the previous

government has been in power, which has proved to my mind that the population has increased steadily from year to year, and not, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce contended, that all the increase has been in the last five years. When I look up the figures, I find that our exports have increased in quantity in an average ratio, and that there has not been a very great difference in the past five years as compared with the previous five years. Was it the government that caused the value of these products to increase in the last five years? No, it was the prosperity of the buyer in the old country and the United States. Take cheese, for example, one of our largest and most profitable exports. In 1891 we exported 106,202,140 pounds. In 1896, after those depressing times when our exports did not increase as rapidly as they have done in the past five years in value, the quantity had increased to 164,689,123 pounds, an increase of 55 per cent. But during the past five years the increase in quantity has been but 19 per cent. This shows that the people have been working away just about the same in one period as in the other, and it is fair to conclude that the population has been increasing in the same proportion. Take another item—wheat. The quantity exported in 1891 was 2,108,216 bushels, and in 1896, 9,919,542 bushels, an increase of 370 per cent, whereas in 1901 the quantity exported was 9,739,758 bushels, a decrease of 2 per cent. I mention these figures for the purpose of showing that whereas the quantity of wheat exported during the first period increased 370 per cent, the value only increased 264 per cent, and that in the last period, while the quantity exported decreased 2 per cent, the value increased 19 per cent. Who placed this increased value on the wheat—the hon. gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches, or the British buyer? Take another item—lumber, or planks and boards, one of the largest exports of the products of the forest. The quantity we exported in 1891 was 807,859,000 feet, and in 1896, 818,529,000 feet, an increase of but 1 per cent in the quantity, while the value actually decreased 5 per cent. In the next five years, while the quantity actually decreased by 11 per cent, the value increased 10 per cent. Are hon. gentlemen opposite to be credited with that increase? Did they increase the price of our lumber, or did the British buyer and the American buyer? So I could go through all the different industries. Take bacon. During the first period our exports of bacon increased in volume 558 per cent, and during the last period they increased only 119 per cent in volume. Here is an industry which is an example of what the government can do to improve the affairs of the country. Before the Conservative administration placed a high duty on pork, we were buying pork from abroad; we were not exporting any. Enormous quantities of American pork were brought in and fed to our lumbermen. But the farmers and pork producers came and represented the matter to the Conservative administration, who did not turn a deaf ear to them, but placed a duty on pork—not a moderate but a high duty. What was the result? In a very few years we were not only able to supply our own markets with all the pork we required, but pork packing establishments were started all over the country, and they have kept on growing year by year until they are now exporting $12,000,000 worth of bacon, besides supplying all the demands of the country. There is what a government can do, and there is where this government is wanting, and until it adopts a measure, such as suggested by the amendment of the leader of the opposition, and bring about such a condition of affairs that a large part of that $75,000,000 of manufactured goods, which we import from the United States will be made in this country, it will not be doing its whole duty.

What would be the condition of affairs should the amendment of the leader of the opposition be carried? Just consider our present condition. Here we are importing large quantities of goods from the United States and from Germany. From the United States we are importing $75,000,000 worth of manufactured goods. My hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) was very careful not to touch particularly on that part of the question. When speaking of our large importations from the United States, he confined his attention to the imports of raw products. But nobody objects to raw products coming in free, which are the basis of our manufactured goods. To admit these free was the policy of the late government and the Conservative party. But what would be the result if this amendment should carry? Instead of the large quantity of goods which we now import from the United States being made in that country, a considerable portion of that trade would be transferred to this country. Supposing only $25,000,000 worth of these goods were made on this side of the line, would not that be a very good thing for us? It would add the population of a very large town to this country. And supposing that $25,000,000 or $50,000 000 more of our imports, instead of coming from the United States, were to come from Great Britain that would be an advantage in two ways. First of all, I feel that I am equally a Briton, equally a citizen of the British Empire, as a citizen of Canada. The result of that transfer of trade from the United States to Great Britain would be to give the advantage of the manufacture of that quantity of goods into the hands of our own people. I consider that the people of England, Ireland and Scotland are equally our own people as the citizens of our own country, and that in transferring this trade from the United States to Great Britain we would be add-

ing to our own prosperity. What would be another result ? It would be this, that our ships would have more goods to carry from the other side to our shores. Instead of coming across, as a large number of them do, in ballast, they would come across loaded, and that would give us lower freights on our exports. In that way therefore our producers would be largely benefited. In that respect we to-day occupy a very unsatisfactory position. Instead of British ships coming back to this country loaded, they only bring back $40,000,000 worth of goods, although they carry from this country $100,000,000 worth. Then we bring back goods in condensed form, for one ship will bring back as much value as five ships carry away. Things are not in that position in the port of New York, for the quantity of exports from that port only exceeds the imports by about one-fifth. Therefore by putting on a big tariff against the United States, we would cause a considerable portion of American manufactures, which we now import, to be manufactured in this country, and another considerable portion to be manufactured in and imported by us from Great Britain, thus improving our position in every respect. The Minister of Public Works may improve the St. Lawrence channel as much as he pleases—and I shall be delighted if he can improve it to such an extent that steamers may sail through that channel at the highest rate of speed both night and day—we will still be handicapped, as compared with New York and Boston, until such a change is effected in our fiscal policy as will cause a much less disproportion to exist between our imports from Great Britain and our exports to that country. That can only be brought about by shutting out a large proportion of the goods which we to-day buy from the United States.

I may be met by the argument that the result of putting on a stiff duty would be an increase in prices, that our people would have to pay more. Well, the history of the past does not bear out that theory. I maintain that we are now making in this country a large number of these things which we import from the United States just as good and just as cheap. I maintain that our agricultural implements are as good and as cheap as those made on the other side. Why, then, do Canadians buy $2,000,000 worth of American agricultural implements? Let us get right down to the facts, and we will see. These agricultural implements are sold chiefly through agents, and every man who has ever handled agents knows very well that a good agent can sell a poor article at a high price and a poor agent cannot sell even a good article, in opposition, at a lower price. Our agricultural implements are sold almost entirely through agents. The agent goes about through the country and canvasses the farmers and a good smart tongued seller will persuade them that his implement is better than that made by Massey-Harris or Frost & Wood or any other Canadian manufacturer. Everybody conversant with the business knows that to be the case. I know from my experience in my own business, through my own agents, that a poor agent cannot sell a better article, even at a cheaper price, in competition with a smart agent. The whole thing lies largely with the salesman. We buy half a million dollars worth or more of American shoes, yet we make as good shoes in this country, fit for any Canadian to wear. But the American drummer comes along and persuades the retail merchant that his shoes are better than the Canadian article, and the retailer concludes that he will try them. The smooth slick tongued agent succeeds in making a sale, the shoes are laid on the tradesman's shelves, and he must sell them. Our manufacturers will even buy an American made article when they might just as well buy one of Canadian make.

It is useless to tell the people to be patriotic. I remember very well on one occasion last winter, when at a gathering of the people I tried that argument. I said to them : You ought to be patriotic. We make as good machines as you can get on the other side, we make just as good boots and shoes, and yet you will buy $75,000,000 worth of American goods when you can get just as good value at the same or lower prices in our own country. Why do you not encourage manufactures and thus add to the population and prosperity of our country and enlarge our own home markets. Not only the merchant and the factory people but the farmers and the producers of every kind will benefit by this building up of our own industries. That seemed to take very well with the audience, but to my surprise a clergyman followed me and repeated the very argument which the Minister of Trade and Commerce gave us last night. He said: I am afraid that the arguments of Mr. Smith are not very sound, because in order to sell you must buy. That was the very argument used by the Minister of Trade and Commerce last night. But I have shown by the example of the United States, and it can be shown by the example of many countries, that it is not necessary to buy in order to sell. The United States sell $100,000,000 worth of goods and buy only $40,000,000 from us.

The United States export $2,640,000,000 more than they import in five years. There is a living example that it is not necessary for any nation or individual to buy in order to sell. I was gratified, on coming home from that meeting, to read an address made by the Finance Minister the night before at some banquet along the same line, declaring that it would be a patriotic thing for Canadians to buy Canadian goods and urged strongly that they do so. The hon. Minister of Finance did not suppose that, before one short year rolled round the

Minister of Trade and Commerce would—from his seat alongside of him—tell him, that people, in order to sell must buy. Now, no amount of talk, no amount of persuasion, nothing but putting up the tariff wall a little higher—a good deal higher if necessary—will induce the people of this country to buy Canadian goods entirely or nearly so. It is due chiefly to throughtlessness. But it would be a happy condition of affairs, having the goods in this country, or having the facilities to make them to have the people induced to buy the goods. It is said that the manufacturers would charge enormous prices and that the consumer would suffer. But the government has shown, as in the case of the paper combine, that it has the remedy in its own hands. If a combination exists in any industry, the government can apply the remedy at once. Considering these facts, I think it is the duty of every member of this House to vote for the amendment presented by the hon. leader of the opposition. That amendment is certainly along the line of progress made in the past. And, judging by our experience and the experience of the United States who adopted that policy and prospered under it, such a policy must inure to the benefit of the country. Having the facilities we have, and the resources we have, under no other policy can we succeed so well. I am glad to know that there are on the other side a number of gentlemen imbued with the same spirit. I imagine that before many years the party that is now in power will take up that policy. When once the Minister of Trade and Commerce and a few more of the old war-horses who have talked so long and hard against this policy are removed to good places, Senatorships or Lieut.-Governorships, I feel sure that the master hand of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) will assert itself. And that the hon. gentleman will be supported in bringing this policy by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd). He will be supported by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell), who has of late, become a convert to the principle. Living, as he formerly did, in the county of Kent, and representing that county, a county that had beans to sell, it is natural that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) should favour commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, free trade with the United States, and so on. But, having removed to a county where he is surrounded by protectionist influences, he has become converted. Whether it was the influence in and about Toronto, or honest conviction, I am not prepared to say. But I am pleased that the hon. gentleman has come out boldly and declared his conversion. Having read some of his addresses of a few years ago in this House, I am bound to say that of all the anti-protectionists, of all the men who opposed that policy tooth and nail, he was one of the strongest.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth).

I do not know whether the Minister of Public Works can be spoken of as having been converted. But he is a leader in the movement; and, knowing as we do that he has the whiphand of the administration, I believe that before many years the government will do what they have done on many occasions before, steal the policy of the leader of the opposition, and that, two or three years from now, we shall have them coming before the country proposing the same kind of a tariff as is declared for in this amendment.

Mr. DONALD A. MACKINNON (East Queens, P.E.I.) After the interesting addresses to which we have listened, Mr. Speaker, and considering the lateness of the hour, it becomes me, in speaking upon the subject now before the House, to make my remarks brief. The hon. Minister of Finance has made his motion for a Committee of Ways and Means and the leader of the opposition has proposed the following amendment:

> That all the words after 'that' in the proposed motion be left out, and the following substituted therefor:
>
> This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries, as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians. And, while thus firmly maintaining the necessity of such protection to Canadian interests, this House affirms its belief in a policy of reciprocal trade preferences within the empire.

Now, it seems to me that the leader of the opposition must have a very keen sense of grim humour when he resurrects from a motion moved in this House in 1878 the main part of his amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKINNON. I am glad the supporters of the leader of the opposition understand that it was, in effect, the resolution of 1878—they are not working in the dark. The preference part of the resolution of course is new. The last speaker, as well as the leader of the opposition, informed us that under such a policy the people would pay increased prices. I think I took down the words of the leader of the opposition correctly, that 'the people would pay slightly increased prices to protect the manufacturers.' That goes, of course, to the root of the question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman (Mr. MacKinnon) does not quote me exactly. I said I thought that prices would not increase, that competition would keep prices down.

Mr. MACKINNON. I am willing to accept the explanation. I thought I had the words correctly. But the sentiment was reasonably clear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My words are reported in 'Hansard.'

Mr. MACKINNON. I think we substantially agree. The hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith) said he wished to have the tariff wall put up, and that prosperity would follow such a policy, as it did in the United States. But, in the first part of his speech, that hon. gentleman said that we already had prosperity. I do not see why he should revert to the old resolution of 1878 in order to bring prosperity which is already here, particularly as that resolution and the high tariff which was the outcome of it did not bring anything like the prosperity that the present policy has brought. There are a few principles laid down by the last speaker, which I think it is my duty to refer to. He stated at the outset that he was a practical man and believed in practical politics. Yet, he does not suggest a single commodity the duty on which he desires to have changed. Had he suggested an increase in the duty on any article, I would not at once agree that the change would result in advantage to Canada. It might plainly result in good to some part of Canada. But, being something of a practical man myself, I would look into that subject and see how it affected the whole of Canada, and perhaps I would come to the conclusion that it would be better to increase duty on that particular item. That is the way, it seems to me, that a practical man should consider any question of changing the duty. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) did not give us a single practical suggestion but dealt in theories throughout his whole speech. And the amendment of the leader of the opposition to the extent that it expresses anything at all, expresses a mere theory. From a practical point of view it is a resolution into which we can read anything—even our revenue tariff or any other tariff method. Now I will admit that there is one conspicuous instance in which that tariff has not operated satisfactorily, indeed it operates unsatisfactorily, and that is to the success of the Conservative party in Canada.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is an old story.

Mr. MACKINNON. I never heard it before, I gathered that idea from reading the resolution, and noting its disastrous effects on the national policy leaders in the elections of 1900. I regret to repeat a chestnut for the hon. gentleman, because I suppose he is not accustomed to hearing it. Now, the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) says that it will not do to take the total trade of the country as an argument to show prosperity, but that we must take the imports. So he proceeds to consider the imports, and at one blow he destroys his argument by stating that the imported goods should be manufactured here. He is opposed to any importations at all. He says that the imports represent prosperity, and in the next breath he says we should not have any imports at all; I hardly see how he can make both these arguments coincide. He instanced Germany, and says that we should not import from Germany. He instanced Belgium and the United States, and says we should manufacture in this country the goods we import from these countries. He forgets that we export to these countries as well as import from them. For instance, in the case of Belgium, we import $3,783,919 worth of goods from that country, and export $2,806,142 worth. In the case of Germany, we exported $2,141,552, and we imported $6,679,264. In the case of the United States we imported $119,000,000, and exported $72,000,000 worth. If the principle he lays down is a solid one, and if all nations adopted it, what would happen? Why, no nation would have any imports at all, and where would our exports go? International trade would cease. The position is evidently one that no reasonable man can accept, because it is only by the whole trade of a country that we can gauge that country's prosperity.

Now, what prosperity have we had? The hon. gentleman admits we have prosperity, and I wish for a moment to present some instances of our prosperity as affected by the tariff. The hon. gentleman says that the government should get no credit for the prosperity that exists, and then he proceeds to show that values do not represent the increased prosperity at all. He says that the increase in value occurs in this way: The countries that purchased goods from us, if times are good, are able to pay more for these articles. That is the position he takes. He admits the increase in value and not in quantity, but he does not give any credit to the government for it. One important factor he forgets, and that is the part the people themselves play in the production and manufacture of these articles. He forgets to give the agriculturist and the manufacturer credit for their work. I for one am not unwilling to give credit to the men who produce the articles. I think it is owing largely to the people themselves that we have such a large export and import trade.

We have had governments and governments, and certainly this government is deserving of considerable credit when we compare what has been going on under their administration with what went on under a former government. I intend to make a few comparisons between the two administrations. The total trade during the last year the Conservatives were in power amounted to $239,025,360. Last year the total trade was $386,903,157, an increase of nearly $150,000,000. Now, that increase did not take place under the tariff enacted in 1878, it has occurred under the present tariff. Yet the opposition bring forth an amendment declaring that the operations of the present tariff are unsatisfactory. How

can any reasonable man state that the operation of a tariff is unsatisfactory under which the trade of the country has increased $150,000,000, in round numbers, in five years? How can any reasonable man vote for such an amendment? I appeal to the common sense of hon. gentlemen opposite whether they can support such an amendment by their votes in view of this great increase under the present tariff. I must say that when the present tariff was enacted I for one would never have dared to predict the enormous results that have resulted from its operation; and I believe that neither of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken in favour of the amendment would have dared to predict that Canada would have seen such a marvellous development in her trade as has taken place.

Now, let me deal with the imports. In 1896 these amounted to $118,011,508; in 1901 they amounted to $190,415,525, or an increase of nearly $90,000,000 in imports alone. The duties collected upon these imports amounted in 1901 to over $29,000,000, and in 1896 to $20,000,000; so that the duty amounts to only about $9,000,000 more in 1901 than it did in 1896. Had the famous old national policy remained in force, instead of collecting $9,000,000 more, the government of the day would have collected a much larger amount in duty upon goods imported into Canada; and if hon. gentlemen who are in favour of this amendment think that the government should have collected many millions more of duty than they did, I beg to differ with them. Now, there is this important point to be noticed, that of all the goods imported in 1901 there came into Canada for the benefit of the people $71,730,938 free of duty. Perhaps it is that particular result of the tariff that our hon. friends opposite object to, it may be unsatisfactory to them in that respect. I have not heard any of them point out in what respect the tariff is unsatisfactory. For my part if all the goods came in free I think the people would be satisfied.

I will refer to the exports. In 1896 these amounted to $121,000,000 odd, and in 1901 to $196,000,000 odd, showing an enormous increase of $75,000,000 and over. I have simply gone into a few of the details of our exports and I would like to refer to them. Take our fisheries, for instance; in 1896 the value of our exports of the products of our fisheries was $11,183,698, while, in 1901, it was $10,000,000 odd, showing a decrease. I think that the fishing industry deserves to be taken up by the government and some improvements made so that the country will derive more benefit from that important branch of industry. There are many ways in which the fishing industry may be improved and the establishment of hatcheries is one way. The government has been doing very well in providing a system of cold storage for preserving fish, and I hope it will go further with that work so that the industry, instead of retrograding shall go ahead. Of animals and their produce in 1896 we exported to the value of $37,404,396, while in 1901, our export of animals and their products totalled $56,299,282. There is an increase of over half as much as the exports five years ago under that famous national policy. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) who spoke last endeavoured to make it clear that the government had not accomplished anything to encourage the development of the cheese and dairying industry of the country. But it is evident, and the country knows it well, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has been introducing the cold storage system into steamers wherever he could. It is already in operation on some steamers, and this year, I understand, seventeen steamers will be equipped with cold storage. This is a system that I believe the hon. Minister of Agriculture is experimenting with, and we cannot expect it to be perfect all at once. If a few losses have occurred, as the hon. member for Wentworth has suggested, this must be expected, because people must necessarily run some risk in experimenting at the outset. But, to further benefit the agricultural interests I would suggest the advisability of establishing more illustration stations throughout the country. If there is one thing more than another that we are interested in it is in advancing the agricultural prosperity of the country in every way possible, and, speaking for my own little province, I can say that the farming community are now in such a position that they understand in a different way from what they formerly did any new methods that are brought to their attention, any improvements that are brought to their knowledge in the working of their farms, and they are ready now to adopt everything along the line of improvement. Of course, the farmers of Ontario for some years have been engaged in a dairying and cheese business and have led the way in those important branches of agriculture. Down in the eastern provinces we are following in their footsteps and we are after all a portion of the same body politic and we wish to share in the general advancement of the country. In agricultural products, in 1896, the exports amounted to $17,900,000 and in 1901 to $38,568,000, an increase in value of more than double the total exports of five years ago. When an hon. gentleman says that this is simply an increase in value, he does not speak by the book, because this is too great an advance to be entirely affected by the value of these products, and I can take the blue-book and show him the quantities set forth proving conclusively that there has been a large increase in the volume instead of the value only having been increased. Of the produce of the mine we exported $8,000,000 worth in 1896, and in 1901 the splendid sum of $40,531,314 was realized from our exports, or over five

times as much in 1901 as in 1896. Of course, the Yukon was opened up, but, possibly, if our Conservative friends had remained in power, it would have continued as it had been since Adam's time. In butter we exported, five years ago, $1,000,000 worth, while in 1901, we exported over $3,000,000 worth, so that hon. gentlemen will see that our exports of butter more than trebled. The hon. member for Wentworth spoke of the slight decrease that had occurred compared with the year before, but he forgot to tell the House that there had been an increase of $2,243,000 as compared with five years ago in the butter trade. There is no doubt that the government are entitled to considerable credit for supplying cold storage wherever they could. They could not force it into steamers, but they have offered subsidies to such steamers as would adopt it. It is remarkable that from Canada we export more butter than they do from the United States. The figures I have of their butter export in 1900 show that they sold $3,142,378 worth, while Canada exported in 1900 $5,429,563 worth of butter. In cheese, in 1896, we exported $13,956,000 and in 1901 we exported over $21,000,000 worth, or nearly $7,000,000 of an increase in our cheese export. Of course, the largest part of this cheese was made in the province of Ontario, but I think our own little province comes second or third on the list, and this is remarkable where there is so much farming land. It shows the farmers there have been benefited by the addresses given by the gentlemen sent down to the island by the government and that a new era has opened up for that province. Everything looks brighter than in the past. This amount of cheese which we exported in 1901 was the largest amount ever exported from Canada. There is no year previous in which the export comes anywhere near to it. It was over $21,000,000 in 1901. Comparing this export with the export of cheese from the United States we find that they sent out $4,939,255 worth, or only about one-quarter or one-fifth as much cheese as we did. In 1896, in eggs, we exported $807,000 worth, while last year we exported $1,692,296 worth, an increase of $885,000, an increase of more than double in the egg trade. In bacon and hams, in 1896, we exported $4,000,000 worth and in 1901 $11,000,000 worth, or nearly treble the amount, and yet some hon. gentlemen grumble about the condition of the bacon and ham industry. In beef and mutton only $28,000 worth were exported the last year the Conservatives were in power, while last year over $826,000 worth were exported, showing an increase of nearly $800,000. Of fruits we exported, in 1896, $1,700,000 worth, and in 1901 $2,000,000 worth. Now, the government deserves credit for taking a greater interest than ever has been taken before in the fruit industry and in horticulture. Of wheat, in 1896, we exported $5,000,000 worth, and in 1901 over $13,000,000 worth. Of flour of wheat, in 1896, we exported $718,000 worth, and in 1901 we exported $4,030,746 worth. Our export of our total grain products amounted in 1896 to $1,000,000, and in 1901 over $4,500,000, with one exception that of the year 1898, the largest export of grain in the history of the country.

I shall not confine my remarks to agricultural products alone, but I shall refer to a few of our manufacturing products in order to show the prosperity that exists in this branch of our national life. I have given a few examples to show that the farmer is marvellously increasing his exports, and now I trust to be able to prove that the manufacturer is benefiting as well. I am not of that class of radical free traders who would favour free trade through thick and thin and deny just favours to the manufacturers or to any other class of people in Canada. I want to see the manufacturer and the farmer working hand in hand and prospering together. I can observe now more than ever before, that in certain portions of Canada our manufacturing interests are deserving of more encouragement than I formerly thought they deserved. I did hold, and I still hold, very strong free trade views, but as one hon. member has said, I believe in practical politics, and I believe in doing what is fair to each section of the country, so that we may benefit as a whole people. Take the manufacture of agricultural implements in Canada, and we find that $1,749,000 worth were exported last year as against $593,000 worth exported in 1896 under the old Conservative tariff. There certainly is an instance where the manufacturer has benefited under the Liberal tariff. Our people are able to manufacture more of these implements and to export more, bringing wealth back to the country, than they did before the Liberal party came into power. Surely there is nothing in that to show that the present tariff is unsatisfactory. I would like some solid sound reason against the existing tariff before I could vote for the amendment proposed by the hon. member (Mr. Borden). It is true that you may find that a few manufacturers complain, but those are the men who want to make money personally. They do not complain because they seek the general welfare of the country. I believe that any manufacturer who wants any change which would be in the general interest of Canada, will get that change made by the present government, but the man who wants a change for the benefit of his own pocket will not and ought not get it at the expense of the country. One gentleman on the other side complained of the number of carriages that were imported into Canada, but I can point him to the fact that over $450,000 worth of carriages, including carts, bicycles, &c., were exported from Canada

last year. I can see no reason why carriages should not be imported into Canada just as well as we export them from Canada to other countries. Again let me point out that $75,000 worth of boots and shoes were exported from Canada in 1896, and that last year we exported $200,000 worth ; in 1896 we exported leather and manufactures of leather to the value of $1,995,000 and last year to the value of nearly $2,500,000. Surely these enormous increases show increased activity in trade. These figures strike me, Sir, as very excellent reasons why we should support the present tariff. Under this tariff the country has progressed by leaps and bounds and when the hon. leader of the opposition proposes that we should change existing conditions, he should be able to give some sound reason to induce us to make the change. That reason I have not yet heard. Reference has been made during the debate to the increase of the public debt. There is no doubt that the public debt has been slightly increased, but we should remember that if there is a large public expenditure it is in the interests of the country that it should be so. If there is any unwise expenditure of public money then it should be condemned, but no man who knows the extent of our country and the resources which we have to develop, will deny the necessity of an increase in the public debt for useful public purposes. I will take some credit to the present government for some features in connection with the increase in public debt, and I will make a comparison. In 1896 we paid in interest on the public debt $10,502,429, and in 1901 the interest amounted to $10,807,954. We are now paying $305,000 more interest on the public debt than we paid five years ago, but on the other hand this government is receiving more interest on its investments than the Conservative government received. In 1896 the government received as interest on investments $1,317,000, and in 1901 we received from the same source $1,784,000 making an increase of $414,833, or a balance in our favour—comparing the interest which we pay now on the public debt with the interest which was paid in 1896, and the interest which we receive now on investment with the interest which we received formerly—a balance in our favour of $109,308. On the whole this government is paying less interest than did the Conservative government, and we are having the benefit of the expenditure of more money in the country. I call that good financing, and I am quite sure that the gentlemen opposite will give credit to this government where credit is due. I repeat that in view of the larger rate of interest we receive on our investments, we are actually paying less interest charges than did the Conservative government five years ago. I shall not trouble the House with a reference to the expenditure because gentlemen on the other side have voted for each item of almost this total expenditure session after session, and to that extent they have endorsed the expenditure. That is the best answer to any complaint that may be made as to the increase of our annual expenditure. As another indication of the prosperity of the country I might mention that the total deposits in the Post Office savings banks alone have increased by $11,000,000. I would point out also that the larger share of our exports during the year have gone to Great Britain. We sent to Great Britain $105,000,000 worth and to the United States $72,000,000. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has suggested that we should follow somewhat in the footsteps of the United States. I take issue with him there. His amendment is intended to retaliate in some measure against the United States. That would be an unwise policy for us to adopt. We as sensible men, must use our judgment and frame our tariff regardless of the tariff adopted by any other country. It would be foolish for us, because they increased their tariff that we should increase ours in proportion in order to hit back. It would be a senseless policy for us to adopt. We are after all but a young country in comparison. Many of our people are living happily on the other side, and the disposition of the United States towards us is, I think, friendly, as our disposition towards the United States should continue to be. They have put up a high protective tariff, but we have the word of the late President McKinley in his last speech that their intention was to reduce their tariff and gradually get it to a revenue tariff basis. I believe that if President McKinley had lived he would have changed the old United States tariff, which undoubtedly was injurious to us at the time it was adopted.

I have now a few words to say with reference to the administration of our railways. The Intercolonial Railway is to-day in splendid condition and its accommodations are equal to those of any railway on the American continent.

Mr. BROCK. Does it pay as well ?

Mr. MACKINNON. It pays better than when the Conservatives were in power; that is the point. You cannot expect a railway to make as good a showing when it is being thoroughly equipped—when new cars are being built, new engines being purchased, new ties and rails being laid. The revenue from the railway in the past year has, I think, been greater than in any previous year. Then, there is the Post Office Department, from which we are all deriving great benefits. A great many new post offices have been opened up throughout the country, and greater conveniences have been given to the people. The new system adopted by the Postmaster General will cause his name to go down to posterity side by side with some of the postal reformers of England.

I cannot close without referring also to the Public Works Department, which we all know to be one of the most important departments of the government. We find from one end of Canada to the other public works being constructed for the general improvement and advancement of the country, and transportation facilities being provided. All these things will help the farmers and manufacturers ; we cannot do without them. We find hon. gentlemen opposite complaining of the increase of the debt, and yet asking for more public works—a very peculiar position to take. I feel satisfied, as a representative of the people, that in every department of the public service we have men in charge who are entitled to the public confidence and the praise of men of good judgment, for their ability in managing the affairs of the country ; and they are led by a leader who is beloved and trusted by our people all over Canada. What is the use of our people sending up this prayer from our churches and elsewhere :

> With bounteous times our cities crown,
> Our fields with plenteousness.

If when that prayer is answered hon. gentlemen come into this House and say that this country is dissatisfied with one of the methods by which this prosperity is brought about.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 20, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright) moved that the third report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of this House be now concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that objection was taken lately in this House to motions to concur in reports being made on the same day that the reports were presented ; and it was thought advisable in future that a notice of motion to concur should be given previously, and the motion could be made later on. The hon. gentleman, therefore, will understand that a notice of motion would be more in accordance with the rules.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 59) respecting the Ontario James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. McCormick.

Bill (No. 60) to amend the Canada Temperance Act and Acts in amendment thereof.—Mr. Flint.

Bill (No. 61) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—Mr. McCarthy.

QUESTION.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT PICTON.

Mr. ALCORN asked :

For what reason is the opening of the public buildings at Picton delayed, as to the post office, as to the custom-house ?

When will the same, respectively, be opened to the public ?

Is a residence for the collector of customs to be provided in said buildings ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). In the absence of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) I would say that the building is now completed and the Post Office and Customs Departments have been notified.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a few observations on the question that is now before the House for consideration. In the first place, I wish to allude to the fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) questioned some of the figures that were quoted in this debate by the leader of the opposition. When the hon. leader of the opposition was speaking, he was interrupted by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce :

I would like to know from my hon. friend what are those 'official statistics.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Year-book.

MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am sorry for my hon. friend if that is all the authority he has to adduce.

Now when I heard that statement, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was a strange statement to come from an hon. Minister of the Crown. I hold here the Year-book, and I remember well that during the last session of parliament there was considerable discussion over an item that was placed in the estimates for the printing and circulating of this book. I wish to quote what the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) said in that discussion over this item :

> This book is compiled from departmental reports, which are generally ready for the public within six months after the termination of the year.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that if this book is to be of any value to the public, if it was right for parliament last year to vote not only the sum of $3,000, but to increase the sum to $4,000, on the request of the Minister of Agriculture, for the production of this book, then I say we have a right to find in this book some information that any hon. gentleman can quote on the floor of this House. If this book is of no value to the parliament and to the ratepayers of Canada, then it is the duty, not only of the government but of this parliament, to strike out of the estimates that $4,000 a year, and discontinue the production of this book altogether. Now let us see if we can verify the statements made by the Minister of Finance from this Year-book. During this debate the hon. Minister of Finance stated, page 1341, 'Hansard,' that the net debt of the Dominion of Canada in 1896 was $258,497,432.77. I turn to the Year-book to find out whether the statement of the Minister of Finance is correct, and I find in that book a statement of the debt of 1896 in exactly the same figure as quoted by the Minister of Finance. I continue for the years 1897, 1898, 1899, and 1900, and a comparison shows that the figures the Minister of Finance quoted on the floor of the House in this debate were also taken from the Year-book. Therefore, I say it is not proper for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to stand up on the floor of this House and cast any reflection on the figures quoted by the leader of the opposition. Now it is generally conceded, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to have a good government it is important that we should have a good opposition in the House. I wish to read just one statement from the leader of the opposition, made in his closing remarks on this question :

> We want a policy of protection to our labour, agriculturing, manufacturing and other industries. We want a policy which will give to our people the advantage in their own market—a policy of Canada for the Canadians and Canada for Canadians means not the less, Canada for the empire as well.

While the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was willing to make the statement that it was the same old policy of the Liberal Conservative party, as a new member, coming into the House for the first time, and as a Canadian, I am proud to say that the policy of the Liberal Conservative party as enunciated by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in this House, is the policy of the forefathers of this country. But the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) ventured to lay upon the Table of the House, and the Table is now covered with them, returns in respect to the census ten years old. Away back in 1891 he made a very long reference to the census returns. I would like to lay on the Table also another statement which is a little more up to date for the consideration of the government and particularly for the consideration of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. Whatever discussion and public opinion there may be as to the correct taking of the census in 1891, I would remind that hon. gentleman, and I do it with no pleasure, because the Liberal Conservative party do not wish to state upon the floor of this House with any measure of gratitude that the population of this country is decreasing, and although there is a great deal said upon the other side of the House as to the splendid prosperity that the people of Canada are enjoying, as I have said, I would remind him that the census taken last year proves that the population, at least, in many of the central counties of Ontario, is fast decreasing. Let me give the hon. gentleman his own riding of South Oxford. It had a population in 1891 of 22,421. Under this wonderful prosperity that we have had for five years under this new government, the population has gone down until last year it was 21,797, or a loss of 624 of the population of the county that the hon. gentleman represents himself. Then, North Oxford, the riding which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) represents, has lost in population in 10 years 773 souls. South Ontario has lost—I will not weary the House with the figures. Halton has lost in population 2,409, Lennox 1,478, East Lambton 1,221, Kingston, the old city where the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce resides, 1,220, West Huron 1,243, South Huron 1,722, East Huron 1,599, North Lanark 1,086, West Lambton 1,427, Peel county 1,780, South Perth 1,523, Centre Wellington 2,824, North Wellington 1,156, North York, lying alongside of the great city of Toronto 1,497, Prince Edward county 1,025, making in all of these central counties a loss from 1891 down to 1901 of 28,469. That would be a document also to be laid on the Table that would be a little more up to date and would be worth the consideration of hon. gentlemen who are talking so much about the prosperity of this country.

But, now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that the Liberal Conservative party are just as anxious as the great Liberal party of

this country that Canada should be prosperous. In the county I have the honour to represent we have been contributing to the prosperity of Canada like other counties. If we have a large measure of prosperity, as I think we have at the present moment, I wish to say that in that county, in the town of Brampton, Ont., we have the largest cut flower business in the Dominion of Canada, and the third largest on the continent of America known as the Dale Estate. The present manager being Mr. T. W. Duggan. That business has now fifty greenhouses with 300,000 square feet of glass, covering 7½ acres. The largest houses are 840 feet long, and the firm are now erecting 21 new houses. When these are completed at the close of this year, there will be 70 greenhouses, covering about 10 acres of land, and having a total area of glass of 400,000 square feet. This institution is three times larger than the next largest in Canada, which is Dunlop's, of the city of Toronto, and the firm employ from 50 to 70 hands, all men who are paid large wages. The output consists of roses, carnations, violets, chrysanthemums and smilax, and a portion of it is exported from the country to the cities of Chicago, Detroit, Rochester, New York and other large centres of the United States. The gentleman who inaugurated this great institution, Mr. Harry Dale, some twenty years ago, saw a future for Canada, and although he was cut off in the very midst of the development of this rose and cut flower industry, it is still growing, and I am delighted to be able to say that last year the output of cut flowers from that institution was $65,000 and that 90 per cent of that $65,000 was sent to the different centres and cities throughout the Dominion of Canada. So that the old story that Canada is the land of snows must be set aside because we are fast becoming a land of roses and cut flowers.

There has been a great deal of talk in this House and in the country in respect to the national debt. I wish to make a brief statement in respect to this question. The national debt stands to-day at $268,480,000, leaving out the odd cents. That leaves a net debt upon every man, woman and child in Canada of $50. We are paying, or we did pay last year, in interest upon this enormous debt, $10,800,000. What does that mean? It means that there is due out of the treasury of this country at the close of each day $29,250 to pay the interest upon this enormous national debt. That means that every hour that we are sitting here and every hour from the commencement of the year until the close of the year, including Sundays, there is due out of the treasury of Canada $1,218 to pay the interest on the national debt. Whatever may be in the reports and statements made by hon. gentlemen on the floor of this House as to the prosperity of Canada, I say that it should be a note of warning to us when we are paying over $10,000,000 simply for the interest upon this enormous national debt. We have had a great many statements from hon. gentlemen opposite about this great national debt and we had a great many promises from them when they were in opposition. Let me quote the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), page 769 'Hansard' of 1893, when these hon. gentlemen were in opposition. That hon. gentleman said :

> Where is the statesmanship of these men who said that they could hold the expenditure to that amount, and have allowed it to increase until it has reached the enormous sum of $36,000,000 ?

Perhaps I ought to read it up to date, and let me read it to this hon. gentleman and say to the hon. gentleman himself and the members of the cabinet : Where is the statesmanship of these men who said they could hold the expenditure to that amount, and have allowed it to increase until it has reached the enormous sum of not $36,000,000 a year, but in the neighbourhood of $55,000,000 a year ? I suppose that it is well we should remind the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) of some of his old promises in connection with that matter.

The members of the Reform party in this House are constantly making the statement here that the tariff is highly satisfactory, and as an evidence of that they point to the increase of revenue we are receiving, and to the great trade that is going on in the country. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I am concerned my opinion is that the present tariff is not at all satisfactory to the people of Canada. Let me give a few examples to account for the faith that is in me in this respect. When the people of Canada wish to send wheat to the United States—and we grow more wheat than we can use in our own country—when we wish to send a bushel of wheat into the United States, we are met with a duty of 25 cents a bushel, while the Canadian duty is only 12 cents a bushel if the American wants to send his wheat in here. On oats the American tariff is 15 cents a bushel and the Canadian tariff is only 10 cents a bushel. On barley the American tariff is 30 cents a bushel, while the Canadian tariff is only 30 per cent, or 12 cents per bushel. On pease the American tariff is 40 cents, while the Canadian tariff is only 10 cents a bushel. On hay the American tariff is $4 per ton, and the Canadian tariff $2 per ton. On apples the American tariff is 75 cents a barrel, and the Canadian tariff only 40 cents. On potatoes, the American tariff is 25 cents a bushel, and the Canadian tariff 15 cents per bushel. On beans, the American tariff is 45 cents per bushel, and the Canadian tariff 15 cents per bushel. On butter, the American tariff is 6 cents per pound, and the Canadian

tariff only 4 cents. On corn, the American tariff is 15 cents a bushel, and the American corn is allowed to be imported into this country free of duty. On wheat-flour, the American tariff is 25 per cent ad valorem, or about 75 cents per barrel, while the Canadian tariff is only 60 cents per barrel.

Article.	American Tariff.	Canadian Tariff.
Wheat	25c. bush.	12c. bush.
Oats	15c. "	10c. "
Barley	30c. "	30 p.c. or about 12c. bush.
Pease	40c. "	10c. bush.
Hay	$4 ton	$2 ton.
Apples	75c. brl.	40c. brl.
Potatoes	25c. bush.	15c. bush.
Beans	45c. "	15c. "
Butter	6c. lb	4c. lb.
Corn	15c. bush.	Free.
Wheat Flour	25p.c. or about 75c. brl.	60c. brl.

I wish to say that so long as the tariff of the two countries remains in that relative position to each other, I, representing as I do an agricultural constituency, will declare on the floor of this parliament that such a Canadian tariff is unsatisfactory to the farmers of Canada. I will tell you why it is unsatisfactory. During the last year there came into this country oats to the value of $946,313; barley to the value of $32,346; peas to the value of $15,943; potatoes to the value of $88,649; tomatoes to the value of $37,508; grapes to the value of $59,915; blackberries, strawberries, gooseberries and raspberries to the value of $80,366.

Imports from United States, year ending 13th June, 1901.

Oats	$946,313
Barley	32,346
Pease	15,943
Potatoes	88,649
Tomatoes	37,508
Grapes	59,915
Blackberries, strawberries, gooseberries, raspberries	80,366

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have in this country, and indeed in the vicinity of many of our large cities, great quantities of land that is suitable for the production of all these articles I have mentioned; I say it is unfair to the Canadian population of 5,500,000 living alongside the American population of 70,000,000; it is unfair to us, I say, that we should allow that enormous quantity of grain and other products of the farm to come into this country while we have millions of acres of land in Canada not occupied at all.

But we had some promises from these hon. gentlemen opposite and I have a record of them here. We had some very glowing promises from these gentlemen when they were in opposition. They told us that when they came into power they would get us reciprocity with the United States, and that cry took with the farmers of Ontario at least.

This reciprocity with the United States can be obtained by those whose hearts are in the business.

A quotation from Sir Louis Davies in 1892.

Put us in and if we do not obtain reciprocity for you turn us out.

Said Sir Louis Davies.

Mr. BENNETT. He is out now.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is another quotation: tion:

If my leader comes into power it would not be a rash prediction to say that within six months from that day by the scratch of a pen a treaty of reciprocity would be in force between Canada and the United States.—(Mr. Fisher, now Minister of Agriculture.)

These are words which were used by the present Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) when he was in opposition.

If hon. gentlemen on this side of the House cross over to the treasury benches I can promise that there will be no difficulty in getting reciprocity with the United States.

Said the Hon. David Mills in 1895. These quotations could be added to by similar expressions used by the present Prime Minister, then leader of the opposition, and by other distinguished Liberals. But, when they came into power they did appoint a deputation, or a commission, as I understand it to bring about reciprocity. I have been looking up the records of the House; I have been making inquiries from hon. gentlemen who have had seats in this House for many years to find out what report this wonderful commission has brought to us in respect to the promises they made to get reciprocity for the people of Canada. Well, I have a report from that commission, but all I can find in that report is an expense account for $34,000. I find that the Prime Minister received out of the treasury of this country when looking for the reciprocity which he failed to obtain, a sum of $3,821. I find that Sir Richard Cartwright drew $3,361; that Sir Louis Davies drew, $2,630; that Mr. John Charlton drew $1,766.

Mr. BENNETT. He is the cheapest and best.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, and I find that H. Bourassa, M.P., secretary, drew $2,200. I need not enumerate these expenses further only to say that they had tips to servants during this good-time commission amounting to $407; they had rooms rented at Washington and at Quebec for which they paid $1,314, and they had entertainments,

banquets, fishing trips, &c., which cost $2,656.58. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I am not correct in this statement, hon. gentlemen on the other side can very easily rise and correct me. So far as I can gather that was the only record that the commission presented to the people of Canada, and that is all the people of Canada get from the promises which the Liberals made that they would secure reciprocity for us.

And now what about the preferential tariff. In so far as I am concerned, I wish to say that the preferential tariff is not at all satisfactory to the people. The Minister of Finance, after the preferential tariff was placed on the statute-book stated in parliament, I quote from 'Hansard,' page 2469, year 1899 :

> Let us not for a moment suppose that our new tariff has not been of substantial advantage to the British manufacturer which he understands and appreciates. . . . . the imports of British goods have not been so large as we had hoped for.

These are two statements made by the present Finance Minister, and I wish to say that I do not accord with these statements. I would rather have a Finance Minister of this country place on our statute-book a tariff, that instead of being of substantial advantage to the British manufacturer which he understands and appreciates, would be of substantial advantage to the people of Canada which they would understand and appreciate. That is the policy the people of Canada desire, as against the preferential tariff.

Now, it is said that some of the manufacturing establishments in Canada are prosperous, even under this tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. Some hon. gentlemen say 'Hear, hear,' and that undoubtedly is true; but there are living examples of the injury this tariff has wrought at different points in Canada. We know that in the town of Cornwall two of Canada's leading gentlemen, Lord Strathcona and Lord Mountstephen, who have great means at their disposal, invested large amounts of money in a woollen manufacturing establishment. Why is that establishment closed up to-day ? Is it for the want of capital ? Not at all; because these gentlemen have given of their means to many other institutions in Canada. Is it because they have lost interest and faith in Canada ? Not a bit of it, because they are proud of Canada's present position and hopeful for its future. But they believe that it is of no use continuing to operate an establishment of that kind so long as the government of Canada keep on the statute-book a tariff that gives a preference to the British workman over the Canadian workman. That is the reason these gentlemen have discontinued operations in connection with that mill, for it cannot now be operated to pay.

Mr. COWAN. How do you account for the fact that the woollen mill at Kingsville, which closed down under the old tariff, is now running night and day ?

Mr. BLAIN. I am not at all familiar with that factory.

Mr. COWAN. The Wigle-Brown factory.

Mr. BLAIN. But I venture to say that if that institution is running to-day, it is because of the principles that have been imbedded in the history of Canada by the Liberal-Conservative party, and it may be that it will continue for a little while. But we have the testimony of the best business men of Canada, on both sides of politics, who have come to this government on deputations, session after session, and, although they have not made much impression on that government, even though the present Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has said that he is a protectionist up to the hilt, I understand that they have made some impression on some of their followers, if we may judge from statements which we have heard in this debate.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Kingsville factory is a gas machine.

Mr. BENNETT. It is shut down while the member is away.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the county of Peel we have three manufacturing establishments which are directly interested in the tariff as it now stands. One is a woollen manufacturing establishment that employs fifty hands. Almost every pound of the raw material which Mr. McMurchy, of Huttonville, uses in his factory, comes from the old country. Here is a sample of the raw material from New Zealand; here is another from Great Britain. In the main this raw material comes from 3,000 miles away. I ask this House, how can they expect that gentleman to continue his business when he is compelled to bring his raw material 3,000 miles across the water, and pay freight upon it, and when he is compelled to pay 25 per cent more for his labour than the manufacturer in the United Kingdom or in Germany ? When he has to bring all his machinery from Great Britain, and when the equipment of his factory costs almost double the equipment of a similar factory in Liverpool or Glasgow, how can it be expected that a man like Mr. McMurchy can develop his business under this tariff, which gives a preference to the British and German manufacturer ? We have also a tweed factory in the county of Peel, at Streetsville, owned and managed by Mr. Brodie, and the preferential tariff is altogether detrimental to that institution. If the preference in the tariff were done away with, that institution could enlarge and develop its business by supplying more of the goods used by the Canadian

people. We have a large boot and shoe establishment in the town of Brampton, the Williams Boot and Shoe Company, and I do not think it is fair to the proprietors of that establishment that in every town in Canada where they sell their goods, they are confronted with boots and shoes made in the United States by people who do not contribute one dollar to the taxes of the Dominion of Canada. I hold that the tariff should be so arranged that every institution in this country which is manufacturing goods to be consumed by the Canadian people should have sufficient protection to keep out the same class of goods made in any foreign country; and I have no hesitation in saying that if that country should be England, the policy of Canada should be framed in the interest of the Canadian taxpayer as against people who are producing the same class of goods even in the old country under the same flag.

Now, I wish to refer to some other statements which have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), in 1898, as reported in 'Hansard' at page 3399, said, speaking about the Intercolonial Railway :

> We shall earn a much larger proportion of money than before ; so much so that not only will we be able to pay $210,000 annually, but there will be a respectable surplus to place to the credit of the country.

Mr. Paterson, the present Minister of Customs, said in 1899, as reported in 'Hansard,' page 2670 :

> Here was a railway that cost this country over $50,000,000, and the policy of the Minister of Railways and Canals has succeeded in making this railway of greater use to the country, and has put it in a position to pay its own way.

These are statements which these hon. gentlemen have made on the floor of this House. I shall now take up the record in order to see whether these predictions have turned out to be true or not. I find that last year this great railway, which was so extended by this government that it was going to pay its own way, had a deficit of $488,186.77 on the running expenses, and there is also charged to capital account $3,652,313.46. That is the way these hon. gentlemen suppose that this railway is paying its way. At the investigation which is now going on before the Public Accounts Committee, it appeared that they have opened a new kind of account, which this House has never heard tell of before—a suspense account; and in that suspense account we find a large sum that ought to have been charged up against the railway last year, so that it does not appear in last year's report as having been charged up at all. Therefore, I say that the predictions of our hon. friends in respect to the running of this railway have not been true predictions, and are not verified by the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask a question. Was the hon. gentleman not present in the Public Accounts Committee when the manager of the Intercolonial Railway said, under oath, that the suspense account was an old account and had been used on every occasion during the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not permitted to refer to anything that has occurred in a committee.

Mr. BLAIN. Then we had a statement from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that if his party were returned to power they would so reduce the public expenditure as to effect a saving to the extent of $5,000,000 per annum. I am delighted to know that the hon. gentleman has undergone some conversion with respect to the tariff, and the people of Canada will still more rejoice if he will stand up like a man in the House and condemn this government for having increased our national expenditure and our national debt. I am quite sure that when he recalls the debate to which I have just referred, he must feel strongly impelled to condemn the extravagant expenditure of this government which had promised to be so economic.

Coming to the record of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) I find this statement made by him, as reported in 'Hansard' page 1,333, in 1882 :

> Now it is quite true so long as we continue having this prosperity the mischief of this may not be so apparent, but even the hon. Minister of Finance will hardly venture to say, in view of our own experience and the experience of the United States, in view of the experience in England, and every country that raises money at all in the same way as we do ourselves, that he has any patent which will enable him to secure a continuance of this prosperity for ever,——

That was the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) when in opposition, and when the Hon. Geo. E. Foster was Finance Minister. He went on to say .

> ——and the moment the check occurs, the moment times become, in the slightest degree hard, then, Sir, our surplus will disappear, but unhappily our taxes will remain. And the scale of the expenditure which the hon. gentleman is now fixing, will remain too ; there is no more difficult task than to cut down, or materially reduce the expenditure of any country, when it has been allowed to attain a certain figure.

That was the statement which the hon. gentleman made when in opposition, and I am surprised, in view of his then expressed opinion, that, having accepted a seat in the government, he should have allowed not only our national but our public expenditure generally to grow to such enormous proportions.

But we have a statement from another hon. gentleman, high in the councils of the

Liberal party, with respect to the office which the Minister of Trade and Commerce holds.

> I must take exception, in the first place, to the office, the Department of Trade and Commerce, ever having been created. I do not see why it was created, unless it was to give a resting place for the balance of his life to the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position, drawing $7,000 per year for virtually doing nothing.

That was the statement made by a former member of this House, Mr. McMullen, when in opposition, and who has since been transferred to the Senate,

> We denounce this expenditure upon superannuation. We will wipe it out when we get into office.

That was the statement made by one of the leading members of the opposition, and yet these people have increased this very taxation which they then denounced and promised to wipe out. 'We demand,' they said, 'the strictest economy in the administration of the government.' This demand you will find in the resolution passed at the Ottawa convention of 1893. 'We are the party of low taxation,' said the Prime Minister, when leader of the opposition. I had the honour myself of hearing the right hon. Prime Minister, when leader of the opposition, make this declaration on the platform in the town of Brampton, surrounded by hundreds of his admirers, prior to the election of 1896 :

> The expenditure of this country has grown until the people are not able to bear it. I promise you that if you put our party into power we will reduce that annual expenditure $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 per annum.

I will not refer to what the expenditure is now, as that can be taken from the statement of the Finance Minister, but let me draw attention to a promise which the Finance Minister gave us when making his statement. It was not a promise that he would meet the views of the deputations which might call upon him. No, he was very careful in that respect, but he promised that next year the debt would be increased about $6,000,000. That was the promise made by the Finance Minister in his last budget speech.

I do not see that I need weary the House any longer upon this question. But there is one great question before the people of Canada, the transportation question, to which I wish to refer before taking my seat. I heard one of the distinguished gentlemen from the other side make the statement in the last session of parliament that out of every hundred bushels of wheat transported from our North-west eighty-five per cent was now sent to the seaboard on American railways and American vessels. When we consider the immense expenditure we have made on our railways and canals, that statement is a very disappointing one, and I am quite sure the people of Canada expected that at this session at least the government would have come forward and laid before parliament some properly matured plan of transportation, and committed themselves to it, that would when completed bring down all this wheat through our own Canadian territory. I am surprised that these gentlemen allow this state of things to continue. The Minister of Public Works is asking money from this parliament almost every day to be spent on private docks here and there. On all these different schemes the government are recklessly expending large sums but they have not expended, nor are they prepared to expend a dollar in procuring expert information as to what would be the correct course to bring that wheat through our Canadian territory to the seaboard, whether by water or rail route or partly both.

I say that the people of Canada have a lasting grievance against this government for having allowed that condition of things to go on year after year, while they spend public money upon wharfs here and there, with no properly matured scheme to place before the people's representatives when they assemble here to discuss public affairs.

The other great question is the question of the population of Canada. In concluding my address, I wish to remind the House that there was some information presented to the House last session with respect to the census taken last year that might be of value in the consideration of this question that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has introduced into this debate. I have here a letter dated Bradford, April 17, 1901, and addressed to the Hon. Sydney Fisher. It says :—

> I am sending you one of the schedules you wired me about. I regret to say that they had been forwarded to each of my enumerators some days ago. I thought they had been sent in the regular way and was under the impression that I was doing my duty by placing them in the hands of the enumerators.

What were these schedules ? Here is a letter which will explain :—

> In reply to yours of the 27th inst., asking information as to the bogus schedules, I beg to say I received these schedules through the post office in the regular way and the general appearance and a make-up of items led me to think they were genuine. At the time of receiving them, I was very busy and did not notice until I had received your message that they were to be sent to the Liberal candidate in each county in Ontario after having been filled in by the enumerators.

These were documents sent out in connection with the taking of the census. They were placed in the hands of men who were paid to take the census of Canada and sworn not to divulge the facts they learned or to make any statement concerning them outside of their official duty. Yet, I have here, copies of telegrams which were sent in connection with these documents. The first is from North York :

Bradford, Ont., April 17, 1901.

Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Ottawa.

Have received such document; am making every effort to have it stamped out.

(Sgd.) CHARLES ELLIOT.

Here is one from Algoma:

Fort William, Ont., April 16, 1901.

Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Ottawa.

Have received schedules but did not give them to enumerators. No authority to do so.

(Sgd.) E. A. MORTON.

The next one is from North Bruce:

Chesley, Ont., April 16, 1901.

Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Ottawa.

I have received the schedule you inquire about; have made no use of them.

Here is a letter addressed to Mr. Blue, special commissioner of census, from Campbellford, and dated 17th April, 1901:

Your telegram of to-day's date reached me too late to wire answer and I accordingly now write you. I have seen the schedule in the hands of some of the enumerators.

And here is one addressed to the commissioner of census from Bancroft, dated 22nd April, 1901:

I way away when your telegram of 17th inst. came to Marmora asking if I had seen or heard of alleged fraudulent schedule. I at once followed up the enumerators and found some of them had blank papers to fill in the names of males 16 years and upwards.

It was discovered by inquiry on the floor of this House that these documents were sent out by some person to the men in charge of the work of the census. I do not think that it will be alleged that the opposition in this House or the Liberal-Conservative party in Ontario caused these schedules to be sent to the officers, considering that these enumerators were asked to fill in the names of all male persons over sixteen years of age and return the schedules to the Reform nominee. I am of opinion that this government should have investigated that case; they should have taken pains to find out who it was who sought to make use of the enumerators and of information gained by them in their official capacity to assist one political party against the other in connection with the revision of the voters' list.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up the time of the House with the discussion of other questions. I desire to say that I am heartily in accord with the resolution moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). We have a leader that the Liberal-Conservative party in this House and in this country are proud of. On this side of the House, you find no division. This government have the advantage of being criticised by an opposition that is not talking blue ruin, but is endeavouring to investigate public questions, and is giving its united influence for the promotion of wise legislation in this House. We are standing behind a leader selected by the party who is not only a credit to the members here but is a credit to the Conservative party in this country; and I predict that in the very near future, he will cross over to the other side and be the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to follow the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) in his arguments. If I were disposed to criticise his remarks, I should find it difficult indeed, considering his very gracious tribute to all of us yesterday in the distribution of the beautiful rose of Brampton. However, should I find it in my heart to criticise him, I should have ample opportunity. The first point on which he laid himself open was in having the temerity to begin with statistics of the census returns of 1891. If there was one topic which the hon. gentleman ought to have avoided this was that one. Admitting his premises in his reference to the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), of course his conclusion would be inevitable. But the hon. member (Mr. Blain) began by assuming that the Statistical Year-book was a proper source to which to go to prove that the remarks made by the hon. member for South Oxford was misleading. Because, forsooth, a reference made by the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) was corroborated by the Year-book, therefore the reference made by the hon. member for South Oxford was erroneous. The hon. gentleman mistates the position of the hon. member for South Oxford—whose cause, however, I do not wish to champion. What that hon. gentleman said was that the Year-book was not a correct criterion, inasmuch as the census returns of 1891 were not correct. It is not evidence that the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford was incorrect, that the Year-book is in accord with the statement made by the Minister of Finance. However, as I stated, I shall not attempt to follow the hon. member for Peel. I do not see what he or any gentleman on the other side has to complain about in regard to the condition of affairs in Canada to-day. I am sure that the prosperity which we now have and which we have had for the last five years does not require statistical demonstration. I do not think that the spectacle of the hon. member for Peel with the Year-book in one hand and 'Hansard' in the other is enough to shut out from view the general prosperity of the country. The hon. gentleman may search all the statistical year-books in existence, and may read the speeches made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House from the time of confederation, yet he will not succeed in

satisfying himself or the people that the country is not prosperous, or that, if the country is prosperous, the present administration is not to have some credit for that prosperity.

I am not one of those who think that the fiscal policy of any country is perfect, or that the tariff of any country is not subject to improvement. I will go so far as to say that there are some features in the present tariff which are not satisfactory to the people of the province from which I come, though the tariff is on the whole the most satisfactory the Dominion of Canada has ever had. But we are confident, in view of the history of the Liberal party since they have been in power, that they will go on from year to year improving the tariff; and we are confident that, upon the administration being satisfied that grievances exist, they will remedy those grievances. There is no use in frivolous criticism, or in harking back to what occurred ten, fifteen or twenty years ago. Let us face present conditions. I think if hon. gentlemen on both sides were to bear in mind that the administration of the country must be regarded as we would regard the administration of any large business concern, if they would bear in mind that the affairs of the country must be conducted upon sound business principles, a great deal of misunderstanding that appears to exist would be cleared away. I think the chief difference between the present administration and the one it succeeded lies in their business methods. We may, for campaign purposes and political effect, raise before the electorate the cry of Liberals and Conservatives, of free trade and protection; but at the same time, underlying free trade or protection, incidental protection or revenue protection, must be found sound business principles, call them by whatever name you please; and a government that departs from sound business principles is bound to mismanage the affairs of the country.

Now, I consider that the great measure of prosperity that we enjoy, the fact that the present administration have taken advantage of an era of good times, is a proof that we have at the head of the administration men of business capacity, men who adhere to sound business principles, and who never lose sight of them. So long as we have men of that kind conducting the affairs of the country, we may be sure they will take all possible advantage of good times. In prosperous times they will make the most of the prosperity, and in times that are not prosperous, a judicious business administration will foster and husband the resources of the country, will adopt a policy of economy and frugality, will keep down expenditure, and will only construct those public works which are necessary and construct them as economically as possible. In times of great prosperity such as we have now, I think it is quite proper for an administration to make large expenditures so long as they can show some equivalent for such expenditures. It is no argument against any administration to say that the debt is very large, that the expenditure is growing, that it is much greater to-day than it was five years ago, or ten years ago. The question is: Have we anything to show in return? That is the test, and I think the present administration have no fear of the application of such a test.

Now, I think that the first consideration of any administration is the welfare of the people. There is a very true expression in one of the letters of Junius, with which you doubtless are all familiar. He says that the ruin or prosperity of a state depends so much upon the administration of the government, that to be acquainted with the character of a ministry we have only to look to the condition of the people. If we find them obedient to the laws, prosperous in their industries, united at home and respected abroad, we may reasonably conclude that the affairs of the country are being conducted by men of experience, ability and virtue. That statement, I think, is as applicable to-day to the present administration as it could be applicable to the administration of any country. That Canadians are obedient to the laws goes without saying; gentlemen on both sides of the House will cordially agree with that statement. That the people of Canada are prosperous in their industries, we have abundance of evidence. That they have been prosperous in their industries since 1896, there is the most cogent evidence. We have only to refer to the budget of the hon. Minister of Finance every year from 1897 down to the present time. The characteristic of that deliverance has been a display of surpluses, in striking contrast with the budget speeches delivered prior to 1896. We have this year, according to the statement of the Minister of Finance, a surplus of $5,800,000. What does that mean? It's elementary meaning is that our revenue has exceeded our expenditure by that amount; and applying the test as you would to any ordinary business concern, is that not a most satisfactory showing? All the people of Canada require to know, I think is that the current revenue for the fiscal year ending June, was $56,800,000, and that the estimated expenditure for the same time was $51,000,000, in round numbers, leaving, as I said, a surplus of $5,800,000. That is evidence of prosperity, it is evidence of a proper handling of the affairs of the country during that year.

As a further evidence of the prosperity of the country, we find its various resources make a satisfactory showing. The products of the mines, the fisheries, the forest, the farm, amount to a very large figure

indeed. We find that the value of the fisheries in Canada to-day exceeds $24,000,000; we find that the value of the minerals this last fiscal year leaped up to the enormous sum of over $69,000,000; we find that the lumber and forest industries exceeded in value $80,000,000; while that great industry, that great source of wealth to the people of Canada, the agricultural industry, exceeded the almost incalculable sum of $600,000,000. Now those are some of the assets of the country with which the present administration has been dealing since 1896, and in the handling of which they have made the very satisfactory showing to which the Minister of Finance referred in his address.

Now I do not wish to dwell at any length upon the general fiscal policy of the country. It is indeed a difficult matter for one to deal with that subject after the able addresses we have had from the Minister of Finance, the leader of the opposition, the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler); and in view of their exhaustive treatment of the subject, it is scarcely necessary for me to go into a general discussion of the trade question.

I shall presume, for a short time, to say something in reference to the province from which I come, the western province of British Columbia, and refer to one or two aspects of the tariff which are not satisfactory to the people of that province. As has often been said to the public and to this administration as well as to preceding ones, the province of British Columbia contributes three times as much per capita in the way of customs and other revenue as do the people of the rest of the Dominion of Canada. The people of British Columbia have to pay a great deal more than this to their fellow-citizens in the east in the way of the increased cost of staple goods, which except for the tariff, the people of British Columbia would be able to get very much cheaper from the American side. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite can get no consolation from any criticism by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House of the tariff as it is applicable to British Columbia. These grievances existed under the old regime as they exist to-day. We have, for instance, merchants in British Columbia, and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will be able to corroborate what I say, who have reason to complain of some of the existing tariff rates in regard to staple articles. Merchants there complain, we will say, of the tariff in regard to the staple article of preserves. There is a specific duty of 2½ cents a pound imposed upon canned fruit, and 3½ cents per pound on jellies, jams and preserves, which amounts, in some instances, to 100 per cent upon the value of California goods of the same quality. We find in the matter of lumber, one of the great industries of British Columbia, that the hardship is indeed great. Lumber coming into Canada, as hon. gentlemen know, is free, while lumber going from Canada to the United States has to pay a duty of $2 per thousand feet, and this imposition bears particularly upon rough lumber shipped to the American side. We find that a small mill located near the international boundary on the American side, has a market both in the United States and in Canada. A small mill, or in fact a large mill, located on the Canadian side, has only the Canadian market, and if the owners wish to go to the United States, they are met with a tariff of $2 a thousand feet. Let us see how this condition affects the construction of international railways like the Crow's Nest road, which is now being built from Jennings, Montana, to the Crow's Nest district. An American contractor can bid for the construction of that road on the Canadian side as well as on the American side. The Canadian contractor, however, in bidding for the American section, must figure upon this duty of $2 per thousand feet on lumber, of course, shutting him out, practically, from securing the contract. Then, about Rossland and in some parts of the Kootenay, in the mining camps, planks and timber are used for mining purposes and most of this lumber is brought from the American side of the line, thus competing directly with the lumber industry on our own side. The supply trade finds itself in much the same position. The mills in Washington, Montana and Idaho, ship their lumber across the prairies of Idaho and Montana by the Great Northern, or the Northern Pacific Railway, into Manitoba and the North-west Territories over the Canadian Pacific Railway, cutting out the products of the British Columbia mills. The people of British Columbia maintain that so long as there are readjustments of the tariff to be made, the article of lumber should not be overlooked. A difficulty is presented by the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, who, of course, properly enough, say that the cheaper they can get their lumber the better it is for them, and they care not where they get it, but the fact is that with the present state of affairs and under the present conditions the American mills will soon have the market of the North-west Territories and Manitoba to themselves, they will have a monopoly of it, and they will raise the prices to the notch at which they had them before the competition of the British Columbia mills was introduced into Manitoba and the Territories. The people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories ought to appreciate the competition of the British Columbia mills more than they do. I am told by people who are competent to form an opinion upon this matter, that the imposition of a fair tariff, a tariff equal to that imposed by the Americans on our lumber, would not in any way increase the value of lum-

ber in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I had the pleasure of hearing the representations made by a very large and influential delegation of lumbermen, men such as Mr. Waldie and Mr. Bertram, of Ontario, Mr. Jardine, of British Columbia, and other gentlemen from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec, who came here, and, before the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), demonstrated, at any rate to my satisfaction, that if a duty were imposed, such as is imposed upon other articles under the tariff, the price of lumber would not be increased to the consumers in the North-west Territories and Manitoba. However, I think, myself, that the government will realize that notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen from Manitoba and the North-west Territories may say—and I think the time will come, and come very soon, when hon. gentlemen from that part of the Dominion of Canada will see—that it will pay the people of Canada to patronize home industry and pay them to insist, as I shall insist, that the tariff—call it what you may, protection incidentally, or for revenue—shall be a tariff of Canada for the Canadians. That is the kind of tariff I want. We want an indiscriminating, equal tariff if we are to have a tariff. I think the country must have a tariff under the present conditions. I am not a protectionist, I never have been a protectionist, and when I go as far as I do, I do not think it is any evidence that I am a protectionist. But, we have a tariff to day in Canada, and we see that there are certain articles that are not in the tariff, that the tariff is not equal, and we want an equal equitable distribution of these impositions.

There is another matter affecting the people of British Columbia to which I wish to refer, and it touches the people there just as much as the matter of lumber. It is the question of lead products. The question of lead products applies almost exclusively to the province of British Columbia. The production of silver lead ores in British Columbia has amounted up to date to $25,000,000, showing that this is no inconsiderable source of revenue and of advantage to the nation. Its production began in a very small way, but by proper development, with railway and smelting facilities and proper consideration by the government, it has increased, as I have said to something like in all $25,000,000. In the year 1899 it had reached the value for the two metals combined of $2,542,758 and for the year 1900 a total of $4,985,676. To give you an idea of the value of this industry, I may state that in 1900 the price of lead on the London market was about £17 sterling per ton, and in that year the production of lead in British Columbia amounted to about 31,000 tons, in value nearly $3,000,000 worth. During the past year 1901, the price in London went down to ten pounds five shillings per ton, but owing to the fact—and it is a very humiliating thing for us to consider—and owing to the fact that the American Smelting and refining Company known popularly as the American Lead Trust, saw fit to withdraw their ore buyers from British Columbia and to refuse to make any terms for the smelting of the British Columbia ores, the quantity produced fell as well as the price. There is in Canada altogether a consumption of something like 13,000 tons of lead in all forms. This consumption is at the present time partially supplied by our own mines, but owing to a peculiar twist in the tariff to which I most respectfully and most emphatically draw the attention of the Minister of Customs ; owing to an inexplicable eccentricity of this arrangement of the tariff, a most important item in the list of lead products consumed in Canada is not supplied from our own lead mines. Of the total quantity of some 13,000 tons consumed in Canada, about 7,000 tons comes to Canada in the form of lead used in paint. As you all may know the lead as it is used in paint is simply metallic lead. As it comes from the refinery it is known as pig lead. This pig lead is subjected to one of several processes by which it is corroded or reduced to the form of what is known as dry white lead and in that condition and being mixed with linseed oil we have the ordinary paint of commerce. Our tariff as it stands imposes a duty of fifteen per cent on pig lead ; (that is this metallic lead that comes from the refinery) and a duty of twenty-five per cent on mixed paint. Here is where the anomally comes in. On dry white lead there is only a duty of five per cent, so that you can see that instead of sending in his pig lead on which there is a duty of fifteen per cent, or his paint on which there is a duty of twenty-five per cent, the exporter to Canada subjects this pig lead to a very important process enhancing its value, and makes it dry white lead and has it sent in here with only a duty of five per cent against it. The consequence is that the very important industry of corroding this pig lead is completely killed in Canada. People will not invest their money in concerns for the purpose of treating this lead in this way when they find there is only a duty of five per cent against the American product, and under the preferential tariff it is reduced to three and one half per cent, so that as regards that commodity we are at the mercy of the American and British manufacturers. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that this is a very important industry, and I hold that if the tariff on that particular branch of that industry were equal to the tariff on the pig lead and on the paint the difficulty would be overcome. I do not mention that at all as an attack upon the principle of the tariff. There is no principle involved in an objection of that kind. The fault is traceable to gentlemen opposite when they were in power. They cannot criticise this tariff. This little ano-

mally runs back to the time of Confederation. These gentlemen opposite are satisfied with the present tariff apparently, because they say it is theirs, and we seem to be quite satisfied because we have made little or no alteration, and particularly none at all this year.

Now, Sir, we in British Columbia have loyally accepted the tariff as we find it. I am drawing attention to these features of it in a friendly way and as a culmination of the many overtures made to the government in respect thereto by delegations and by private representations. We in British Columbia have submitted to this tariff which imposes very substantial taxation upon us in respect to what we consider staple articles, and which taxation is a burden upon us for the advantages of our fellow citizens in the east. I refer to the high percentage per capita which we in British Columbia are contributing in the way of customs and revenue duties. Whether intentionally or otherwise, the people of British Columbia are made to contribute very substantially by having themselves taxed in this way for the advantage of the people in Eastern Canada, and it is nothing but reasonable that we should ask that in respect to those items of production in British Columbia which are susceptible of being benefited by a tariff rearrangement, it is nothing but reasonable that we should ask that these productions of British Columbia should at least be put on an equal footing in the tariff, with those articles which we are obliged to buy in the east. Put us on an equal footing in the tariff, with, at all events, the people on the American side of the line. For instance, if the duty upon bricks is to remain at twenty per cent and upon grindstones at twenty-five per cent, and upon drain pipes at thirty-five per cent, and upon plumbago and asbestos at twenty-five per cent; there is no reason why the duty upon pig lead should not be twenty or twenty-five per cent. If the duty upon ochers which are mere earth dug out of the ground, is to stand at twenty per cent; if the duty upon oxides and siennas is to be twenty-five per cent; if the duty upon fire proof paint dry, which is an iron paint, is to stand at twenty-five per cent, and if the duty on linseed oil with which the paint is mixed is to stand at twenty-five per cent; then we can see no reason why the duty on dry white lead should remain at five per cent, and should not be raised to twenty-five or thirty per cent. Is there anything unreasonable in making this demand?

Mr. CLANCY. The reason is, if the hon. gentleman will permit me—

Mr. MORRISON. I do not want my hon. friend's explanation at the present moment. No doubt it is very interesting.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose you know what it is.

Mr. MORRISON.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not see why the government of the present day, and the Conservative government of the past as well, did not drop on to that apparent injustice to an industry which should be a very important industry in this country. I, in the best spirit, insist on the government taking this matter into consideration. I know that with such a vast country as we have, and in view of the multiplicity of things which the administration has to consider, the chances are that a matter of this kind which might be looked upon as somewhat insignificant, may be overlooked. But Sir, to the people of the Kootenays this is a very serious matter indeed.

Take for instance the condition of silver mining in British Columbia. We have in the Slocan and in the East Kootenay, a silver deposit district that is unparalleled in the world. During the short time that this mineral has been developed and exploited, we have a mine which has only been exceeded in its output on the whole American continent by another mine in Idaho. That is saying a good deal. That Canadian mine is idle to-day. What is the reason? Do you blame the people out there for saying that it is in consequence of this tariff discrimination. Take for instance the other mines such as the North Star and the Sullivan mines, and notwithstanding that they have at their doors smelters like those at Nelson and Traill, yet they are lying idle. The only mines that are working are the high-grade mines, and they have great difficulty indeed in keeping going, owing to the present very low price of silver something like fifty-five cents per ounce. I think this is a matter to which the government should give its immediate and most serious consideration. I must admit that there has been no want of representation on the part of the people who are most interested in this matter; and I trust that at this time next year, when the hon. Minister of Finance makes his budget speech, it will be as satisfactory in respect to other matters as it has been this year, and that, in respect to the matter I have referred to, it will be eminently satisfactory to the people of British Columbia.

To further illustrate the humiliation that must be felt by every Canadian when he looks into this aspect of the tariff, I may say that notwithstanding the fact that the smelters at Nelson and Trail have given to their customers a rate of freight and treatment more favourable by from $2 to $6 per ton than is given to the Cœur d'Alène miners by the institutions on the American side, yet the mines to which I have referred are practically idle—it is hard to say what the reason may be. But the American Lead Trust ignores the British Columbia ore. It will show you the discrepancy there is between the rates on the two sides, to show you that although it would pay the Americans to take the Can-

adian ore, yet they will not do it, and are succeeding in stifling a great industry in British Columbia ; and the government seem to shut their eyes to the fact. Take some of the items in the tariff of the United States, and compare them with similar items in our tariff. Pig lead we tax at 15 per cent ; in the United States it pays 2⅛ cents per pound, or something like 60 per cent. Bar and sheet lead pays 25 per cent in Canada ; in the United States it pays 2½ cents per pound, or about 70 per cent. Dry white lead in Canada pays 5 per cent ; in the United States it pays 2⅞ cents per pound, or 60 per cent. Mixed paint in Canada pays 25 per cent ; in the United States it pays 5 cents per pound. Lead ore comes into Canada free ; in the United States it pays 1½ cents per pound. Under the operation of this tariff the American Lead Trust are able to pay and are at the present time paying their miners in the Cœur d'Alène camps something like $3.50 per 100 pounds for the lead contents of their ore, and they maintain the price in the New York market uniformly at something like $4.15 per 100 pounds. That is to say, the Slocan miner only gets $1.46 per 100 pounds for his lead, as against $3.50 which the American miner gets. So great is the discrepancy that the American Lead Trust could afford to pay the duty of 1½ cents per pound, and yet pay to the British Columbia miner more than he is getting at the present time. Whether it is from loyalty to the United States or hatred to Canada, the American Lead Trust ignore the British Columbia ore, and refuse even to give quotations. They say : 'We do not want to treat with you or deal with you in any way.' In other words, they are absolutely stifling that important industry in British Columbia.

Now, I do not say that the full control of our own market would absolutely remedy this evil ; but I do say that of the 28,000 tons which were produced last year, if even half had been treated in this country, and the money spent here instead of sending it abroad to England, Germany and other countries, the condition would be eminently more satisfactory than it is. We have satisfactory railway and smelting facilities ; but the people of British Columbia think that owing to this defect in the tariff, this industry has suffered to the extent I have pointed out. On the other hand, owing to the action of the government in granting a very substantial bounty last year, a refinery is now being built at Trail, and before the present year is over, refined lead will be there treated, it is estimated, at the rate of 18,000 tons per annum. Before this bounty was paid, it was the custom to ship abroad the bullion for treatment at American refineries. This question of lead is a very serious one indeed, and I hope the government will give it their immediate attention.

We have in British Columbia another grievance ; and the remarks I now make have reference to the prosperity of the people of Canada as a whole. During the last 5 or 6 years our people have been particularly prosperous in many industries. That they are united in sentiment is as palpable as that they are obedient to the laws. I need only refer to the settlement of the Manitoba school question. If there is one thing that tended to unite the people of Canada, it was the settlement of that matter by the present administration. There are other directions in which the government might go to give an earnest of their desire to have the people of different portions of this country still further united. There is a danger on the Pacific coast of a difficulty arising in respect to Chinese and Japanese immigration, and I think that danger is menacing and imminent. In fact, the government considered the matter of such importance that last year at the instigation of my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), myself, and other members from British Columbia, a commission was appointed to investigate the question of Chinese and Japanese immigration into Canada. That commission was appointed early in the year, and very shortly afterwards it proceeded to take evidence on the Pacific coast. That commission visited California, and only the other day made their report. That report is very voluminous, but unfortunately has not yet been published. It has, however, been handed in to the government, and I have had the opportunity of glancing through it. Of course, until it is published and distributed hon. gentlemen will not have that opportunity of discussing it, which I trust they will have this session, and which will be necessary in order to do the matter full justice. However, I may say that sufficient is known by the government and the people most immediately interested to justify the administration in taking immediate steps to cary out the findings of that commission. As far as I could see, there is not one word of information within the covers of that report, which every member, who has ever been returned to this House from the province of British Columbia, has not put before the government at one time or another. The report is simply a reiteration of the old story, and, unlike that made by hon. gentlemen opposite, decides emphatically and unmistakably against the continuance of Oriental immigration. The commissioners have reported that a tax of at least $500 per head should be imposed on every Mongolian coming into this country.

Some 131 witnesses were called. Out of that number 77 were for exclusion and restriction. Only 6 were in favour of unrestricted immigration. The balance were distributed between those in favour of the status quo, in favour of not allowing any more in but not interfering with those who are here, and those in favour of ridding this country of that immigration altogether.

Every line of the evidence, with the exception of the six witnesses I have referred to, goes to justify the administration in bringing down legislation in accord with recommendations made in that report.

The commissioners have the advantage of evidence taken on the American side as well, and there the same story is told. In fact I cannot conceive what argument can be presented against the findings of that report. Some gentlemen will say that there is a trade argument to be considered. They will plead that inasmuch as Canada bonuses steamships, such as the splendid 'Empress' boats, to develop trade between Canada and the Orient, we ought not to embroil ourselves with China by this policy of exclusion. But I would ask those gentlemen to remember that the United States passed an exclusion Act and that this year they have extended the scope of that Act, and yet in spite of that hostile legislation, their trade with China has increased. On the other hand, while Chinese immigration is comparatively unrestricted in Canada, while we have no Exclusion Act, our trade with China has decreased. In the United States the increase of trade with China amounted to $22,000,000 from 1891 to 1900, whereas in the same period the trade of Canada with China decreased from $1,900,000 in 1896 to $860,000 in 1900. So that there is really nothing in that trade argument.

It may be said, however, that it is necessary to have Chinamen in Canada and British Columbia, because there are large tracts of waste land which must be reclaimed, and in the reclaiming of which these Chinamen will do the same good service that they did in California. But there is no analogy in that respect between California and British Columbia. In California there were vast swamps of uncultivated land known as tule lands, and owing to the rush of the whites to the mines and the consequent scarcity of white labour, these Chinamen were serviceable in reclaiming these swamp lands. But no conditions of the kind exist in British Columbia. That province comprises some 300,000,000 acres of land. True many of those acres are mountains, but out of that quantity there must be, at the very lowest estimate, 10,000,000 to 20,000,000 acres of arable land, which we want to keep for white people, and not for Chinamen or Japanese. We do not require coolie labour to make these lands fit for the plough, because there is no better soil under the sun. Although not as extensive as the prairies of Manitoba and the North-west, let me tell you that our arable lands per acre can grow a much larger quantity of wheat than can the soil of Manitoba or the territories. These lands of British Columbia will produce something like 62 bushels to the acre. They will give 99 bushels of oats per acre, and 3½ to five tons of hay. That is a showing which no other lands in the Dominion can make, and we have 10,000,000 or 20,000,000, acres of such lands waiting for people to come in and cultivate them. For such lands as these, we have no need for coolie labour, but desire to preserve that earthly paradise for the people of our own race and blood. Statisticians tell us that an individual can sustain life upon three acres, without the proverbial cow, so that we have space enough for the sustenance of a prosperous community of 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 white people; and we want our government to assist us in bringing those people in and in excluding yellow labour. I do not see why the government will not exert themselves, as they have exerted themselves on behalf of Manitoba and the North-west, in bringing proper immigrants into British Columbia. We have a salubrious climate, and we have fruitful soil. Then—another condition to be considered—we have an advantageous position in regard to exports. To show how productive and prosperous that province is notwithstanding the small population, and notwithstanding what might be called adverse circumstances, I may say that we stand as the third province in our volume of exports in the Dominion. Our exports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, were $21,648,000. Our imports amounted to $11,137,000. Our entries for consumption amounted to about $10,000,000. Of course, this does not represent all the imports for consumption into British Columbia, because great quantities of goods are consumed there that are imported from other provinces. The amount of duty collected on imports into British Columbia direct was $2,358,842. The other Dominion revenues from British Columbia make the total Dominion revenue from that province $2,530,000. Thus we are not only third in exports, but we are third in the amount of duty paid in imports and third in the amount of revenue. That is some ground for our coming here and asking this government to give us assistance in every way in which we can reasonably ask for assistance.

I trust that, when the report to which I have referred is distributed amongst hon. members, they will weigh carefully the evidence that appears there. And if, at present, they have any deep-rooted opinion that Oriental labour is necessary in British Columbia and in Canada, I am sure that that evidence will show them their mistake, and will convince them that steps should be taken at once to remedy evil under which that province exists. As I have said, I regret very much that I have not had time or opportunity to go through the report in order that I might present such an account of its contents as I should like to do, that I might convince hon. members of the truth of my statement that the finding of that commission is one upon which action should be taken by the government. In

that commission's report, there is some very valuable material collected from reports made by United States commissions to investigate this question of Chinese immigration. There is one report, that of the commission which was appointed in 1878, which puts the case in favour of the exclusion of the Chinese in very succinct and unmistakable and incontestable form indeed. I crave leave to refer to it and read a few extracts. It is a very ably prepared report, and I wish to spread out part of it on 'Hansard' so that those who take an interest in this matter may read it:

1. That the presence of the Chinese has had a tendency to degrade and dishonour labour.

2. Their personal habits, peculiar institutions, and lax morals render them undesirable members of society.

3. They cannot and will not assimilate with our people, but remain unalterably aliens in habits, morals, politics and aspirations.

The principal facts upon which these three propositions rest will be briefly considered:

1. The Chinese labourer, in some respects is desirable. He is frugal, thrifty, patient, cheerful and obedient. He readily learns his trade and expertly performs any species of light work. Chinese cheap labour has worked great national benefit to California in its early history, digging its canals, delving in its mines, reclaiming its tule-lands, building its railroads, and in various other ways contributing to the rapid development of its wonderful natural resources. If, therefore, money-making were the only question involved in this contest between the American and Chinese races, it would, in its industrial or labour phase, be promptly decided in favour of the latter. The material advantages of this kind of labour, however, sink into insignificance when compared with the personal considerations at stake—the comfort, the self-respect and decent, honourable living of the labourer himself.

The Chinese labourer does not come up to the American standard of industry. The central idea of our system is that the labourer shall possess courage, self-respect and independence. To do this he must have a home. Home is the mold in which society is cast. There the habits are formed which give character. There the zest and wakeful interest of living center. There the fires of patriotism are kindled. There free institutions find their source and inspiration.

The Chinese who come to this country have no homes. They have neither home feelings nor home interests in any true acceptation of the words. With the conditions of their mode of life they never can have homes. They are willing to work for less wages than will secure homes or comfortably support white labour. In their own country they work patiently and obediently during twelve or thirteen hours for less than one-tenth of what the poorest class of white workingmen receive. In the Pacific states they are willing to work for about one-half the price paid to American operatives. They are able to live upon rice, tea and dried fish, costing upon an average from 20 to 30 cents a day. Underclothing is a luxury almost unknown to them. What clothing they wear is of the cheapest, simplest and coarsest character. They bring with them neither wives, families nor children. One hundred Chinese will occupy a room which, if subdivided, would not accommodate five American workingmen with their families. In such a small space they are packed like sardines in a box, and here they both sleep, eat and cook. Such a place does not deserve the name of home. No tender and loving interests cluster around it, and dull habit alone endears it to them. As enlightened statesmanship would suggest that no material advantages, however great, arising from Chinese frugality and industry, can compensate for the loss of the homes, the comforts and the appliances of personal civilization which have always been enjoyed by the labouring classes of America, and from which springs that spirit of self-respect and manly independence which is the highest result and best security of our political system.

2. Another and more serious objection urged against the Chinese is that their personal and moral habits make them undesirable members of society. The crowded condition in which they live renders the observance of hygienic laws and sanitary regulations almost an impossibility. Neatness and cleanliness is the exception. The air of their apartments is filled with noisome smells and pestilential vapours, threatening disease and death. Property occupied by them is consequently lessened in value and the locality itself is avoided by the white population.

Not only their personal habits, but their moral idea, methods and institutions directly antagonize our own. What we love, they hate; what we admire, they despise; what we regard as vices they practice as virtues or tolerate as necessities.

The religious ideas even of the higher and titled classes in China are pre-eminently wretched; their superstitions numerous and ludicrous, their educational system exceedingly defective, and their civilization effete and decaying. Among the labouring or 'coolie' classes the grade of morals is very low. One illustration of this is seen in their treatment of woman. Her birth is commonly regarded as a calamity. If not destroyed, which is not unusual, she is regarded as a slave and suffers privation, contempt and degradation from the cradle to the tomb. Instances are frequent of the sale for debt by parents of their daughters, and by husbands of their wives, and that too for the worst purposes. Infanticide of girls is practiced to some degree, in all parts of the empire, and in some sections to an alarming extent. Concubinage is a recognized institution. The sanctity and obligation of an oath are disregarded, and the torture is often employed to extort the truth.

Such are some of the characteristics of the class from which nine-tenths of our immigrants come. Respectable persons are deterred both by law and prejudice, and as a rule, only the most indigent and desperate consent to leave their native country. The female immigrants are bought and sold like chattels and practice the most revolting vices and immorality. Born and brought up under these heathenish influences, with these low ideas of law and virtue, coming to our country for the sole purpose of making money, without homes and families without domestic affections or interests; with no high incitements to duty or strong dissuasives from wrong doing; with no adequate sense of special obligation; with no property to pay a fine and with no fear of imprisonment since it brings no greater discomfort or con-

finement than his usual mode of life; with blunted or erroneous perceptions, grovelling thoughts, gross passions, parsimonious and degrading habits, the Chinaman in America cannot be considered a desirable member of society either from a physical or moral standpoint.

3. The third and principal objection, however, to the Chinese is the fact that they do not assimilate with our people, but remain a distinct and alien element. In this respect they differ from all other voluntary immigrants. The German, the Irishman, the Frenchman, have sought our country as a permanent home for themselves and their posterity. Promptly and cheerfully adopting our habits, customs, and political institutions, devoted to our people, to our government and the laws, they speedily become our worthiest and thriftiest citizens, vindicating in the council chambers of the nation their knowledge of our political principles, and illustrating upon every battlefield where liberty has been attacked the patriotism which such knowledge inspires.

It is not so with the Chinese. They have been in this country over a quarter of a century. Their employment as house-servants and labourers has brought them into close and immediate contact with our people, but no change in them has been produced. What they were when they came here they are to-day—the same in dress, the same in disposition, the same in language, the same in religion, the same in political feeling. They indicate no desire, either by word or action, to become identified with us. They came to us not because they were dissatisfied with the social or political institutions of their own country, but because they believed they could better their condition in life. To make money was their sole object. When they have accomplished this they do not invest their earnings in land or homesteads, but return with them to their native China. They come with no desire or purpose to make this their permanent home. So strong is their feeling in this respect that the poorest labourers stipulate, as a part of the contract by which they sell their services, that their dead bodies shall be carried back to China, and thousands have been thus exported. They have no conception of our judicial or legislative system. They cannot be relied on to perform military duty. They are incompetent as jurymen. Indeed, the only purpose in society for which they are available is to perform manual labour. They bring with them neither wives nor families, nor do they intermarry with the resident population. They have an inferior intelligence and a different civilization from our own. Mentally, morally, physically, socially and politically they have remained a distinct and antagonistic race.

Nor, in view of their strong national prejudices, is there any hope that the future will be different. Instances are numerous where an inferior race has been absorbed and improved by a superior one, but the condition precedent to such a result is the acknowledgment on the part of the lower race of such inferiority. Nations, as well as individuals, must conclude that they need help before they are willing to ask or receive it. The Chinese have not, and never will, come to such a conclusion. Their inordinate vanity leads them to believe their country to be the centre of the territorial system, and they therefore call it the 'midland or central nation.'

They boast a civilization which antedates the birth of Christ; they point with pride to a philosopher, Confucius, whose maxims, as the perfection of wisdom, have become their code of laws. They obey a government which, in their faith, is heaven-descended—an absolute despotism, vast, awful and impressive, whose tremendous and mysterious power regulates their lives or decrees their death, and under which liberty is an unknown idea.

Thus intrenched behind national prejudices, they are impregnable against all influences, and remain a great, united class, distinct from us in colour, in size, in feature, in dress, in language, in customs, in habits, and in social peculiarities. A nation to be strong must be homogeneous. All the elements that attach themselves to its society should be assimilated rapidly into one harmonious and congruous whole. It is neither possible nor desirable for two distinct races to live harmoniously in the same society and under the same government. If this single proposition be true, the conclusion is sound that Chinese immigration should be restricted or prohibited. This conclusion, however, is strengthened by the facts already stated, showing its evil effects upon the industrial and social interests of our people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the very able presentation made by this commission in 1878. The presentation made by the commission, which was handed down the other day, is equally strong, in fact, being more recent evidence, it is stronger than the previous presentation. Some people say: You must allow these Chinamen and Japanese into the country and treat them as the people of the United States treat the negroes. There is no analogy in the world between the negro question and the Chinese and Japanese question; there is no analogy inasmuch as the negroes were not a civilized people. They were not a civilized people when they were taken hold of. The first civilization they knew was the Christian civilization, and they submitted to it, and became incorporated in the body politic of the United States, or of any other Christian country to which they may have gone. That statement applies to any other savage nation; but the Chinese are an old civilized nation, they boast of an older civilization than our own. They have the idea ingrained in them that they are a superior people; and anybody who knows anything about a Chinaman is aware that a Chinaman looks with the utmost contempt, in nine cases out of ten, upon white people. They look with unconcealed contempt upon white women, and would show that contempt in various ways were they not in fear of chastisement from white men. So the case of the Chinaman is totally different from that of the negro. Some entertain the hope that in receiving the Chinaman and treating them well, we would be much more likely to engraft them upon our Christian civilization. Such a thing in my opinion is absolutely impossible; and I make the statement which may appear heterodox, and which I dislike to make very much indeed, that I do not think there is any chance of

ever Christianizing a Chinaman whilst he holds the opinion that his religion is superior to the Christian religion. He will pretend that he is a Christian, because he is brainy enough and astute enough to know that he can thereby advance his own interests, and he knows that he is better off in a Christian country. In fact, I do not know of one argument that can be advanced in favour of Chinese immigration. However, the present administration, which has by its policy succeeded in uniting the people at home, I know will go a step further, and make our population more homogeneous by giving us relief against this Chinese onslaught upon the nation, a relief which the people of British Columbia so much desire.

The policy of the government in respect to labour questions is inconsistent with any policy admitting Chinese immigration. How can the government reconcile the labour policy of the Postmaster General with the policy of admitting these Oriental hordes? Of what avail is his 'Labour Gazette,' and his Labour Department, and his machinery for inaugurating and carrying out labour legislation, if, on the other hand, he permits such an anomaly in our political economy to remain as the existence of such an antagonistic element as the Chinese and Japanese? A government which has passed legislation in favour of labour, such as we have had, a government which has done away with the sweating system which grew up under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, a government which has done away with long hours and unsanitary conditions, a government that has inaugurated a system of current wages and has introduced a fair-wage clause in government contracts, a government that has adopted the policy of giving government work to Canadians, that has introduced the conciliation and arbitration principles into their platform, that has made provision for the safety of the labouring man in mines and on railways—surely a government that has done all these things cannot, consistently with their past and present policy, allow this Chinese and Oriental immigration into the country. We must, Mr. Speaker, perpetuate government by the people and for the people, and we cannot do that if we allow Chinese and Oriental immigration. We cannot do that if we allow an element which will destroy our political economy to become established in this country. The government must be an example in every way. It must be an exemplary employer, and I am sure that the government would not for one moment consider the advisability of allowing Chinamen to be employed upon its works, and if it does not allow Chinamen to be employed upon its works, why does it encourage the employment of Chinamen in the industries of the country? It is an absolute inconsistency, and I am quite sure the government will not do so. A Liberal government must preserve the government and resources of Canada for the people of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word in conclusion as to the way we are respected abroad. I have in a very slight way shown that we now enjoy a measure of prosperity unexampled in the history of Canada, that we are united and comparatively satisfied with our present state of affairs. To make the text complete I crave to refer very briefly to the way in which Canada is looked upon abroad. The London 'Times' after the preferential clauses of the tariff were introduced saw fit to make this reference:

> The new departure (the Preferential Tariff, 1897) is most gratifying to all who desire to see the empire knitted more closely together. It is the most remarkable step yet made towards the fiscal confederation of the empire.

The 'Daily News' said:

> As patriots we welcome this significant display of attachment from the greatest of our colonies, and as Liberals we congratulate the leader of the Liberal party of the Dominion.

The London correspondent of the New York 'Times' wrote:

> For the first time in my experience England and the English are regarding Canadians and the Dominion with affectionate enthusiasm.

The London 'Financial News,' a paper that the people of Canada should regard with a good deal of esteem, said:

> We are not grateful merely for what Canada is doing for the mother country in the field, or in the less glorious sphere of commerce. What appeals most strongly to our instincts is the splendid example Canada is giving to her younger sisters.

The 'Bullionist,' another financial paper, said:

> We make bold to say never in the history of an English dependency, and rarely in the history of the mother country, has a finance minister been able to conclude his annual statement with such a stirring peroration as Mr. Fielding in the Dominion of Canada on Friday.

Referring to the presentation of the budget on that occasion. Then, we have, in regard to the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and his great work for knitting the empire together, the letter of Mr. Henniker Heaton in respect to the hon. Postmaster General's efforts in behalf of penny postage. He gives credit to the hon. Postmaster General for the inauguration of penny postage and to that extent taking another step towards unifying the empire. Now there is an abundance of evidence of the highest esteem in which the people of Canada are held abroad, and I am quite confident that I have conclusively shown that the people of Canada are obedient to the laws, that they are prosperous in their industry, that they are united at home and respected abroad. That being so, I am quite confident that you, Mr. Speaker, will agree with

me that we are justified in assuming that the affairs of the people of Canada are in the hands of men of ability, experience and virtue.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, the fiscal relations of Canada with other countries and especially with the United States at the present time excite a very great degree of attention and interest in the public mind. It is a question which deserves and calls for our careful consideration and deliberation. It may not be, Sir, that revision of our policy at the present time, or definite action of any character is desirable, or called for, but some action of that character is inevitable in the near future, and it is in the highest degree important that the facts relating to our fiscal relations with various countries should be discussed, and should be made generally known to the public. I propose, to-day, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, to make a few references to some events in the past history of the legislation of this country which I think are, in the highest degree, pertinent to the condition of things that exists to-day. I had a great deal of pleasure a short time ago in listening to the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), and I can endorse most fully his encomiums as to the good character of the administration of the Mackenzie government, and his speculations as to what would probably have been the outcome of that policy had they continued in power. There is one thing in connection with that administration which I think the administration in power may profitably take into consideration. We had, in Canada, in the early years of the Mackenzie administration, a strong protectionist feeling. That was a question which was discussed to some extent when I first entered politics in Canada in 1872. It was a question which received a good deal of attention in the years 1874, 1875 and 1876 in this Canadian House of Commons. There were in the Liberal party, among the supporters of Mr. Mackenzie, a number of members who believed that the duties should be advanced and that the government should adopt a protective policy of a moderate character and to a limited extent. This policy was advocated by the members for the city of Hamilton who were supporters of the government, by the members of the city of Montreal, who were supporters of the government, by the members of the city of Toronto, by the member for South Brant and by myself. The rate of duty upon the great mass of our importations then was 17½ per cent and the request made by the members of this House and supporters of the government who represented this demand for some advance in the duties was that the duties should be advanced from 17½ per cent to 25 per cent. But, it was well known that an advance to 22½ per cent would have been acceptable and it is even probable that an advance of 2½ per cent, or to 20 per cent, would have allayed the protectionist feeling that existed and would have been accepted with some degree of allowance and grumbling as a solution of the question by those who were demanding an increase of the duties. These demands, it is not necessary to say, were of the most moderate character. There were good reasons for adopting this policy. The revenue of the country was insufficient to meet the expenditure even with the careful and economical administration of Mr. Mackenzie. It was an era of deficits and it would have been the most proper thing in the world to have increased the revenue to a sufficient degree to meet the absolutely necessary expenditure of the government. It would have been done, and very little more than have been done, by the increase of the duties that was asked for.

I do not know—and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is not present to say—I do not know what the actual desire of the Mackenzie government in reference to this matter was. I suspect however—and I think I have good reasons for the suspicion—that the Mackenzie government were willing to advance the duties to 20 per cent or even to 22½ per cent. But the Minister of Finance of that day was waited upon by a delegation of the members from the maritime provinces headed by the Hon. A. G. Jones, then member for Halifax, and was informed by that delegation that if any advance in the duties was made it simply meant that there would be a bolt of the supporters of the government from the maritime provinces. Well, the members who advocated this policy and who were the supporters of the government in the west, hardly felt justified in taking so extreme a position as to threaten the Mackenzie government with their condign displeasure if it did not meet their wishes, and consequently the government, if it had any intention to advance the duties, abandoned that intention and surrendered to the threats of the Liberal members from the maritime provinces.

At that time we were on the eve of a rearrangement of party issues. If the Liberal party had advanced the duties even by a bare 2½ per cent on the 17½ per cent list, we have reason to suppose that the then opposition would have met that advance by a denunciation of the adoption of a protective policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. We have reason to suppose so. The advance of the duties, however, was not made. The Minister of Finance in his budget speech in 1876 set at rest our speculations, our doubts, our aspirations and our desires by announcing—as has been announced on the present occasion—that there would be no change in

the tariff. That speech was made in the afternoon. The Finance Minister closed his remarks just a little before six o'clock, and in the interval betwen six o'clock and eight o'clock—unless the opposition had deliberated upon this question before, and had resolved what they would do in case the government did increase the duties, and had also made an alternative resolve as to what they would do if the government did not increase the duties, which I am doubtful of—in the space between six and eight o'clock the opposition had decided upon its course; had decided to strike out a bold course; had decided to adopt the policy of protection; had decided to denounce the position taken by the Finance Minister and the Mackenzie administration, and tabled a resolution calling for a readjustment of the tariff of Canada upon protectionist principles.

Well, Sir, we all know the result. Our chances were thrown away. I fought for an increase in the duties, for I believed that the salvation and the existence of the Liberal party depended upon the government taking the course that my friends and myself then advocated. We failed. The duties were not increased. The policy outlined by the resolution of Sir John Macdonald became the policy of the Conservative party. We went to the country upon that issue and we sustained a crushing defeat. Now, Sir, the leader of the Reform government of that day, and the ministers of his administration, in my belief had not the slightest anticipation that they were in danger. They had not the slightest degree of realization as to the character of public sentiment in the country. I felt it. I went to my constituency and held meetings for the two years that elapsed before the elections. I held twenty or thirty meetings in each year, because I felt that my position was in danger. I felt that as a supporter of the Mackenzie government I was liable to be defeated, and in June, 1878, I wrote to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. I had previously implored our friends to go into the field, to hold meetings to combat this new principle, and I had warned them if this was not done they were in danger. I wrote as I say, to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie in June, 1878, telling him that in my opinion his government was in a dangerous position, that in my opinion they were resting in a fancied security, and might wake up upon the realization of disaster. I advised him to postpone the date of the elections and to take measures to have this question thoroughly discussed in every riding in the Dominion, and to have this protective policy combatted by good speakers everywhere. Well, I suppose that my good friend Mr. Mackenzie had some little sympathy for me, a poor deluded member from the west who had got scared and who did not realize fully how safe the government were, and how little danger there was of this heresy taking possession of the public mind. The hon. gentleman had the kindness to write me a long letter, to disabuse my mind of the false impressions I had imbibed; to show me that really I failed entirely to apprehend the drift of public sentiment; to assure me that the government was perfectly safe; that there was no danger at all; and that it was folly for me to borrow trouble. He went on to enter into details and to show me the ridings we were sure to carry, the ridings we might possibly loose, the ridings we might possibly gain, and he wound up his survey of the field by the assertion that he would come back to power with a majority of 60 members in the House of Commons. Well, I did not believe it, but when the thunderbolt fell on the 17th of September I must confess that I was paralyzed, for I had no anticipation that there would be a majority of 60 on the opposite side. But such was the case.

Now, the mistake of the government of that time was simply this. They underrated the force of the currents of public sentiment that pervaded the country. They did not realize how strong a hold this doctrine of protection had taken upon the public mind. They failed even to take advantage of the circumstances they might have taken advantage of, by combatting vigorously in every riding in the Dominion this so-called heresy. They failed to do it, and they were beaten.

The opposition party came into power, came into power largely because the Liberal party had failed to understand the drift of public sentiment, and because the Liberal party had refused to do what was a reasonable thing, and a thing they ought to have done. They had refused to make a slight concession to this protectionist sentiment that pervaded the country. What was the great difference between a tariff of 17½ per cent, and a tariff of 20 per cent or even 22 per cent. Each was a revenue tariff. The one was a little more protective than the other incidentally and that was all. However, this concession to public sentiment was refused by the Liberal party and the party fell. Sir John Macdonald came into power. Now, Sir, I am bound to say that the policy inaugurated by Sir John Macdonald—that the changes made by that hon. gentleman were not violent changes; that the changes were not in the strictest sense of the word what might be called radical. It is true that a protective policy was adopted; a moderately protective policy I am bound to say in the light of past events, and speaking as I want to speak candidly and with a desire to present the truth. The duties under the Sir John A. Macdonald tariff were about half as high as the duties in the United States under their protective tariff; they were what we may reasonably assert to have been moderate duties. We went on under that policy for eighteen years; and during all that time we had been dealing with states which, with the exception of

Great Britain are protective states—the United States, Germany, France, Russia—all highly protected; only one example of a free trade nation standing out in the whole field—the example of Great Britain.

In dealing with this question, it is easy enough to take the position of a doctrinaire, and to say that this or that corresponds with the teaching of political economy, and that nothing else can be correct; but it seems to me that the proper course for us to pursue at this juncture is to be governed by practical conditions. Theories are all right, but theories may not be applicable to the conditions; and we should be governed by practical conditions. Now, I am afraid I shall be considered an inconsistent man.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is no trouble about that.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend says there is no trouble about that. I must confess that I cannot hold on to the doctrines of absolute free trade, as my hon. friend does, in the light of the experience I have passed through and the knowledge I have obtained. I am afraid that I must confess that I am slightly inconsistent, that I sometimes change and modify my opinions; and on this question I have reached conclusions by a process of reasoning founded on conditions which have come under my notice.

For instance, with regard to our trade relations with the United States, when I became a member of the Joint High Commission, I commenced to analyse the American trade returns; and I found before I had worked at them long, that I had been quite ignorant of our trade relations with the United States, and that the same degree of ignorance had characterized the great mass of the Canadian people. As I proceeded to analyze these trade returns, I found that the policy which the United States had pursued against Canada since the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty had been a positively unfriendly and hostile policy—a policy conceived by the desire to keep us from growing and prospering; and that under the operation of that policy of repression they had kept our exports to the United States stationary from 1866 down to this present moment, while we had left our markets open to them through the operation of moderate duties, and they had marched in and practically monopolized the supply of manufactures to the Dominion of Canada. Well, I said, this is not right; something needs to be done. Whether I am a free trader or a protectionist, or whatever my antecedents may have been, this is a condition of things which requires readjustment; it is a condition of things which is not proper or desirable or in our interest to allow to continue. Thus, by a course of experience, of study, of inquiring into the facts, I confess that I have to some extent modified opinions which I may have entertained some years ago. Changed conditions and changing conditions must ever modify opinions; and the man who does not change or modify his opinions, is a man who does not grow—is not a progressive man; is not an intelligent man; is not a man who is influenced by his environment as he ought to be.

When I issued my address to my electors at the last general election, I was, I think, the first public man in Canada to give public utterance to the views which I entertained with regard to our American trade; and I judge that those views were acceptable to my constituents, because I was elected by acclamation; and I think I am justified in making the prediction that the views which were enunciated in that address, and were accepted by the electors of North Norfolk, Conservative and Liberal, are views which will be accepted by three-fourths of the electors of Canada. As a Liberal, I stand here to make these statements, because, so far as my own influence and voice can prevent it, I do not want my party to be in ignorance of these facts or to take a position or enter upon a line of action without being fully aware of the conditions that exist. The government, of course, are not, in my opinion, called upon to take definite action in this matter now. When I tabled a resolution here on the 24th of February, I did so, not for the purpose of defining an issue and challenging the issue as between the government and the opposite party. It was not with that intention at all. I approve of the policy of the government in taking this matter into consideration—in deferring their conclusions as to the course they will pursue, and in the meantime ascertaining what will be the result of the conference at London in regard to the relations of the various parts of the empire to each other. While I sustain my views by every argument which I can advance, while I believe in them and commend them to the consideration of the government, I do not expect that the government is to take them into consideration with a view to definite and final action this session.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CHARLTON. I had stated, Mr. Speaker, just before you left the chair at six o'clock, that the change in our fiscal policy, consequent upon the success of the Conservative party in 1878, could not fairly be termed a radical one. And in the same connection, Sir, I would say that upon the defeat of the Conservative party in 1896 and the establishment of the present government, the changes made in the fiscal policy of the country were still not at all radical

in their character, with the exception of the feature introduced into the tariff, termed 'the preferential policy.' With this exception, the changes were comparatively slight, and the policy pursued by the previous government was, in a large measure, continued. The promise of the Liberal party to reduce the taxation from the customs duties was, in a measure redeemed by the adoption of the preference in favour of Great Britain—the preference, first, of 12½ per cent, then increased to 25 per cent, and later to 33⅓ per cent. I have never been very enthusiastic about this preference. It was, of course, a method for reducing taxation. It was an indirect, but nevertheless an actual reduction of taxes from customs, so far as the importations from Great Britain are concerned. And to this extent and in this respect those who advocated the policy may feel justified. However, to me it has always seemed that we receive nothing in return for this concession. We are left in the English markets upon exactly the same footing as that occupied by all foreign states. The preference was a sentimental one, an evidence of our good will for England, it was accepted as such, it promotes good feeling, but I think that, so far as a mere expression of sentiment is concerned, a preference of 12½ per cent would have been just as effective as the highest preference. It has wrought consequences that are not such as we can felicitate ourselves upon, because it has reduced the protection enjoyed by certain manufacturing industries below the point this protection should stand at. For this reason I think it would have been a commendable act if some change had been made in the tariff this session to meet that condition of things which has been created by the unusualy reduced production to the woollen industries. However, it is difficult for a government to meddle with the tariff, and a government necessarily shrinks from such a step. It was specially natural for the government to shrink from interfering with the tariff in this case, when it avowed its intention, after the London conference was held and certain conditions settled, so that we may know where we are, to revise the fiscal policy of the country.

Mr. CLARKE. When was that avowal made ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think we had from the Minister of Finance practically the statement that while the tariff would not be taken up and changes made this session, it would receive the attention of the government another session. And I do not think, if it should receive the attention of the government, that the government can fail to rectify certain abuses that now exist.

I, of course, differ in opinion from the Minister of Finance because it seems to me that the proper time to stop a leak in the roof is when it leaks. But that is a mere matter of opinion, and we will have the matter adjusted later on and in a way I trust satisfactory to all. Now, Sir, as I stated just before recess, it is evidently the intention of the government to carefully consider all these questions that are the subject of discussion at present. It is evidently the intention of the government to see what will be the outcome of the conference to be held in London before making any change in the tariff. It is evidently their intention to place themselves, first of all, in the position of knowing all the conditions and being able to deal intelligently with the fiscal question that may confront them when this House is convened again. In the meantime, I hope that the Minister of Finance in particular will ask himself the question and will proceed to make investigation for the purpose of answering that question satisfactorily to his own mind why nearly all the states, all the nations of christendom, are protective nations except Great Britain ? Is it some insane fatuity that prompts these countries to adopt protection? Are they utterly ignorant of what pertains to their best interests ? Are they rushing blindly and madly upon a course that will land them in serious difficulties and ruin ? Are we to suppose that all these governments are acting without a knowledge of the circumstances best calculated to promote their own interests ? Why, it is natural for a great nation to desire to be self-sustaining, to desire to create within its own borders every variety of industry, to seek to attain that position where it will be independent within itself, where it will have every branch of business carried on and every variety of working men employed in these various branches. And this realization may be attained, must be attained, at the cost of some sacrifice. The question is whether the result is worth the sacrifice. It is worth the while of a nation to impose upon itself conditions which temporarily cost money and entail difficulties and disabilities for the sake of the good that lies before it. That is a question worth while considering.

And how, at this present moment, is Great Britain standing up against this prevalent policy of protection, on the part of nearly every nation with which she has commercial transactions ? Is she maintaining her relative position that she occupied thirty years ago ? Has she command even of her own markets ? She has not. She finds her rivals, the manufacturers of Germany and United States and of France, selling goods in her own markets, underselling her own manufacturers. She meets in every common market the keen and bitter competition of Germany and the United States, and a competition which naturally is growing more formidable. She finds it difficult to maintain her position in many lines. The United States has obtained

command of the iron and steel market. It has increased its exports and manufactures, within a very limited number of years, to over $400,000,000 per annum, and when the Isthmian canal is built, the United States will give Great Britain competition in the open door markets of Asia that will trouble not a little the British manufacturers. In our common markets to-day, Germany and the United States are the formidable competitors of Great Britain. Are these two great nations, are their institutions and their development, an evolution from the free trade ideas of Cobden? Not at all. These competitors of Great Britain have been created by a stringent and effective protection, and without the inauguration, adoption and continuance of that policy, these nations would never have attained the position they occupy to-day. These are matters for grave consideration. Why are nearly all the nations in the world protective? Why is it that some common impulse impels these nations to adopt a policy that will develop their resources and enlarge the operations of their labourers, give them a great variety of interests and multiply and fortify their industries? It is because they feel that this is necessary to their development as a nation.

Let us give some little attention to the effect of protection in the United States—the country with which we have the most intimate trade relations, with which we must in the future have the most intimate trade relations, that will have more influence on our destiny than all the rest of the world, in all probability.

Mr. CLARKE. Notwithstanding the preference.

Mr. CHARLTON. Notwithstanding any other influences which may intervene. The protective policy of the United States, I am free to say, has been an extravagant one. It has wrought many evils in that country.

An hon. MEMBER. It is doing so now.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, I admit the truth of that assertion. These evils have been wrought by the fact that the protective policy of the United States, the instrument they use, they applied with too great rigour; that, where moderate duties, such as we have in Canada were sufficient, they have adopted extravagant duties; where a 30 per cent duty was enough, they would have, perhaps, 60 per cent or 75 per cent. And manufacturers in the United States, where they have been able to combine, have been in a position to charge the domestic consumer very much higher prices than they could afford to export for, and did export for. These are evils attending the system, they are evils which are the consequence of the application of the system in a way which was beyond the means required for the development of the industries of the country. But, notwithstanding this, it would be folly to deny or to attempt to minimize the effects which protection has produced in the United States, a country which, to-day, is the greatest manufacturing nation on the face of the globe; a country which, last year, produced more goods than Great Britain and France combined; a country which produced, last year, $13,000,000,000 worth of manufactures; a country which, last year, exported $400,000,000 worth of manufactures; a country which is increasing its export of manufactures with marvellous rapidity. All these things, whether they make a desirable consummation or not, are the results of the system of protection which has been in vogue in the United States, and which has been continued continuously and consistently for over forty years.

It would be interesting to see what the condition of the American export and import trade has been in the period anterior to the period of protection and succeeding the adoption of protection. I draw the line between the two periods; at 1875, although the Morrill tariff was passed in 1861, but the civil war and the inflated currency prevented the system of protection from having its full effect at once. The full and fair results of protection were not attained until the country had emerged from the difficulties attendant upon the war and had resumed a specie payment. And, so I take the year 1875 as the beginning of the period when protection was in full force and the results of protection were fully attained. From 1790 to 1874 is a period of eighty-four years. During that period there were fifteen years when the United States had a balance of trade in its favour, the aggregate amount of these balances being $152,723,000. During the same period, there were sixty-nine years when the balances of trade were against the United States, and the aggregate amount of these balances was $2,150,000,000. Now, the period from 1875 to 1901 is a period of twenty-six years. During that time there were twenty-two years when the balance of trade was in favour of the United States, and four years when there was an adverse balance. The favourable balances aggregated nearly $5,000,000,000, while the adverse balances aggregated $69,000,000. In the last four years the favourable balances of trade in the United States aggregated $2,354,000,000, and, last year, the balance of trade in favour of the country was $664,500,000, and of that amount we provided $71,000,000. Now, these are conditions which I think must convince any candid mind that protection has wrought certain results in the United States; that, whatever may have been the abuses of the system, however crude and improper may have been the application of the details of the system, it has made of the United States the

greatest manufacturing nation on the face of the globe. It has increased, as I shall show, presently, its output of manufactures at a marvellous ratio, and it has put the United States far in the van among the nations of the world in the productions of manufactures. In 1860, the census returns of that year gave the production of manufactures in the United States as $1,885,861,000. In 1890, the production of manufactures was $13,000,000,000. The increase of manufactures in this period was at the rate of 688 per cent. In 1860, the population of the United States was 31,000,000; in 1890, it was 76,000,000. The increase of population in that period, therefore, was 145 per cent, while the increase in the production of manufactures was 688 per cent. These figures tell their own story, and that story is that, protection has not been a failure in the United States; that story is that the United States has attained a position among the nations of the globe which makes it the wealthiest nation under the light of Heaven, the greatest manufacturing nation in the world, perhaps the most powerful nation in the world, a nation with its industries developed to the fullest extent, a nation supplying its own wants and seeking the markets of the world, a nation with an educated class of operatives, men of intellectual character, and capable of performing a great amount of work—for it is said that, notwithstanding the high rate of wages in the United States the dollar will purchase more work in the line of manufactures than in any other country. Now, the United States has reached at this moment the position where these excessive rates of protection are unnecessary, has reached a position where protection can be dispensed with, as that country can compete with every other country in the world on equal terms, and without favour either in her own markets or in the markets of the world.

Now, this is what I have to say with regard to protection in the broad field of its operation and application in the world. I have given more particularly and in detail the results in the United States, but the fact that this policy has been adopted and is continued in Germany, Russia and France is evidence, I think, that it must be producing practical results in the same line, or it should be repudiated in those countries.

Now, I come to the consideration of our own trade relations with the United States. I think, Sir, the spirit of the American policy towards us should affect the spirit that we show toward the United States and our policy toward them. I state that as a fact in my belief—that, whatever would be abstractly desirable, concrete conditions should govern our action rather than theories, and that the policy of the United States toward us, the conduct of the United States toward us, the spirit of the United States toward us should have an influence and a direct influence, upon our action, conduct and spirit toward the United States. What have been the salient features of the policy of the United States toward Canada? In 1854, we secured from that country a very desirable and favourable treaty. That treaty remained in operation for twelve years. Under its operation our export trade with the United States quadrupled, and our import trade with the United States increased in almost the same proportion. That treaty conferred upon both countries unmixed advantages and blessings. Although our exports to the United States were slightly in excess of our imports, that was owing to exceptional circumstances, the existence of the civil war in the United States and an abnormal demand for animal products and farm products. Yet, it is certain that, when the war had ended and matters had adjusted themselves to their usual level, our importations from the United States would at least have equalled our exports to that country.

Now, that treaty was abrogated in 1866 without cause, abrogated in a fit of spleen, abrogated in face of the fact that, to offset the exhibition in the Canadian Assembly at Quebec of a little pro-confederate feeling, we had sent 40,000 men to fight in the union armies; and that the great mass of the people of Canada sympathized with the north. I say in face of these facts that treaty was abrogated, avowedly because of some little exhibition of sympathy with the South in the Canadian legislature. Canadians made an effort to avert the loss of the treaty. They admitted that it might perhaps be advisable to enlarge its provisions, to include among the articles for reciprocal interchange, certain manufactured articles. They were ready to consent to any proposition within reason rather than have that treaty abrogated. They were spurned, no propositions were entertained, the fiat of the United States had gone forth that the treaty must be abrogated. The feeling in the country with regard to the Alabama matter and some other matters gave a hostile tinge to sentiment that rendered it impossible to secure any arrangement that would save the treaty.

Now, then, for thirty-five years since the abrogation of that treaty, what has been the policy of the United States? They have continually and continuously, consistently and persistently, adopted and continued a policy of repression. They have sought to shut out our imports from their markets, it has been their fixed and deliberate design to do this—no question about it. We sent to them, in 1866, $44,000,000 worth of the productions of Canada; we sent to them in 1901, aside from precious metals, less than that amount, trade had remained stationary during all these years. That was their policy toward us. What was our policy towards them? We had a

scale of duties of about 15 per cent on their manufactured articles, we raised those duties in 1876 to 17½ per cent; we raised them under the policy of protection that was in vogue from 1878 to 1896 to less than one-half the rate of duties they imposed upon our exportations to that country; and to-day, under a Liberal policy, with as large a reduction made in our duties as is possible to make, larger perhaps than is advisable to make, their duties are still as high again as our own; and in consequence of that, while our exports to the United States have remained stationary, our imports from the United States have risen from $28,000,000 in 1866 to $119,000,000 in 1901. While in 1866 we sold them $25,000,000 worth of farm products, in 1901 we sold them a little more than $8,000,000; we had reduced our sale of farm products to one-third of what it was in 1866. But while we have given them a larger market for their farm products than they gave us, while we have increased our importations to three-fold, almost four-fold, what they were in 1866, they still continue this same policy, this deliberate policy of shutting us out of their markets.

Now, what are we going to do? Of course our tariff to-day does not exactly suit the United States, they would rather have us remove all duties and give them absolute control of our market. But the tariff suits the United States about as well as they can ever expect any tariff will suit them. It suits them so well that they are able to sell us three times as much as they buy from us; it suits them so well that they have control of our markets for manufactures; it suits them so well that while we are their third best customer in the world, their custom, so far as we are concerned, is of comparatively very small value indeed. And what we want to do is to avoid earning their contempt by refusing to stand this kind of treatment. And how will we do that? Well, we want to place ourselves in a good trading position, we want to place ourselves in a position where we have got something to offer in return for something that we ask. We have got nothing to offer now except that we might enlarge our free list, which is already too large. We might let down the bars, which are already too low, while our neighbour has a stake and ridered fence in front of us but it is not desirable to do this.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I do not suppose, sympathizes with my ideas; I gathered from what he said the other night that he scarcely does. I would not expect that the hon. gentleman would do so fully, for I do not think that he would voluntarily incur the odium of inconsistency that would attach to him if he who refused to advance the duties in 1876 to 2½ per cent to allay the protectionist sentiment, were to go as far as I am prepared to go to-day. I think he will maintain his consistency, nail his colours to the mast, and sink, colours and all, if it is necessary to do so. I was very much pleased with his speech the other night. I admired his masterly analysis of the census returns. If his premises were correct, it was a very marvellous exposure of a great outrage—and I have no reason to say that his premises were not correct. I endorse fully his admirable forecast of what would probably have been the outcome of the policy for the Mackenzie administration if it had continued in power. The common sense policy for the North-west was holding the land for the settler and the construction of a Canadian railway to be owned by the government, and I think the country would have profited vastly by the continuance of Mr. Mackenzie in power, even if he did not rise the duties 2½ per cent.

Mr. CLARKE. After the experience we have had of the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think perhaps we would have had a better experience, for the road would have been built under different auspices and by a different party. Then I admired the hon. gentleman's justification, plausible, to say the least, of the increase of the expenditure. I do not think that matter could have been presented in a better, a more ingenious, a more convincing light than it was presented by the Minister of Finance. I think so far as the hon. gentleman and myself are concerned that we might honestly reach different conclusions in measuring the effect of recent developments and influences. It is not necessary for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to believe as I do. I respect his convictions. It is not necessary for me to believe exactly as he does, and I trust that he will respect my convictions. I look upon the character of our trade with the United States with deep resentment, perhaps he does not. That is a matter for us to consider calmly, fully and fairly when we discuss this question, as we shall do for weeks and months to come.

And just here, by way of parenthesis, I may refer to a story my hon. friend told, a story in which I figured to some extent as one of the characters. The hon. gentleman said that I was a very devout man, that I had stated on several occasions in the House that I was. Well, I wish to affirm, Mr. Speaker, that I never said on several occasions, or on one occasion, in this House that I was a very devout man, and I have never claimed to be anything else than a very great sinner. It is very true, Mr. Speaker, that I have taken in charge, and to the best of my ability, promoted and urged certain legislation in this House. One Bill I did, after a long struggle, succeed in getting upon the statute-book. I took up another subject and I did not succeed with that. Now, I always realized, Mr. Speaker—I say this to you in confidence—I always

realized in taking charge of these Bills, that I was doing a most unpopular thing, that I was losing caste with my fellow-members, that I was making myself a subject of ridicule. I felt that from the start, and I certainly did not go into this for the sake of popularity. I fought one Bill persistently, and I think courageously, until I secured a success.

I fought the other Bill in the same way until I came to the conclusion that success was hopeless and then I abandoned it. So far as any political return, or any return in the shape of popularity among my fellow members was concerned, I never expected to get it, I never did get it and it has been to me, as far as my position in this House is concerned, undoubtedly a detriment. I felt that to be the case then and I feel it still. In regard to the story of my hon. friend it was not exactly correct. He has a good sense of humour but he was guilty of attributing the vision of some person to me. I told the story as being the vision that somebody else had. I never had a vision myself and I do not ever expect to have one. If I were asked to tell the story again and to make the application now, I should say that the probability would be that the person having the vision would see the souls hung up to dry, because they were too green to burn, of men who were satisfied with our present trade relations with the United States and intend to permit them to continue and who had no idea of resenting the conduct of the country which treats us in such a manner.

I gave very careful attention and consideration to the speech of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I entirely disapprove of his position on the reciprocity question. I disapprove of that position in toto. I am sorry to see an attempt to create in this country a sentiment adverse to the securing of reciprocity with the United States upon fair and reasonable terms. We are two countries, existing side by side, with the same boundary for 4,000 miles, each of us possessing about 3,000,000 square miles of the North American continent, with railways binding us together by networks for intercommunication, with water courses serving as a boundary between the two countries and inviting communication, with geographical conditions between the two countries knitting us closely together, with a similarity of races, laws, religions and institutions. Practically one people, nature designed that these two great countries should have intimate trade relations and the ingenuity of adverse and hostile fiscal legislation has not been able to prevent a large development of intercommunication between these countries. If we remove the barriers, if we place the fiscal relations of these two countries upon a mutually fair basis we will have an enormous development of commerce and one which would be profitable and advantageous to both peoples alike. We have obtained a very satisfactory development of trade with Great Britain. We have built up an export trade in farm products with that country of a most satisfactory character. We owe to Great Britain fair treatment, fraternal treatment, but, it is not necessary for us to confine our attempts to create a profitable market to one country, or one hemisphere; and while Great Britain with her forty million inhabitants is a good market, we compete with all the nations of the world, and we compete upon conditions which place us, in some cases, at a disadvantage. We cannot reach the markets of England as easily as can France, or Germany, or Russia, but, the United States with 76,000,000 inhabitants is at our doors. We can reach the markets of that country with a facility and ease that no other country can. We have here almost within telephone call—yes, within telephone call—teeming millions of people in great centres of population and markets that we can reach more readily than even the states of the west, and for people to say that we do not want trade relations with this country, that we do not want reciprocity, that we will throw the whole thing over and sacrifice this great American trade, is preposterous nonsense. What we want of the United States is not non-intercourse, not repression, but what we want of the United States is fair play, what we want of the United States is an equal chance with them, a chance to get into their markets on as good terms as they get into ours.

Mr. CLARKE. How do you hope to get it?

Mr. CHARLTON. If we cannot get it we can do the other thing. If we have to do the other thing we will do it, but I would deprecate it. I would adopt another course as a last resort. I would only resort to it if nothing better could be done. There is one thing to be borne in mind in connection with this American trade. If we adopt a system of protection in Canada, we do it for the purpose of manufacturing in our own country the goods that we import from abroad, of having in our own country the artisans who produce these goods so that we can feed them. One thing that affords us a cause of complaint against the United States is that we import over $60,000,000 worth of manufactures from that country, and we are not allowed to send to them even a small portion of the food that the operatives who produce these goods consume. What we want is a chance to reach that already created market, that market that exists to-day, that exists by virtue of the production of thirteen thousand million dollars' worth of manufactured goods. If we go to work to create a market we can do it, but it will not be as great a market, not as valuable a market, and it will take years and a vast sum of money to do it. If we

can get access to the market of the United States, to the market that has been created by a period of forty years of protection, will it not be better to attempt to do that than to attempt to create a market ourselves ?

Mr. POPE. No sir.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is preposterous to say no. These, in brief, are the reasons why I deprecate the enunciation of a policy by the hon. leader of the opposition adverse to reciprocity. There never has been a time since the reciprocity treaty of 1854 was negotiated and went into force that Canada was not anxious for trade relations with the United States of a broad and liberal character. We enjoyed these relations for twelve years and profited immensly by them. We have been anxious to secure them ever since that time. We have sent deputation after deputation to Washington but we have not been able to get them up to this time. I do not want to give up the race yet. If we cannot get them we simply would have to do without them and adopt another policy if there is no other alternative.

Mr. CLARKE. Why did you not get them in 1898 when you were over there ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, we came very near getting a good treaty. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman (Mr.Clarke) what the details are, but, he would probably have been highly satisfied if it had not been for a little trouble that intervened between the trade treaty and something else. The condition of trade between these two countries at the present time warrants us in saying to the United States : Give us reciprocity in natural products. Not that we will promise you any mitigation of our tariff system. We will not agree to put a single article more on the free list. We will not agree to reduce our duties unless we choose to do so, we are entitled on the basis of the conditions as they exist to-day to reciprocity in natural products. If we can get it, it is all right ; if we cannot, we cannot get what we are entitled to. If we can get it what would be the result ? Would it be worth while ? Some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will say no, I presume. I cannot agree with that view of the case. If we could get reciprocity we would have free coal. We imported last year nearly 3,000,000 tons of bituminous coal for manufactures and railways and this paid a duty of fifty-three cents a ton. If we had reciprocity this coal would come in free and we would send to the United States, if their duty were removed, a much larger amount than we send now. We sent last year nearly $5,000,000 worth of coal to the American market ; we would vastly increase that business ; it would be a mutual advantage in the coal trade. If we had reciprocity in natural products we would have the competition of American buyers here for the purchase of all the articles we sell for export. We would have that competition for wheat, for oatmeal, for flour, for cheese, for butter, for meats, for fish, and the competition thus created in the matter of wheat for instance, would be worth more to the producer in Canada than a five per cent preferential duty in England would be. It would have the effect of raising the price of wheat to a greater extent than five per cent preference, because it brings in active competition, and it would be impossible to create a ring to put the price down (as now is sometimes the case) below the level at which it should be. We would have an increased price for lumber to the extent of the duty we now pay. We would have a vast trade in quarry products. We have, all along the northern shore of our lakes, quarries of sand stone, quarries of free stone, quarries of granite, quarries of marble, and on the other side of the lake we have vast cities like Milwaukee, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland and Buffalo, that would furnish a market for millions of dollars worth of these quarry products where we now do not sell a ton. We would have a great market for our mine products ; a market for millions of tons of iron ore, besides what we need to use ourselves. We would have an increased and better market for fish, and we would have a market for our farmer's products and all kinds of products in these great cities which have congregated in them many millions of people within easy reach of us. We would have a market in these cities at American prices whereas, now we have to sell, if we sell at all, less the exorbitant duties charged. We would probably have free pulp and free paper in exchange possibly for free pulp wood. These are a few of the advantages that would accrue to Canada from reciprocal free trade in natural products.

Our trade with Great Britain has been built up by the adoption of business methods ; by cold storage, by pushing our trade intelligently, efficiently, energetically. The same course pursued with regard to the United States, if we had access to that market, would build up an enormous trade for us with that country and would add enormously to the wealth and prosperity of Canada.

My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, tells us in his resolution that he is in favour of 'reciprocal trade preference within the empire.' What does that mean ? What would literally 'reciprocal trade preference' be between Canada and Great Britain. Great Britain admits everything we send there free of duty, manufactures, natural products, anything and everything. A reciprocal preference for us would be to admit free everything coming here from England. Is that what is meant by the resolution ? Of course that is a policy that would be highly satisfactory to England,

but would it be satisfactory to Canada? That is literally a reciprocal trade preference between the two countries. You cannot have it. We never can have it. What does the leader of the opposition mean? Does he mean that England is to readopt the corn laws?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I hope that is correct. I would not object to see the corn laws readopted and preferential duties imposed on wheat and lumber in favour of the colonies. But does any man here suppose that England is going to do that—that is to the extent of affording us any tangible advantage. Five per cent would be a mere bagatelle, a bauble. Ten per cent might be of some little advantage in wheat and lumber, but anything less than ten per cent would not be worth consideration.

Now, if my right hon. friend the leader of this government and those associated with him, when they visit London, can secure from Great Britain a concession of a tangible character that will give us a preference in the British market for our wheat, for our cheese, for our lumber, for the various products we send to that country; then we will stand the 33⅓ per cent preference and we will have then to face new conditions that will require a revision of our policy, or that at all events will require careful consideration. But I think perhaps we will have to wait until we see what success is scored by our representatives in this matter before we build very much expectations on the result of that conference.

Then as a corollary and necessary adjunct to this policy of reciprocity in preference, within the empire comes the question of Imperial defence. There is a great deal said about Imperial defence. A great many men are so ardent in their Imperial predilections that they want to see some kind of a legislative or defensive union existing between Great Britain and her colonies; some central authority that will designate what we shall pay and what we shall do. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe Canada should preserve absolute autonomy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have not the slightest doubt of that. The union between this country and Great Britain is a union of sentiment. The aid we have given to Great Britain in her emergency has been voluntarily rendered. Sir, while we are ready to make sacrifices; while we cherish the feelings we do towards the mother country, we can never allow the mother country, we can never allow anybody else to say how much we must do. It must rest upon the voluntary decision of ourselves as to what we will do, and nobody else must be in a position to say what we shall do.

We will make great sacrifices to preserve the empire. We realize the importance of this Imperial connection. We realize the importance of the English market that takes 82 per cent of our agricultural products. We realize that fully. We cannot afford to let Great Britain be blotted out. Why, Sir, if it comes to a question of life and death, Canada would give her last man and her last dollar to avert that calamity; but we cannot put ourselves in a position in which we will be deprived of the initiative in deciding what we shall do.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. We could discuss it.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have already made sacrifices; sacrifices of greater consequence than is generally imagined, for Imperial purposes. The Canadian Pacific Railway is really an Imperial road. Every dollar expended in that road is a dollar of expenditure that accrues to the advantage of the British empire. That is a military road; a military avenue of the greatest importance to England. If the time ever comes when the question arises as to whether this country shall be blotted out or not; if that time ever comes we have got to do the business of defending ourselves, to a large extent. That emergency will never confront us in any supposable event except in the case of war with the United States; and in case of war with the United States is it to be supposed that Canada would make smaller sacrifices, would make less exertions than England would. Why, Sir, we would have to put forth superhuman exertions. The brunt would fall upon us. I repeat that Canada never needs to put herself in a position where she would lose her autonomy.

We have the resources for a great nation; we will become a great nation. It should be our object to make this a nation that will be an example to the world—a nation possessing the best institutions and the best laws, and the freest population. We have a territory that gives us room for 100,000,000 people. We do not want to play second fiddle to any one. We do not want to be put into the position of a fifth wheel to any other combination or to any other nation. So much for these questions of reciprocal conditions within the empire; of reciprocity with the United States upon reasonable and favourable conditions, and of Imperial defence.

Now, it has been said, Mr. Speaker, that really this great import trade from the United States is a trade that we cannot dispense with; that although it is very large yet all these imports are indispensable to us; that we take them from the United States because we have to have them, and that there is no help for us. They may take more or they may take less from us, but we must take from them all that we now import. Now, our total free imports from the United States amount to $56,000,000, or eliminating coin and bullion, $53,549,000. On this free list the articles that

are indispensible which we import from the United States include the following :—

Raw cotton..	$4,731,812
Tobacco leaf..	1,720,589
Wool..	389,289
Hides and skins..	2,432,297
Anthracite coal..	7,923,950
Coke..	679,915
Hardwood and manufactures of—axe handles, spokes, felloes, &c.. ..	1,500,000
Miscellaneous articles.. ..	2,000,000
Total..	$21,386,852

Thus there are $21,386,000 worth of indispensable articles which we import from the United States out of the free list of $53,500,000; and on that free list there are the following articles which we can dispense with :

Indian corn..	$6,484,181
Flax seed..	662,696
Miscellaneous articles	1,000,000
Free manufactures..	18,000,000
Total....	$36,146,877

This leaves $6,000,000 of the imports on the free list unclassified. Possibly one-half of these we could dispense with also.

Now, Sir, we import from the United States $65,000,000 worth of manufactures, of which $22,000,000 are free of duty. We can produce in this country at least $40,000,000 worth of that list. We can shut off the imports of Indian corn, flax seed, meats, and a lot of other things in the food line. If we adopt a policy towards the United States as stringent as theirs is towards us, we can reduce our imports from the United States from $50,000,000 to $55,000,000, and bring down our list of imports to the lean and beggarly dimensions of our list of exports. Now, Sir, we do not desire to do this. We would rather increase our exports to the United States by $55,000,000. That is what we want to do. This diminishing of our imports is a heroic remedy which we may adopt if we can do no better ; but we want to do better if we can, and the terms of my resolution submitted on the 24th of February, are directly along that line. It proposes to give to the United States the same status in our markets that England enjoys, if they give us the same treatment that England does, that is, the free admission of our natural products. It proposes to give to the United States the disability of forty or fifty per cent more taxes than Great Britain would pay, if they do not give us the same treatment. It is a plain and simple remedy. We are not called upon to impose it just now; but we may as well talk this matter over. We may as well talk it over a little among ourselves; we may as well talk it over a little with the United States.

I thought it desirable to present these views wherever I have had an opportunity. I have done it at various places in the United States before influential audiences, and I have never done it without producing a marked effect. I have never done it without having had the assurance given to me that this question had not been understood, that my views were correct, and that the United States ought to do exactly what I suggested—give us free trade in natural products, and if they did not do that, they would have no reason to complain if the very policy which I have foreshadowed were adopted.

We want to continue these missionary efforts in the United States; and if the American people come to understand the case, they will take a different position from what they have taken in ignorance of actual conditions. They have been led to suppose that the United States market was essential to Canada—that we lived and moved and breathed in their favour, and could take no line without them. We want them to understand that while the United States take 8 per cent of our exports, England takes 82 per cent; we want to let them know that we can get along without them as well as with them ; and if we take pains to present these views to the American people, we shall have a state of sentiment created in that country that will be favourable to a settlement of our trade relations on a basis that will be reasonable.

For these reasons I have not lost hope that the Joint High Commission has not yet exhausted its efforts or ceased its career of usefulness. I am in a position to say that it has had a career of usefulness. I cannot of course disclose to the public what was done. But I am anxious to see that Joint High Commission meet once more. I am anxious to ascertain, as a result of that meeting, whether these questions can be satisfactorily adjusted or not. When we have definitely ascertained one way or the other, we shall know what course we ought to pursue; and if we cannot get fair-play, we can at least place ourselves in a position where we shall not merit and receive the contempt of the American people.

These views and arguments are submitted simply for consideration. As I said before, while I would have been pleased to see the government make some concessions to satisfy the demands of the aggrieved industries of this country, in two or three cases at least, yet I understand how difficult and dangerous a task it is to re-open a tariff. And so I accept the situation. But I have placed my views before the House, and I will leave my statements and arguments to have such weight as they may have with the members of the government, and when the time comes, after the conference has met, when we shall know more definitely than we do now, where we stand, then the government will take its course and decide on its line of conduct, and every member of this House can take his

course and decide whether he can support the line adopted by the government or not.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, in the introduction of his remarks, referred to the position of affairs prior to the time that Mr. Alexander Mackenzie went out of power in this country. He makes the statement that a request was made on the part of certain followers of Mr. Mackenzie to advance the customs duties 2½ per cent. He states that Mr. Mackenzie meant to accede to that request, but that because of certain representations made to him by members from the lower provinces, he abandoned that intention, and as a consequence a protective system was advocated by Sir John Macdonald, and in the election which ensued Mr. Alexander Mackenzie was defeated and Sir John Macdonald triumphantly elected. He attributes that defeat entirely to the fact that Sir John Macdonald had adopted protection as his policy, and that Mr. Alexander Mackenzie had adhered to his former views in favour of a low revenue tariff. He deprecates the action of Mr. Alexander Mackenzie at that time, not because of the principle involved, but because he was defeated at the polls as a consequence of his action. Now, Mr. Speaker, I regret to hear the statement the hon. gentleman has made, because I am one of those who believe, as I always have believed, if that was the cause of the defeat, that Alexander Mackenzie accepted defeat rather than give way for one moment on the principle which he held to be in the best interest of the Canadian people.

The hon. gentleman tells us that he advised the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie that he would be defeated if he did not accept the hon. gentleman's views on the tariff question. Well, Mr. Speaker, what value can we place on the opinions of the hon. gentleman, what reliance can we put in his professions, what credit can we give him for political honesty, when we follow his subsequent record? Since the day when he tells us he gave Mr. Mackenzie that advice, he has been in turn, according as the wind suited, a free trader, a commercial union man, an advocate of reciprocity, and to-day we find him blooming forth again in all the colours of a most pronounced protectionist. There is one quality for which we must give the hon. gentleman credit, and that is that whatever role he assumes, he plays with all the apparent sincerity of a consummate actor. In each particular phase, no matter what may be the particular policy he advocates at the moment, no matter how it may differ from views he held on any previous occasion, he addresses the House and seeks to impress on the government his momentary convictions with all the gravity and seriousness of a Nestor, and so to-day we find him exhorting the government in his usual fashion and threatening that if they do not accept his advice and adopt his views on protection, defeat stares them in the face at the next election. It would be interesting to have the hon. gentleman explain how it was that, in spite of his arguments against protection in the campaign of 1896, the protectionist government of that day met so crushing a defeat at the polls.

Referring again to the defeat of Mr. Mackenzie in 1878, the hon. gentleman went on to explain that while Sir John Macdonald on being returned to office, did adopt a protectionist tariff, it was but a moderate one—not half so high as that of the United States, and then proceeded to argue that if the United States have enjoyed very great prosperity, it is due to their high protection. And, he added, the conditions in that country are to-day such that protection is there no longer needed. In Canada, however, it is desirable that we should adopt as high a tariff as the Americans, and the adoption of such high protection, the hon. gentleman claimed, would be productive of equal prosperity. I dissent entirely from those views. My hon. friend, as he has very clearly shown the House to-night, is now a protectionist to the hilt. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am a free trader to the hilt. As such, I dissent entirely from the hon. gentleman's view on the question of the balance of trade. I deny that because the balance of trade is in favour of the United States, that it is any evidence of the prosperity of that country. That, in fact, is the only argument which the hon. gentleman used to show that the United States were enjoying a great measure of prosperity in consequence of high protection. If that argument be well founded, how is it that the balance of trade has been so enormously against Great Britain ever since the days of the introduction of the Corn laws? And no one will deny the great progress in manufactures, trade and commerce—a progress which has not been paralleled in any other country in the world—which has taken place in Great Britain since she adopted the policy of free trade. I take the contrary view to that taken by my hon. friend. I say that if the United States had made all the development and progress, which it should have made, the balance of trade would have been against it. In a new country like the United States, into which a large influx of population was yearly flowing, the balance of trade should have been against it, and the fact that it was not, is proof that the United States was not making the development and progress it should have made.

The hon. gentleman went on to point out that it is only in recent years that the United States had exported largely of manufactured goods. Every one who knows the condition of the country knows that to be true. Until very recently the United States paid for all its foreign purchases in agricultural products. And I ask how it

is possible that the agriculturists of the United States could show their best results when they were taxed so largely and unduly in favour of the home manufacturers. While it is possible to protect the manufacturers, it is perfectly impossible to protect the agriculturists of a country like the United States, and equally impossible to protect the agriculturists of Canada. The conditions in Canada to-day are very similar to those in the United States. It is only within the past few years that we have begun to export in any degree manufactured goods. Our exports have been the products of the farm, fisheries, the forest, and the mines; and I ask you how are you going to enrich the farmers, the fishermen, the lumbermen, the miners, of Canada, by taxing them for the benefit of our manufacturers? Their products have to be sold in the markets of the world in competition with the products of the world; and if our farmers, fishermen, lumbermen and miners, are to make their best development and progress, they must be permitted to buy in the same way as they have to sell. They must be permitted to enjoy in their favour the same free competition that they have to fight against. Holding these views, I cannot agree with my hon. friend in the hope he expresses that after the London conference this government will raise the tariff. On the contrary, I, as a free trader, will not be able to support any government which raises the tariff any higher, as against the interests of the great producing and consuming masses of Canada. Let the agriculturists, the great producers of the wealth of Canada, have a chance to exist. Give them a chance to enjoy the results of their own labour. Give the producer of the natural wealth of Canada that position, and I am not afraid for the position of the manufacturers of Canada. I think I heard one of the speakers say this afternoon that certain factories in Canada that had very high protection were yet idle, and he thought that was a reason why the government, for the purpose of having these industries here, should raise the duties and give still further protection. I think the best reason that could be given why these factories should not be in Canada, at any rate to the extent to which they are developed, is the fact that they are not able to live under the high protection that they have to-day.

My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) next came to the preference given to England, and stated that he was opposed to it, or, at least, did not particularly favour it. I am much surprised to hear a protectionist talk in that way, though such ideas would seem quite natural when expressed by a free trader like myself. I never was imbued with the idea of that preference, nor am I now. I think it is wrong in principle. In matters of trade, I am perfectly willing to buy from even the Chinese or the Japanese or from any other people who will sell to me the cheapest. No greater mistake has ever been made than to imagine for a moment that it is against the interest of Canada to buy the cheap productions of another country. What does such buying mean? It simply means that for the labour of Canada we are receiving a larger return than we otherwise would receive. Some hon. gentlemen who have spoken seem to be imbued with the idea that every country should be protected against every other country. What would that mean? It would simply mean the limiting of commerce. And, if the limiting of commerce is what is wanted, it would be as wise to protect individuals in a country against one another as to protect nations against one another, and that shows that the proposition is absolutely absurd—there is no common sense in it. The hon. member for North Norfolk spoke of the great prosperity that the United States enjoys. It is true that the United States has been prosperous. It is true also that the United States has had a protective tariff and has to-day. But it is also true that the United States has enjoyed a great measure of free trade, because the great north, the great south, the great east and the great west of the United States have been free to trade with one another. I would like to ask one question of those who think that the proposition of protection is a sound one. Suppose you move the boundary northward and take in the whole of Canada as part of the United States, would Canada enjoy greater prosperity in commercial matters? Every person would answer that question in the affirmative. There can be no doubt about it whatever. Then, what common sense can there be, as a matter of commerce, in placing these barriers to commerce between the two countries? There is no common sense in it at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) also advises that England should adopt the protective system. Well, I want to ask what, under the sun, England would do under such a condition as that? The hon. gentleman said that Germany, France and the United States were invading the English markets and that, therefore, protection should obtain in England, and let England trade with herself. This is in line with the idea of protection, which is simply that each country should confine itself to itself in trade. England would indeed be a great country under such conditions. I am surprised that any hon. gentleman who knows anything of commerce should support such a proposition. It is utterly childish. England would be absolutely ruined under such conditions. The hon. gentleman next came to the matter of our trade with the United States, our large purchases from that country and our small sales to that country. But he further stated what a splendid condition of

affairs existed in our trade with England, because we were now exporting largely to that country, but, that notwithstanding the preference, we were not buying so largely from that country. Is it not natural that the country to which you export the larger portion of your goods should be the one from which you would buy what you require? That would be a much more natural proposition in our case than that we should send the goods to England, and that England should send the balance, if there be a balance, to the United States in liquidation of our trade balance due that country. Why does this condition exist between Canada and England ? I deny absolutely that it is because of the preferential tariff, but hold that it is simply because, being adjacent to the United States, bordering for hundreds and thousands of miles upon that country, our trade necessarily is greater with the United States than with a country more distant. Moreover, the goods manufactured in the United States are, very largely, the goods we require. Take for instance, in agricultural implements, which we buy very largely from the United States. Why are American agricultural implements bought in the western portion of Canada where implements are not manufactured ? Why, what would the protectionist want ? He would want the farmer of the Northwest to send his grain to the markets of the world and then buy what he required in the east to be transported to the west, instead of buying across the border which is the most natural thing to do.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) will allow me, I would like to ask him a question. Is he not aware that a large number of agricultural implements manufactured in the United States are brought into Ontario, although agricultural implements are manufactured in this province ?

Mr. EDWARDS. If large quantities of agricultural implements are being brought into Ontario from the United States, as I believe they are, all the more disgrace to the manufacturers of agricultural implements in Ontario. There could not be a better argument against their existence than that they are not able to compete with the American manufacturers, even with the protection that they have. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) further says that he is opposed to reciprocity within the empire as suggested by the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition. It seems strange to me as a free trader that a protectionist should agree with me on that point. I also am opposed absolutely to any such proposition. While I am loyal to Great Britain in every way, while I am most desirous that the greatest glory and the greatest prosperity should attend the empire, I believe that every producer in Canada should be a free man and should be allowed to exercise his rights to sell where he pleases and to buy where it suits him.

What is commerce ? Commerce is an interchange of the surplus products of labour, and when you attack commerce you attack labour, yes, and when you attack commerce you attack the labouring man. The proposition, Mr. Speaker, that you can protect the labouring man is the greatest absurdity that ever was spoken. You can no more protect the labouring man than you can protect the farmer. You cannot protect the farmer of this country. Any man who pretends for a moment that he can protect the farmer of Canada knows nothing about the proposition. Any man who says he can protect the labourer in any country of the world knows nothing about the proposition. It is absolutely impossible to protect labour. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if labour can be protected, why did not the United States, that great protectionist country, protect the labourer from 1873 to 1879 ? Taking the period from 1893 to 1898, I ask you why they did not protect labour in that great protectionist country ? Labour fell to a lower point even during those years than it did in Canada. I ask you why protection, in that great protectionist country, did not maintain continuously the good times that its friends claimed it would do ? Simply because under protection it is impossible for good times to be maintained. Under free trade conditions the labourer receives, and always will receive, the greatest reward for his labour. Protection simply means robbery of the labouring man, protection simply means robbery of the farmer, and of every man in Canada who is producing its natural resources. Protection in my estimation is nothing more or less than legalized robbery. Holding these views as strongly as I do, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. gentleman who spoke before me that he could change his views but I was not progressive enough to do so—I never will be progressive enough to join a band of robbers.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to ask the hon. gentleman one question. When he says that labour always fares best in a free trade country, why is it that labouring men come from England, the only free trade country in the world to Canada and the United States, which are protectionist countries, and do better here ?

Mr. EDWARDS. Germany is one of the highest protective countries in the world, England is free trade. In England the labourer receives 70 per cent more than he does in Germany. Will the hon. gentleman explain that ? Mr. Speaker, that is the effect of protection upon labour. Why do we have depressions in commerce ? We have depressions in commerce, and have them periodically, simply because, during those times which are called prosperous times, too many men are diverted from their proper

channels of industry and go into the business of interchanging commodities, too many men go into trade and too few are engaged in producing the wealth of the world, and as a consequence we have depressions. We also observe that the most severe depressions always occur in protective countries, and they are always least in free trade countries; and as a consequence the labourer always enjoys, always will enjoy, and always must enjoy the best results in free trade countries.

Now, the hon. gentleman still clings to the idea that reciprocity with the United States is an absolute necessity to the well being of Canada. So far as I am concerned I deny that proposition absolutely. It is highly desirable that we should have the freest possible trade with the United States, but it is not essential to our existence. If they are determined to pursue the silly course which they have pursued for so many years, why let them do so. The hon. gentleman believes in reciprocity. While I would be glad to see free trade, while I would be glad to see the United States, in the best interests of the people of that country and in the best interests of mankind, living under free trade conditions, at the same time I believe that if they are not wise enough to adopt that policy, why should we, Mr. Speaker, adopt so foolish, so suicidal a policy as to punish Canadians severely because the people of the United States choose to punish themselves. In the United States every producer of the natural resources of the country is a slave. A slave to whom? A slave to relatively a few manufacturers in that country. Do we desire that Canadians should be placed in the same position? Not at all. What are we doing to-day? These men who advocate protection in Canada pretend that a great danger is threatening us from the United States because of the monopolies that exist there, they fear these monopolies are going to crush us in Canada. Sir, how have these monopolies been built up? They have been built up under the accursed system of protection, and that is why they exist in the United States. We are told that manufacturers in the United States sell cheaper to Canadians than they sell to their own people. Well, Sir, does it hurt the Canadian farmer, does it hurt the Canadian labourer, does it hurt anybody in Canada except a few protected manufacturers, if they do sell cheap goods to Canadians? It is a great benefit to the Canadian people, and we should be very foolish indeed if we did not allow them to sell us goods cheaper than they sell to their own people.

I believe that our duty is to legislate for the Canadian people without any regard to what the American people or any other people may do. I believe in legislating absolutely for Canada alone. I care not what other people do so far as their tariffs are concerned. I do care, of course, in a way, for the people who are suffering from monopolies; but having regard to the best interests of the people of Canada I never can support, and never will support, a condition of things which will levy a greater embargo upon the producers of wealth in Canada than is imposed to-day. Perhaps some gentleman will say: Why do you support the conditions that exist to-day? Well, Mr. Speaker, for years the Conservatives have been building up this system of iniquity in Canada. I understand something of commerce, and something of the effects that would attend the removal of such an embargo too hurriedly. I believe in reducing the tariff slowly. Free trader as I am, I am perfectly satisfied with the government as far as they have gone; but I say this, I cannot support you unless you go further. As time goes on you must go further, or I cannot support you.

Now what are the conditions in the United States? These monopolies have been built up so that there is to-day a tremendous centralization of wealth in the hands of a few people. Things have got to such a pass that I believe capital is going to be entirely unsafe in the United States; I believe that firmly. Some may say: What is the difference? Money is circulated anyway. These monopolists may be worth their hundreds of millions, but the people have the use of the money. Well, that is all very fine. The millionaire lives in luxury. Yes, many of them go to England and live in luxury. How do they do it? They live in luxury on the millions stolen from the labourers of the United States. I am absolutely opposed to the condition which brings about any such result. I believe each labourer should enjoy the benefits of his own labour. While I believe the employer should have his just share, I believe, at the same time, that the labourer should have his just share. This is one of the greatest propositions that stares us in the face to-day. The greatest question that we have before us in the world is this question of capital and labour. The conditions in the United States, perhaps over any other country in the world, are such that these enormous fortunes have been amassed through the protective system, and I believe they will bring about a state of things that will prove very dangerous to that country. We do not want any such conditions in Canada. What have we in Canada? We have, to-day, gentlemen who are giving very large sums to different institutions and they are looked upon as great philanthropists. They are nothing of the kind. They are simply giving back to the people a portion of the money, which through legislation, has been stolen from the people. That is all they have been doing. Now, Mr. Speaker, while I am a free trader, there is one thing I am willing to admit. I am willing to admit that free trade does not obtain in England because

of any philanthropic motives. Free trade obtains in England from selfish motives. It was the selfish motives of the manufacturers of England which really brought about free trade in that country. That, I am perfectly willing to admit, but, I also believe that a very selfish motive has been the means of maintaining protection in the United States up to the present time. What are the conditions in the United States so far as this very question is concerned? The manufacturers have been in favour of protection and the farmers have been opposed to it. I foresee a change coming. Perhaps I do not go to certain portions of that country doing missionary work and making speeches, but I come in contact with perhaps as many business men as my hon. friend who sits beside me (Mr. Charlton), and I observe that a very great change is coming over the aspect of things in that country, and that it is drifting rapidly towards free trade. The change in that respect in the United States is enormous—and why? The selfish interest again is going to prevail. The people of the United States are manufacturing more than is required in that country, they have to seek foreign markets, and the moment they have to seek foreign markets, they become free traders, because in competition with the other nations of the world, they desire to produce in the cheapest possible way they can. If Canada does not look out, the United States, in a few years, will force her into free trade. To meet their duties, as in the past, with retaliatory duties is, to my mind, a perfect absurdity, and to attempt, to-day, to levy high duties because they are doing it in the United States is, to me, a perfect absurdity. If there is any one way in which you can fight the United States with tariffs, it is by adopting a very low tariff in Canada. That would be a very great menace to the United States, but, pretending to fight them with a high tariff, is simply committing suicide so far as Canada is concerned. I shall not delay the House any longer upon this subject. I do not suppose, Mr. Speaker, that you will hear as many outspoken free trade speeches as I am disposed to make. I do not for one moment believe that the Liberal party has become insane. I believe nothing of the kind. I cannot believe it. I believe that the old views prevail just as they have prevailed for many years and, perhaps, it is quite possible that the government may go a little slower than I would like to have them go, but, as long as they are moving in the right direction and advocating free trade, as far as I am concerned, they will find me a loyal supporter. But, if I hear protection advocated by any member of the Liberal government, you can depend upon it, that my faith will be found to be weakening. I am absolutely unable to join in a proposition that I believe to be so immoral, that leads to such a great wrong on the labouring men, the producers of the natural wealth of the country. It would be perfectly impossible for me to do it. Mr. Speaker, if ever I am going to be a thief, I will be a noble thief. I will join a band of highway robbers, I will put a pistol to a man's face and tell him to deliver up, but, I can never be a protectionist sneak thief.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, one would imagine from the tenor of the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Edwards) that he is thoroughly convinced, that the faith is in him, and that he never could believe anything but what he has told us to-night. He could not be changed; it is no use attempting to change him. He is thoroughly convicted, and it would not matter if the premier of this country and if all the Liberals of this country were to attempt to show him that he was wrong, he would still maintain that he was right. I have my opinion of a man who thinks he knows it all. I think I ought to be the proudest man in this House to-night. It is something over fourteen years ago since I had the pleasure of presiding, as president of the Farmers Institute in my county, at a farmers' meeting. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was invited to address those farmers. The hon. gentleman lives in the adjoining county, and he came to our meeting. He gave us a very different dissertation from that which he gave us this evening. He was then a strong advocate of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. I was voted out of the chair on that occasion for the purpose of answering our friend from Norfolk. I had an opportunity of speaking, I think, for about my usual time of speaking, and it took the hon. gentleman half an hour to answer the points I produced against him. He was then strongly in favour of commercial union with the United States, and he showed us, at least he attempted to show us, the great advantages as farmers that we would derive by selling our produce in the American market. He illustrated his case that evening in a very striking manner. He said he wanted the Buffalo market, which was the nearest city to him, so that he could take his cattle there. The hon. gentleman raises cattle, and he stated that he had sent a drove of his cattle to the Buffalo market, but owing to the difficulty of getting them to that market they only returned him $30 each. I replied that the hon. gentleman either did not have the right kind of cattle, or else he did not take them to the right market, for I had just returned from Great Britain where I sold cattle of the same age in the Glasgow market for 21 pounds each. You see it makes a difference as to the market. Now, Mr. Speaker, when some gentlemen

clamour so much for the American market, it seems to me that they do not know what they are talking about. If we had not the British market then we might clamour for the American market for our natural products, but so long as the British market is free to us we can always get a first class price for a first class article, and we can always have there the best market in the world. Britain is the best market for our natural products, and it seems to me that it is only fair that we should purchase all we want to import in the British market. I believe that the vessels that take away our cattle, and our cheese, and our butter, and our farm products of all kinds to England, should return laden with goods to Canada which the people of this country had bought in Great Britain. That is only fair play. I, for one, am not at all anxious for that great High Joint Commission to go back begging to Washington for reciprocity in natural products, especially when we have such a grand market open to us in the mother country. I heard a lot of talk here about the German market and other foreign markets, but what are these markets to us when we have the best market in the world open to us all the time in England? I am not in favour of the amendment which has been moved by the leader of the opposition, because it asks for high protection, but I would have supported a motion which censured the government for spending the enormous amount of money they do spend every year. There is no such resolution before us, unless my own will fill the Bill. I would propose the following as an amendment:

That in the opinion of this House the increased expenditure that is taking place from year to year is uncalled for and unwarranted and contrary to the professions of the Liberal party, because in accordance with these professions the expenditure of this country should not exceed the income. We believe that the time has arrived when the interests of the farmer should be considered, especially in view of the fact that government cannot protect to any great extent the productions of the farmer; and as a moderate step in such a direction, be it resolved the duty on agricultural implements shall be reduced to 15 per cent and the duty on coal oil shall be reduced to two cents per gallon.

I do not know if I will get a seconder for that or not. I do not think there are many independent men in the House. They all seem to be obliged either to vote for the government or to follow the leader of the opposition, but I am no servile follower. I suggest that motion because these are my sentiments, and I think that we are here as members of parliament, or we ought to be here to express our views as to what we think should be in the best interest of the country. It seems to be the object of this great House of Commons that when a resolution is brought in by one side, the other side must oppose it whether there is merit in that resoluton or not. That being the case, and the members being apparently bound to one party or the other, I expect that my resolution will not receive much favour here. I am thankful, Mr. Speaker, for one thing, and that is that however we have discussed questions during this session we have had no racial or religious cry mentioned. I am thankful for that. We have the right to come and discuss here all questions affecting the welfare of the country, and I am glad that no bitter feeling has been exhibited this session as has been the case at other times. I do not profess, like the member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) to know it all. I am ready to be converted to anything that is better than I believe. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) is not as the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who like the man who once attended a revival meeting, went to scoff, but remained to pray. I would not wonder if the hon. member for Russell would find himself in the same box sometimes.

Let me ask: How are the farmers going to be benefited by a high protective duty? If there is any gentleman in this House who can show me that, then as a representative of the farmers I will gladly fall in with his view. If it can be shown that the placing of a high protective duty on articles manufactured in this country will help the farmers, then I am ready to submit. But, I have never yet been convinced that the farmer who is obliged to sell his surplus products in the open market can in any way be protected by whatever duty a government may impose.

One hon. gentleman has said that the great evil we were suffering from were the American products which were coming in free of duty or at very low rates of duty. One hon. gentleman stated this afternoon that whilst the Americans imposed a duty of twenty-five per cent against our wheat we have only a duty of twelve and a half per cent against their wheat. Well, I would like to know what would be the difference if we increased the duty. We send no wheat to the American market when wheat is dearer in Buffalo and Chicago than it is in Toronto and Montreal. Then, we want men who have capital to come in and erect mills on our streams which have water powers, in order to grind up all the wheat they can get, whether it comes from Canada or the United States. There is no argument in that. The conditions are the same with regard to any product which the Americans have and which we have not. We are only doing ourselves an injury if we refuse to buy it when it will benefit us to get it. One hon. gentleman complained that we were allowing corn to come in free from the United States. If that hon. gentleman lived in the section I do and fed cattle, he would know that every year the farmers buy carloads of American corn

to fatten their cattle ; and besides the profit they made upon the corn in that way, they also derive a benefit because of the manure it furnishes for the fields. Therefore I say there is no argument in that. But when the American people refuse to trade with us on equal terms, then I would treat them just as I would my neighbour if he refused to trade with me or have anything to do with me. I would try to do my business with some one else. That is just the way I feel like dealing with the American people. I think we should consult our own interests in framing a tariff against them. Our government ought to know that, and if they do not, let us put in a government that does.

Now, I do not know that it is necessary for me to talk much about my resolution. It speaks for itself. The infant industries of our country should be protected. Infant industries are something like a man's family. He has a lot of boys and girls, and he must raise them and raise them well ; but after he has raised them, then he is doing them and himself an injustice if he does not allow them to work for themselves. That is just what we are doing with many of the manufacturers of this country. We are just keeping them up, giving them the benefit of a higher tariff and enabling them to get rich, whilst the poor men who work for them are getting but a dole for their wages. I happened to be in Ohio a few years ago, and dined with the governor of that state. I am not saying this to boast ; I am merely stating the truth. He spoke of the immense amount of good he was doing in the state by building asylums and almshouses at different places. I said, 'governor, I think I can give you a better idea than that.' He said he would like to get it. I said, 'just take two or three dollars off every one of those machines next summer, and give the money to the farmers who are working for you.' It is from the farmers that the money is taken to build poor-houses and churches. It has been said in this debate that the Americans are growing immensely rich because of their high duties. I grant that some Americans are growing rich, but it is only those who have the inside track. The poor people of that country, especially the farmers, are not as well off as our own people. Some of these gentlemen are anxious to make a few people in Canada wealthy too. I am not. I want to see the wealth of the country fairly distributed among the people. I also want to see the taxes fairly collected, which they are not now under our present system of taxation. It seems that the system of customs and inland revenue duties is the only mode of collecting the taxes of this country ; but it is a very unjust method indeed. As I said a few days ago, a poor man, a labourer or a mechanic with a large family of eight or ten children, a man who is toiling and working every day to get sufficient to maintain his family, has to buy dutiable goods to the amount of perhaps his total wages, while some men who are wealthy with an income of perhaps $8,000 or $10,000 a year, have only a wife and one child, or perhaps no children, or perhaps are not married, do not contribute as much as the poor man to the revenue of this country. I say it is a very unfair and unjust system of taxation ; but it seems that that is the only way in which we can collect the money required to keep these gentlemen afloat. I am not casting any reflection upon them, because some gentlemen on this side of the House would like to be afloat too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many things which the farmers and every one else in this country requires which we can neither make nor grow, and consequently we have to buy them somewhere. It would be foolish for us to attempt to grow some things or to attempt to manufacture some things. Most gentlemen here are fond of bananas, oranges, figs and similar delicacies. Suppose some gentleman on this side of the House were to ask the government to give him a grant for the purpose of enabling him to start a conservatory or hot-house to grow these things. Would the government be foolish enough to give him a grant for that purpose? No, because the bananas would cost ten cents apiece and the oranges the same. Therefore we had better let them grow them where they can do it to advantage and we will grow something else. It is the very same with manufacturers. There is a village near my place where for many years there was a manufacturer who made excellent threshing machines, but he had to draw his coal and iron and everything that went into these machines a number of miles, as there was no railway near. He was consequently handicapped and found himself obliged to move his establishment where there were more facilities for his business. That same rule applies everywhere. In Ontario we have no coal, and it is no use in our attempting to go into manufacturing in that province in competition with those who have the coal and the iron at their very door. By putting on protection to foster such competition, we are only bolstering up an artificial industry that costs us more than it gives. What we want is to make Canada a cheap country to live in. That should be our great object. Every year we are spending half a million dollars on immigration, but one of the first things an immigrant will want to know is what is the taxation here. And when the agent tells him that it is $50 a head for every man, woman and child, and that the debt of the country is $268,000,000, which must be paid by somebody, he is not likely to have his imagination excited in favour of this country as a profitable one to settle in. Our Finance Minister has added to our debt $6,000,000 this year, and we do not know what he will do next. How is that debt to be met ?

Surely we are not going to tax the unborn generations to pay it, but that is what we will have to do. It is about time that we should reduce our expenditure. We cannot expect every year the immense crops we have had these last two years, and the sooner we trim our sails to suit the wind the better.

I do not wish to go over what other hon. members have discussed, but I would like to make a reference to the question of the census, which seemed to have agitated the Minister of Trade and Commerce more than any other. I differ with that hon. gentleman in his opinion that the census was not properly taken ten years ago. I know that in our county the men who were employed to take it were above suspicion, and I am equally confident that those who were employed to take the last census were equally free from reproach. I should be sorry indeed to have it said elsewhere that Canadians were perjurers and liars, who could not be trusted to enumerate their own people. If such a charge should be proved, I will sell out as soon as I can and leave the country.

I suppose I will make enemies of every man in this House, save a few independents, by what I am going to say, but I can not refrain from giving my opinion. I find that there is quite a number of independent members in the lobby and out in the streets of the city, but when they come here inside this Chamber—Oh dear! Only two weeks ago I asked where were certain members from both sides of the House, and I was told that they were out in Lisgar, where there was a big election going on. It seems to me that men elected to do their duty in this House could be much better employed attending to their duties here than trying to crush a poor little independent out in Lisgar. But if it be true that so many men voted the independent ticket in Lisgar, it shows that if the independent men in this country would all vote together, as they did at Lisgar, we would have in the next parliament some sixty independents on this side of the House. I do not find any cheering on either side at this remark. Let me say in conclusion that I do trust that when men are elected to any duty, they will try to discharge it.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Centre Toronto). Before addressing myself, Mr. Speaker, to the particular questions before the House, I cannot refrain from paying a tribute of esteem to my hon. friend who has just preceded me. We must admit that he is the only independent member of this House, elected as such, who has the courage of his independence. He was returned as an independent, and during the two sessions he has been in this House he has not in any way departed from that line of policy and is to-day still as independent as he was when he first canvassed his electors.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin).

I wish this afternoon to draw attention to some particular views which I hold, and which I believe are entertained to a considerable extent in this country, upon the budget which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has presented to us with all that beauty of diction and force which marks the hon. gentleman's utterances in this House. But, Sir, I must say that I was considerably surprised by the conclusions at which the hon. minister arrived. He did not seem to appreciate the condition to which his management of the country's finances has led this country. Some five or six years ago, the present government came into power. It was elected just at the close of a very serious state of affairs which had existed in this country and the United States. There had been a very great depression in business, not only in agriculture but in manufacturing. This government immediately investigated the conditions of affairs and introduced a revision of the tariff. That was followed by very great prosperity. For the last five years we have enjoyed unexampled prosperity. We have had an immense increase in our imports and exports. We have, undoubtedly, accumulated a large amount of money in this country. But, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman where he has left the finances of the Dominion? Have we been getting out of debt? What have we been doing with these enormous sums of money that have been taken from the people, these hundreds of millions? Every dollar has been expended, and yet, not only is our national debt greater, but we are very deeply in debt—several millions, I believe—to the banks. And the Finance Minister tells us that he is going to the financial centres of the world on a borrowing trip. That may not appear a very important matter practically, considering the tremendous revenues of this country. But if this were applied to private business, what would be thought of it? Suppose that a man, after conducting a private business for five years, found himself during a period of hard times with $5,000 in debt. He gets relief from his creditors and permission to try again. Immediately, times improve and business grows better. He buys more goods and sells more goods and makes more money. And, at the end of another five years he comes to his creditors, who wish to have a stock-taking and says: Gentlemen, I am in a magnificent position, I have been doing a great business, I have been earning a great deal of money. I have been spending a great deal of money, it is very true. But I have assets, though I can't exactly lay my hands upon them. I want you to understand that, instead of being $5,000 in debt I am now $10,000 in debt, and, over and above that I must go to the banks to borrow money to pay my current expenses. Would that be a very gratifying position for a private individual? But the government will say: Oh, we have

great public works. So we have. We have the Intercolonial Railway. And the Intercolonial Railway has been a very serious liability, instead of an asset. We have spent more money on it every year than we have received from it or are likely to receive from it. We have been enormously increasing our liabilities, even at a time when, as the Minister of Finance says, we have been riding upon the crest of a wave of prosperity. What would the wise merchant or financier do during prosperous times ? Would he not prepare himself for the lean years that are to come ? I do not see any indication in the Public Accounts of any reserve fund accumulated by the Finance Minister for times of less prosperity. And, when that hon. gentleman came to the question of relieving certain industries in this country, he told them that there was no relief to be expected from him or from the government. In saying that he was taking advantage of the position he occupied in this House with an enormous majority at his back to positively refuse a demand that is coming up now, as an hon. gentleman said this evening, from nearly three-quarters of the people of this country. He is supported by some hon. gentlemen who call themselves free traders to the hilt. I notice that while they call themselves free traders to the hilt, they, are, on every occasion, prepared to support by their votes, the government that is not a free trade government, but has repudiated free trade and has told us that free trade is impossible in this country. I think it was my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) who spoke of a servile following. Nothing could be more servile than that. In matters of expenditure also, we are having some revelations before the Public Accounts committee which show that the money we have spent during the last five years has not all been spent judiciously, but that enormous sums have been squandered——

Mr. EDWARDS. Where ?

Mr. BROCK. I can take you to twenty or thirty wharfs and other works in different counties that were built just before election, and built not to serve any practical purpose for the people, but to buy votes for the government. And these works not only cost money to construct, but they form a liability, because the revenues from them are not sufficient to pay the expenses of operation. And, yet, when the city of Toronto asked the Minister of Public Works to consider the case they were in, that a little expenditure would make a harbour at that great city, where railroads are centering and commerce is increasing—a harbour that would be a credit and a benefit not to Toronto alone, but to the whole country—the government hesitates about spending even a small sum there. Why ? The hon. minister himself gives the answer in the question, 'What has Toronto done for me ?' Unfortunately—unfortunately for the harbour, but fortunately for Toronto and for the country, the city does not return to this House one representative of the same political complexion as the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches.

Now, what this country wants is what the leader of the Conservative party has stated by this resolution. The country wants a declared policy. I think it is due to the intelligence of this country that a government that has been in power between five or six years, should, by this time, be able to formulate a policy which they would not be afraid to declare. The policy of opportunism is a very poor one. That policy seems to have guided the government up to the present time. They are not at one among themselves. I suppose that that is why we have no declared policy from them. If they attempted to declare a policy that might happen again which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) mentioned this evening as having happened to the government of Mr. Mackenzie. That government, it appears, made up their minds to a certain policy, but found it was going to be unpopular with the maritime provinces and might put them out of power. And so they let their principles slip and hung on to office for a short time. Therefore, I declare that the advice given by the hon. member for North Norfolk this evening to the present government is good advice. I think that the Prime Minister was taking note of it. A policy such as they have been going to the country with, such as they have maintained in this House, is not a policy that this country could respect. If they favour free trade, let them come out in an open, manly way, and declare for free trade. If they are not free traders, they must be protectionists. The medium course is not an honest course. This country is demanding that our industries should be protected. The Finance Minister says that he will take it into consideration and perhaps some way or other next year he will heal the leak. But, as the hon. member for North Norfolk says, if it is a leak, it should have been healed at once. That would have been the fair, the honest position to take. I alluded more particularly to an industry that I am not only interested in, but well acquainted with, the woollen industry. It is not an insignificant industry, not an industry supported by an unintelligent people. It is an industry that has been fostered in this country in years gone by, an industry that has been prosperous in the past and that could be prosperous to-day, were it not for the policy adopted and the tactics indulged in by the Prime Minister of giving to England a one-sided preference—a preference in this market for them but no preference whatever in their market for us. Immediately after the first 12½ per cent had been taken off, then commenced a gradual decrease in the

woollen industry of this country. The woollen industry of England is probably one of the greatest industries of that country. They have absolutely perfect machinery, they have very cheap labour, they have very cheap money, they have the markets of the world open to them. We have not the markets of the world open to us, quite the contrary. A market that we might have had has been closed to us in consequence of the preference which the Prime Minister gave to Great Britain. And remember, Mr. Speaker, that preference is only a sentimental one. Unfortunately it is a sentiment that, though it may have been in favour of Great Britain, in favour of some industries in Great Britain, it was absolutely injurious to certain industries in this country.

I see occasionally in the papers that certain woollen mills are said to be working full time, some of them night and day. Great comfort is taken by members on the other side of the House with that statement. But I think any woollen manufacturer, or even an ordinary merchant, will know that you can be very busy indeed in losing money. The woollen mills of this country, as a rule, have been losing money, even those that have been working night and day, some of them doing the most business, have been doing it with the greatest loss. That has been caused largely, not so much by the large quantity of woollen goods that they have actually manufactured and sold, but largely through the enormous tons of samples of woollen goods, English and German, that come in here through the Post Office Department, and are scattered broadcast through the country. A gentleman not understanding the business, though he may be very learned in the law, may probably smile at that statement as being an exaggeration. But I know of it practically, and practical men know of it. When our manufacturers get out their samples and call upon the trade of this country to sell them, they are met at once by these samples of English and German goods sent out here, many of them marked at very low figures, and our manufacturers have to make a price to meet goods from a mill which is running on one kind of goods and running all the time, whereas a mill such as that of my hon. friend, Mr. Rosamond, turns out 1,200 or 1,500 different patterns of goods, and of a great many different qualities, and he finds that he cannot meet their prices. Why? Because our market is a limited market. Nothing was done to help us to a foreign market, therefore we have to content ourselves with the home market. English and German manufacturers sell their surplus stocks in this country, and make Canada a slaughter market. Any gentleman who understands the woollcn trade of this country is aware that there are many expert workmen employed in our woollen mills, such for instance as those employed by the gentleman who sits beside me (Mr. Rosamond). They dread losing these experienced workmen, and they actually keep them at work at a loss rather than have the mills closed and the men scattered.

Now, the Minister of Finance said that we should eat a little less and work a little harder. Well, that is very poor comfort, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that what the hon. member for North Norfolk says is absolutely true. Go where I will through the manufacturing districts of this country, I find there is a demand made for the policy announced in this resolution, that is ample protection. We do not ask ample protection for the woollen trade only, we know that would be futile; but we say that ample protection for the different industries of this country would protect the farmers of this country. The statement that the farmer cannot be protected is unfounded, because he can be protected. The best protection for a farmer in this country is to give him a good home market, and nobody knows that better than the member for Russell. There is not a farmer in his constituency who would not rather sell what he has to sell at home, than to be obliged to send it abroad. It is true, as the hon. gentleman says, that the market prices in this country are made by the prices in England, and we have got to meet those prices if we are to make any sales. Therefore, I say that in protecting the farming industry of this country we are actually protecting our greatest industry. The agricultural industry may not be so aggressive, perhaps, but it is a silent industry that the members of the government should take into their serious consideration. No country can be great if it has nothing to rely upon but its agricultural productions, to export. We would be able to buy nothing from foreign countries, and those countries like England, the United States or Germany, if we have nothing to buy from them, would not be so likely to buy from us.

Now, a great difficulty in connection with protection, as I can quite understand, is the way it is supposed to affect our friends from Manitoba and the North-west. When we get a little nearer to the coast that difficulty becomes less. I think I heard an hon. gentleman from British Columbia speak this evening who is not a protectionist at all, oh, no, but he insists upon getting protection for lumber and for lead. I have no doubt, when once we open the door, we will find that British Columbia wants protection on a great many things. The farmers of the North-west, which is exclusively a farming country, have got to be specially considered.

Now, Sir, there is a way, I think, of meeting the interests of the farmers of the North-west that will amply protect them, and place them in a position to put their grain into the Liverpool market at the same

price, so far as the price is affected by transportation, as grain can be put in there from Minnesota, or Dakota, or Illinois, or any other western state. I contend that is a matter that should be taken hold of vigorously by the Minister of Public Works and the government; they should see that we have a properly developed system of transportation. The great calls that have been made upon the government during the last five years should have induced them ere this to give more attention to that matter than they have done. Of course the Minister of Public Works is very energetic, and suggests a scheme of transportation, but his scheme lacks comprehensiveness. The French River canal which he speaks of building is only sixty-five miles long, and it is really out of the question to talk about spending even the five or six millions which he speaks of, unless you have a more comprehensive scheme showing where you are going to start from and what sea port you are going to make for. If you give such transportation facilities that our farmers in the North-west can place their grain in the English market at a favourable price as compared with grain from the United States, I contend that the people of the North-west are big enough, and strong enough to stand a little duty on some kinds of imported goods. Give them this great boon of cheap transportation, and you will find them ready and willing to support any government that finds it necessary to give protection to manufacturing industries.

There is another thing to which I wish to direct attention in connection with our present rate of duty. This is essentially a slaughter market for certain kinds of goods manufactured in the United States. Those are not such goods as we do not make ourselves, in most cases they are the goods we are making to-day. The statement was made to me the other day that a large quantity of goods were being bought in the New York market, and when the question was asked why they were willing to sell so cheap, the parties stated that the mill had produced 4,800 cases of those goods, and they had 190 cases left. The 4,800 cases had been sold all through the United States in the usual way, that is with a guarantee that in the event of their taking any reduction off the price of any of those goods in the United States, they would give a credit note to their customers. This is continually done. Well, you can understand, it is a mere matter of the rule of three, that if they had gone to work to sell these goods left over, to sell them in their own market at a reduced price, they would have had to give a credit note on 4,800 cases of these goods. They therefore slaughtered them in the Canadian market. They gave us as a reason that there was some cotton print mills in this country that they would like to see closed, and they wished these goods sold cheaper than they could be made by the mills at Magog. This, as a matter of fact, is a transaction that I will be very happy to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance in order to show that this country is being made a slaughter market. Of course, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) says: Oh, our poor farmers are getting the advantage of these bargains, but they get no advantage if two hundred or three hundred people in the vicinity of Sherbrooke and Magog are obliged to go to the United States to get work when the mills are closed down as the Cornwall mills have been closed. It will not benefit the farmers about Cornwall to have the mills there closed, nor will it benefit the farmers of this country. Therefore, I contend that a fair measure of protection, surrounded with proper safeguards and judiciously applied, is an absolute benefit to the farmers of this country and to every other class. In conducting business, business men, in a small, or a large way, have a right to look to the hon. Minister of Finance, to the different departments and to the government, for an example in business methods. At the commencement of my remarks I gave an instance as to how business should be carried on, but, I contend that no merchant, conducting business in this country in bad times and particularly in good times as the hon. Minister of Finance and the government are conducting the financial affairs of this country, could possibly stand for a couple of decades. He would certainly become bankrupt. He would be living at too high a rate. This has brought more people to grief than anything else. Because they happened to have a good year or two they have their expenses up and we heard it said from the other side of the House last night, that once the expenses get up, it is hard to get them down again. If the hon. Minister of Finance had to cut down expenses, where would he begin? He would find it a difficult problem, a more difficult problem than meeting the manufacturers of this country who are asking for some little assistance at this time. I had intended to make some remarks based upon some statements made by the hon. member for North Norfolk which were put in the most admirable manner by him. His speech was most moderate considering the aggravation he has had, but, I admit that when he described what a great nation required to be a great nation, that it should have not only agriculture but that it should do its own manufacturing, as far as possible, he rose to a height of statesmanship that I am sorry to say members of the government are not prepared to climb to.

Our attention has been drawn to the enormous amount of money in the savings banks and other monetary institutions of this country and this was given as evidence of great prosperity. But, Sir, I may venture to say that this is also evidence of a con-

siderable amount of want of confidence in the industrial and farming interests of this country. I contend, Sir, that if the farmers were properly encouraged, if the industrial interests were encouraged, a great deal of that money, instead of being left at 2½ and 3 per cent and a good deal at nothing at all in the savings banks and other banks, would find investment in trade and commerce, manufactures and agriculture. Nobody would think of leaving his money in a bank at 2½ or 3 per cent if he had any confidence that by investing it in the manufactures and other industries of the country, he would be able to get a better return for it. It is simply because people cannot get a better return that it is not so invested, and it is a sad commentary upon the management of public affairs, that so many men who have, by their industry and frugality managed to save some money are obliged to leave it at the small rate of 2½ and 3 per cent in the bank. The question was asked across the floor of the House by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) why the German workingman had smaller wages than the English workingman. The answer is quite plain. The German workingman will live on a franc a day and live well on a franc a day. The most expensive man on the face of the earth is the English mechanic. He demands more to eat and drink and therefore the mechanic in Germany can afford to take smaller wages and I believe in the end save more money. It is another case such as I have brought to the notice of the hon. Minister of Finance of living beyond your means. The man who lives beyond his means will come to grief, whereas, the man who saves a little even out of his small means is the best off in the long run. Some hon. gentlemen object to reciprocity, but a fair measure of reciprocity that will suit Canada, I am perfectly in favour of. But, such a measure of reciprocity as the United States will give us, hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches know we cannot touch. There is no use theorizing and talking about it and wasting money. The hon. member for North Norfolk, one of the commission, thinks that the right hon. Prime Minister and others should go to Washington again. We know what the return was. We were told this afternoon that the return was a bill for $36,000 and nothing more. I would not like to see another jaunt of that kind, because we know it is going to be useless. The best thing for us to do is to adopt the manly course of taking the matter into our own hands and legislating for this country to suit ourselves, and while suiting ourselves we will endeavour to work in harmony with the rest of the empire and make an international arrangement such as will suit ourselves. Probably some hon. gentlemen will say that England will have none of our protective ideas. England is rapidly advancing in the direction of protective ideas. Where they were not entertained a few years ago, you find them entertained now by some of the greatest minds in England. The hon. member for Russell said this evening that free trade was getting great headway in the United States. There is no doubt about it. They always had a great number of free traders there. One party is pledged to free trade or to move in that direction. We will get no reciprocity from the United States. There is a feeling of commercial hostility and a little more than commercial hostility, not only in the minds of the Irish residents of the United States, but in the old-fashioned residents of the United States as well. There is not that feeling of cordiality towards Canada that we should expect from the way in which we have treated the people of that country. The United States do not want to do anything to benefit Canada. Therefore, I think we need not waste much time upon any attempt to get reciprocity. I certainly myself felt very favourable towards the trade preference with Great Britain until it commenced to pinch.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROCK. I suppose that is the way we all feel about these matters. The theory was very beautiful and the idea very grand; the whole thing was very pleasant to observe, but it is like these waters which are sparkling and clear to look on, but bitter when you swallow them. The trade preference with Great Britain, beautiful as it is on the outside, is beginning to pinch us hard, and we would like to get rid of it. However, I believe that to be an impossibility, and injudicious, and unwise at the present time. But I do contend, that the disadvantages should be met by the Finance Minister coming down with an extra measure of protection; a judicious addition to the protection that we now have, so as to bring it up to such a level that we can fairly compete in our own market for our own trade. We certainly cannot expect to compete with England abroad. I think if that were done, the people of this country would be contented. Probably my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) would not be contented, but I believe that a great majority of the people of this country would be. At any rate, if the government adopted this suggestion, it would be doing what is fair and right and just, and the government need never be ashamed of having done that.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver), moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 21, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

KLONDIKE MINES RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). I give notice of motion that the rules of this House be suspended in relation to the Bill entitled 'The Klondike Mines Railway Company,' in accordance with the recommendation contained in the 8th report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Cosmos Cotton Company.—Mr. Flint.

Bill (No. 65) to incorporate the Yukon Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 66) respecting La Compagnie du chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord.—Mr. Lemieux.

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Maxwell.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) moved :

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday next it stand adjourned to Tuesday, the first of April next.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of the question before the House I have noticed a desire on the part of several interests for higher protection. The business interests, the mine owners, the manufacturers, the lumbermen and other interests have approached the government in favour of the principle of higher protection.

Mr. EDWARDS. Did they do that ?

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Yes, I happened to be with the deputation last session that met the government on this question. I will say that I agree with the principle of protection to the extent that it prevents the coming into this country of manufactured articles produced under conditions of labour which are servile and impoverishing and which come into competition with the products of the labourers of this country. I agree also with the measure of protection which prevents the labourers of this country having to compete against the importation of servile labourers into the country. An important part of the question before the House is the consideration of the quality of the people that are brought into this country. The question of how to protect the labouring interests of this country is a very important one. It is supposed and believed by those who advocate the principle of high industrial protection that the principle of protection to the manufacturing interests of this country means in every case protection to the labourers who work in these industries. I do not think that always follows. As I have said, I believe in protection to the extent of keeping out of this country manufactured articles produced by servile labour in other countries and coming into competition with the product of the free labour of this country. I also believe in protection to the extent of protecting the labourers of this country who are British subjects, who are Canadians, and who are desirable settlers, against the importation of servile labour into the country. To that extent I am certainly a protectionist, but, on the question of protection as it is represented by the industrial interests of this country, it is very clear that there is a great diversity of opinion. If you take the question of protection in the province of Ontario, for instance, where, I suppose, the largest number of manufacturers exist in this country, taking the single question of protection itself, I am certain that you will not get anything like a unanimous opinion as to the necessity of having high protection even in that province. There is no question that has been discussed, or that has been presented in this debate, in regard to which you would be at all likely to get a very one-sided opinion from the people who are directly interested in it. Now, I have the good fortune to be in a position to discuss a question, which, in my opinion, means direct protection to the labouring interests of this country ; in fact, it involves the application of the principle of protection to every citizen of this country. In discussing that question, I have the privilege, or the benefit, of being supported almost unanimously by the people who are affected by the existence of a class of undesirable residents in this country. I do not think there is any other question that can be discussed in this House, I do not think there is any single demand that

has been made or is being made upon the government by people who have a direct interest in having a grievance removed, that has behind it the unanimous feeling and desire that is behind the question of Chinese immigration into this country. Furthermore, I desire to say that the government considered it wise, although it increased the head tax on these people in 1900, to form a royal commission to look into that question.

The first part of the report of the Royal Commission to inquire into Chinese and Japanese immigration into British Columbia dealing with the Chinese has been presented to the House, and to any one reading the same it must be a perfect mine of information concerning every aspect of this question. The commissioners have spared no pains in gathering the facts, then in sifting, arranging and working up into intelligible readable shape. The evidence comprises eight volumes, in addition to the report proper. The care and impartiality with which the work has been done is manifested in the manner in which the views of all concerned have been recorded and every fact whether in favour of or hostile to the Chinese has been set forth fully. The commissioners have arrived at a unanimous decision that the Chinese ought to be prohibited from coming into British Columbia. The bad effects of this immigration has been traced step by step in every industry, trade and calling and must be a tremendous revelation to our friends in the east, who for the most part considered the agitation the work of a few, and have consequently not paid any real attention to the question. This report brings this question to its climax, as the commission have proven every particle of agitation in the shape of legislation by the province, resolutions passed by the provincial House and repeated petitions by the people for many years, praying the federal authorities to increase the tax at least to $500 and if possible to pass a law to prohibit them from coming into the country entirely. This the government, or at least parliament must do if they have any regard for the unanimous opinion of the people of the province suffering under the grievance.

Mr. Speaker, although the reports referred to have been placed on the Table of the House, I feel it my duty as a member from the province suffering under the presence of these people to discuss the question from the floor of the House. I desire to refer to the demands of British Columbia, as seen by the Acts and resolutions passed by the British Columbia legislature and forwarded to the government at Ottawa. For many years the legislature of British Columbia has been trying to protect the interests of their people by legislation, the most of which of course has been disallowed by the federal authority, sometimes on the ground that such legislation was ultra vires the provincial authority, and sometimes for the reason that such legislation tended to interfere with international consideration. This opinion being presented by the Imperial authorities. The point, however, I am anxious to present to the House for the purpose of showing the absolute unanimity of the provincial representatives of the people in the legislature, is the fact that there is scarcely an Act passed through that House for years in which there has not been some special provision against the employment of Chinese and Japanese. In very many instances these provisions were made to secure the safety to life and limb of Canadian subjects against the ignorance and incompetence of these people in the operation of local industries, the regulation of which is entirely within the power of the provincial parliament, and such legislation was proven necessary in many instances by serious disaster and death, brought about, in the opinion of the people, by the existence of Chinese being employed in certain callings. This legislation, however, has been disallowed repeatedly by the federal authorities at Ottawa, and thus in spite of the hard experiences of the people in British Columbia in the operation of these dangerous industries their desire for protective law against the Chinese and Japanese continues to be ignored on the ground that it includes the discrimination against a class, thus placing the power of legislation entirely with the Dominion authorities. There is not any possible phase of protection against the encroachments of these people in British Columbia that the legislators of that province have not repeatedly and in every case unanimously tried to have brought into force thus proving to the members of this parliament, who are all powerful in this matter, that if the power of entire self-protection against the presence of hordes of Orientals have been in the hands of the provincial parliament, this grievance would have been eliminated years ago. What is true of the province is of course true of the people.

In 1891 seventy petitions were presented from British Columbia to this parliament, praying for the prohibition of the importation of Chinese into Canada. In 1892 a larger number of petitions were presented. Year after year up to 1897 petitions signed by thousands of British subjects asking for a prohibitive tax against these people, and let me say also since this government raised the head tax from $50 to $100, the provincial legislature has unanimously asked for a tax which would be prohibitive. They have also passed an Act based on the lines of the Natal Act, known as the Immigration Restriction Act, which has also been disallowed. Very properly, therefore, we make our demands to this parliament, and if no other reason could be given more than the unanimous wish of that province for such legislation, that in my opinion would be a sufficiently good reason why this par-

liament should settle this question at once and for all, in compliance with the wish of the people of British Columbia.

Let us look for a minute at the action already taken by the Dominion government. The House is aware of course that the Dominion parliament on the finding of the commission of 1884 placed a head tax of $50 on the Chinese; after years of agitation by the people of British Columbia this tax was increased to $100, and in the meantime a Royal Commission was appointed to make full inquiry into the facts of this grievance.

This, Mr. Speaker, has been done, and a most exhaustive and complete report has been presented to this parliament. There is, therefore, placed in the hands of the members of this parliament a complete record of the facts associated with this great question, and I am glad to say that the final expression of opinion arrived at unanimously by the commissioners themselves proved conclusively the fairness of the demands which have been so repeatedly made to this House by the people of British Columbia, and making it in my opinion absolutely imperative for this parliament to at once comply with what has been proven to be the desire of the people, endorsed and confirmed by the Royal Commission after listening to evidence given on oath, and weighing evidence of this kind for many months.

This inquiry was not any slipshod attempt to deceive the people with a species of political manipulation for party interests, but a commission of large scope, formulating as they did, sets of questions touching every possible phase of the question, published these in the newspapers of the province, and thus prepared the mind of every person beforehand, making it impossible for any one connected with any interest to be overlooked in the inquiry. List of thirty-four questions can be found on pages 9, 10, 11 and 12 of the report. The commissioners appointed to inquire into Chinese and Japanese immigration desired information upon the following points, to be necessary to treat the various questions affecting Chinese and Japanese immigration separately. The object of the commissioners in suggesting the following subjects was to enable the witness to give them consideration before giving evidence touching such of them as may be within your knowledge. The following were the points:—

The commissioners will greatly appreciate any information you may be able to give bearing upon the subject.

1. The number of Chinese and Japanese in British Columbia.

2. What has been the annual immigration since 1884?

3. From what class in China and Japan are they principally drawn, and what was their condition before coming here?

4. What is their character for honesty, obedience, diligence, thrift, sobriety, and morality, and keeping of contracts?

5. How many are engaged in——
(a) The fisheries.
(b) The mines.
(c) The lumber business.
(d) Manufactures.
(e) Farming and market gardening.
(f) Domestic service.
(g) Other callings.

6. What is the difference in wages paid to Chinese and Japanese, and to the wages of white men in the same trade or calling?

7. Has any industry been called into existence by reason of their presence; and, if so, what industry, and how?

8. Is there any industry dependent upon their labour for its continuance; and, if so, what industry, and why?

9. How do they come, and under what terms?

10. What proportion bring their wives, or marry here, or attend school or churches, or become Christians?

11. What is their standard of living, compared with that of the white population—clothing, food, rent, &c.?

12. What is their moral and physical condition, their habits of cleanliness, and attention to sanitary regulations?

13. Do they live in different parts of the city, or in aggregations?

14. What effect has their residence in any place on the price of property in that locality?

15. What proportion live in separate houses and have families?

16. How many Chinese and Japanese women are there in this province; and for what purpose and under what terms were they brought here?

17. Are men and women brought here under servile or other contracts? What is their form and effect?

18. How many Chinese companies or other associations are there; what is their object? How do they affect immigration? Have the 'Six Companies' branches in British Columbia?

19. Do Chinese or Japanese immigrants take any interest in our laws and institutions? What proportion build up homes and become permanent citizens or residents?

20. Do they learn our language, customs, habits of living, and show signs that they will eventually assimilate and become an integral part of our race and nation, as Europeans do?

21. How have workmen been affected by Chinese and Japanese immigrants respectively?

22. How has Chinese and Japanese immigration affected white immigration?

23. What proportion of Chinese and Japanese return to their own country, and what proportion of their earnings do they take with them? Do they enrich or impoverish this country?

24. Are the Chinese and Japanese 'a menace to health?' And, if so, in what way?

25. Has trade and commerce between Canada and China and Japan been affected by Chinese and Japanese immigration? And how would restrictive or prohibitive measures affect it?

26. The effect of unlimited Chinese and Japanese immigration upon the country?

27. As to the sufficiency of white labour to supply the demands of the country?

28. The criminal class amongst Chinese and Japanese as compared with the white population; the nature of the offences; the number of convictions, &c.?

29. The relative amount of taxes paid, compared with their earning power?

30. With whom do the Chinese and Japanese trade; and to what extent does the country

benefit thereby ? And what proportion of their earnings do they send or take out of this country ?

31. What proportion speak English, and read and write English ?

32. Do you make any distinction between Chinese and Japanese immigrants ?

33. Do you favour restriction or prohibition of this class of immigrants ?

34. How do you propose to prohibit with the existing treaties in force ?

In preparation for the meeting of the commission there was forwarded the following circular letters :—

1st. To every government agent and mining recorder at British Columbia, the following was presented:—

Royal Commission.—Chinese and Japanese Immigration.

Kamloops, B.C., Oct. 27, 1900.

Sir,—I beg leave to request that you favour me with any information in your possession, or obtainable by you, regarding Chinese and Japanese resident in your district. This information is required for the use of the Royal Commission to inquire into the subject of Chinese and Japanese immigration into British Columbia, and should, so far as possible, cover the following points :

1. Revenue deprived from Chinese and Japanese during the 12 months ended September 30th ult.

II. Nature of said revenue.

III. Number of miners' licenses issued to Chinese and Japanese during the 12 months ended September 30th, ult.

IV. Number of hydraulic leases issued to Chinese and Japanese during said period.

V. Number of placer claims recorded during said period by Chinese and Japanese, and location of said claims.

VI. Number of quartz or any other mineral claims recorded by Chinese and Japanese, and location of said claims.

VII. Assessed value of property, real and personal, held by Chinese and Japanese in your district.

VIII. Any other information in your possession, or obtainable by you, which in your opinion will in any way serve to assist the commissioners in their investigation.

I am in receipt of a communication from the hon. the provincial secretary, informing me that a circular letter has been forwarded to each government agent, gold commissioner and mining recorder in the province, with instructions that they afford me all the information available which they consider will be of service to the Royal Commission. You will therefore kindly see that any questions asked in the foregoing in reference to matters not coming within the scope of your office are referred to the proper officials in your district.

Trusting you will give this matter your earliest attention.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. J. DEANE,
Secretary to the Commission.

The following circular letter was sent to every city council in British Columbia :—

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver).

Royal Commission.—Chinese and Japanese Immigration.

Kamloops, B.C., Oct. 24, 1900.

Sir,—I beg leave to request of your city council, for the use of the Royal Commission to inquire into the subject of Chinese and Japanese immigration into British Columbia, information as follows :

I. The number of Chinese and Japanese now resident within the city limits.

II. Increase, if any, within the past twelve months of this class of residents.

III. Revenue obtained by the city from Chinese and Japanese, sources of said revenue, and amount thereof up to September 30th, ult.

IV. Occupations of Chinese and Japanese resident within the city limits.

V. Special reports from the city medical health officer and city sanitary inspector regarding conditions of Chinese and Japanese within the city limits.

VI. Such other information as in the opinion of the city council may be of service to the Royal Commission.

Trusting you will give this matter your earliest attention.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. J. DEANE,
Secretary to the Commission.

The following circular letter was sent to every board of trade in British Columbia :—

Royal Commission.—Chinese and Japanese Immigration.

Kamloops, B.C., Oct. 24, 1900.

Sir,—I beg leave to request of your board of trade any information in your possession, or obtainable by you, that will be of service to the Royal Commission to inquire into the subject of Chinese and Japanese immigration into British Columbia.

This information, if possible, should cover :

I. Number of Chinese and Japanese engaged in any mercantile or manufacturing pursuit in the district represented by your board.

II. Effects of their competition.

III. Conditions under which the Chinese and Japanese conduct their business.

IV. Any other information that in the opinion of your board would be of service to the commissioners in their investigation.

Trusting you will give this matter your earliest attention.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. J. DEANE,
Secretary to the Commission.

The following circular letter was sent to every health officer in British Columbia:—

Royal Commission.—Chinese and Japanese Immigration.

Kamloops, B.C., Oct. 24, 1900.

Sir,—I beg leave to request of you, for the use of the Royal Commission to inquire into the subject of Chinese and Japanese immigration into British Columbia, a report covering the health and sanitary conditions of the Chinese and Japanese resident in your district.

Any other information or suggestions you may have to offer bearing upon the question of

Chinese and Japanese immigration will be greatly appreciated.

Trusting you will give this matter your earliest attention.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. J. DEANE,
Secretary to the Commission.

The following circular letter was sent to the principal of every school in British Columbia :—

Royal Commission.—Chinese and Japanese Immigration.

Kamloops, B.C., Oct. 24, 1900.

Sir,—Will you kindly forward me at your earliest convenience a statement of the number of Chinese and Japanese who have been in attendance at your school during the twelve months ended September 30th, ult., and who are now in attendance. This information is for the use of the Royal Commission to inquire into the subject of Chinese and Japanese immigration into British Columbia.

Trusting you will give this matter your earliest attention.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. J. DEANE,
Secretary to the Commission.

The following circular letter was sent to the secretaries of all the farmers' institutes in British Columbia.

Royal Commission.—Chinese and Japanese Immigration.

Kamloops, B.C., Oct. 24, 1900.

Sir,—I beg leave to request of your farmers' institute, for the use of the Royal Commission to inquire into the question of Chinese and Japanese immigration into British Columbia, any information in your possession, or obtainable by you bearing upon the subject.

This information, if possible, should cover :

I. Number of Chinese and Japanese engaged, either as employers or labourers, in any agricultural pursuit in the district represented by your institute.

II. Effects of their competition.

III. Rates of pay of Chinese and Japanese farm labourers.

IV. Special report as to number of Chinese and Japanese market gardeners in your district.

V. And the effects of their competition in this particular branch of the industry.

VI. Any other information which in the opinion of your institute will be of service to the commission in this investigation.

Trusting you will give this matter your earliest attention.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. J. DEANE,
Secretary to the Commission.

The following circular letter was sent to every trades and labour council and union of British Columbia :—

Royal Commission.—Chinese and Japanese Immigration.

Kamloops, B.C., Oct. 24, 1900.

Sir,—I beg leave to request of you, for the use of the Royal Commission to inquire into the subject of Chinese and Japanese immigration into British Columbia, a statement of the number of Chinese and Japanese employed in or about the mines in the district represented by your union ; also a statement of the wages paid for this class of labour. Any further information you may have to offer regarding the effects of the employment of this class of labour in the mines, and the extent, if at all, to which white labour is affected by the competition of Chinese and Japanese labour, will be very acceptable.

Kindly add any other information, or suggestions bearing upon this subject, in your possession or obtainable by you.

Trusting you will give this matter your earliest attention

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. J. DEANE,
Secretary to the Commission.

The following circular letter was sent to every canner proprietor in British Columbia :—

Royal Commission.—Chinese and Japanese Immigration.

Kamloops, B.C., Oct. 29, 1900.

Sir,—I beg leave to request that you forward me a statement of the number of Chinese and Japanese employed, in any capacity, at your cannery, during the twelve months ended September 30th ult., also statement of wages paid to Chinese and Japanese employed.

This information is required for the use of the Royal Commission to inquire into the subject of Chinese and Japanese immigration into British Columbia.

Trusting you will give this matter your earliest attention

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. J. DEANE,
Secretary to the Commission.

The following circular letter was sent to every saw-mill owner in British Columbia :—

Royal Commission.—Chinese and Japanese Immigration.

Kamloops, B.C., Oct. 24, 1900.

Sir,—I beg leave to request of you a statement of the number of Chinese and Japanese employed at your mill, each and every month in the year ended September 30th ult., and the number of Chinese and Japanese now employed in your mill ; also a statement of the wages paid to Chinese and Japanese labourers employed at your mill.

This information is required for the use of the Royal Commission to inquire into the subject of Chinese and Japanese immigration into British Columbia.

Trusting you will give this matter your earliest attention

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. J. DEANE,
Secretary to the Commission.

The different interests were also represented by counsel—Charles Wilson, K.C., represented the province, G. M. Bradburn represented the Chinese, Mr. R. Cassidy, K.C., represented the Japanese, Mr. D. C. Macdonell represented the Trades and Labour Council. These legal gentlemen were con-

sulted all the time in the choice of witnesses, and were even requested to produce witnesses who might be expected to give absolutely impartial evidence. I will give the House a short summary of the witnesses to show how every diversified interest of every kind was represented.

On Vancouver Island, in my own constituency, the head representatives of the three largest exporting companies in British Columbia gave evidence to which are the representatives of the coal companies of Vancouver Island, each of which employ thousands of men, the output of which mines is a million and a quarter tons of coal every year. Mr. Palmer also, superintendent of the largest exporting company in British Columbia, several of the principal members of the legislative assembly of British Columbia, several of the principal business men in every city, some of the principal ministers of different denominations all over the province, the bishop, head of the British Columbia Anglican Church, the leading ministers in the Presbyterian, Methodist and Baptist Churches, the managers of all the leading industries of the province, mining, lumbering and fishing were all represented and gave evidence. So that the common statement or opinion that Chinese immigration was the cry only of a number of demagogues was demonstrated to be untrue, as every place, city and town, every conceivable provincial interest, was fully represented and is on record for or against the question at issue.

The scope of the commission was also national and international in its importance. Information of a national and international nature was acquired, extending to the Australasian colonies and the United States; the latter, of course, was of great importance, as the facts of the question in the western States referred to conditions exactly similar to those in British Columbia where the inquiry was held, and had the advantage of judging of the effects of legislation on the question similar to that which the evidence calls upon the commissioners to consider proper for Canada. I intend, however, later on to make more reference to the application of legislation against the Chinese in other countries and the consideration of the international aspect of the question.

I propose now to deal with the findings of the commission. The history of the Chinese dates back to the gold excitement period in the early sixties in British Columbia. They came over from California, but also large numbers came to the province, many left after the principal placer mines in Cariboo were worked out, so that twenty years after we had only a little over four thousand Chinese in the province. A short time afterwards large numbers were brought in to assist in the construction of the British Columbia section of the Canadian Pacific Railway; so that in 1884 there were over nine thousand in the province, and over three thousand were engaged in railway construction. Large numbers left after the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that in 1891 we had less than we had in 1884, still leaving, however, over nine thousand in 1891. In 1901, however, we find the number about 16,000 in British Columbia; in fact, we find that the growth of Chinese population increased in proportion to the white population of British Columbia, as seen by the census figures on page 19 of the report. In 1881, there were 49,000 whites and Indians, 4,350 Chinese; in 1891 there were 89,263 whites, exactly double, and 8,910 Chinamen, exactly double the number of Chinese; in 1901 there was 157,815 whites and about 15,000 Chinese, a proportionate increase in Chinese to whites. The explanation of this increase shows that Chinese labour contractors of British Columbia are in touch with the emigration agents in China, and thus keep full to overflowing the supply of Chinese cheap labour. This is very important, and I will refer to the same point later, the point being contrary to the commonly accepted dictum that this matter of Chinese competition would right itself and that white labour will eventually take the place of Chinese labour. The contrary is the fact, as there is an inexhaustible supply of these labourers who can be manipulated at any minute by the methods perfected by many years of experience. As it was expressed by one of the important witnesses, and an employer of labour at that, the Chinese labour supply is like a reservoir with a tap; when you get all you want you can turn off when they are satisfied.

Then, there is the quality of this immigration, whose supply is exhaustless, as shown by the report of the commission. Nearly all these labourers come from the eight counties in the province of Kwangtung, in the vicinity of Canton. In this province you have an area of 90,000 square miles and a population of over twenty million. The emigrants to Canada are mostly of the coolie class. Very extensive evidence of the nature of the Chinese who come to British Columbia is given in the report of the commission by authorities who have had years of experience in China. One of the witnesses, Mr. McLean, had lived many years in China (and who assisted counsel for the Chinese, being present throughout the investigation, was entirely favourable to the Chinese) gave a description of the value of their property, their houses costing from $5 to $15, the furniture $5, their wages per month from $2 to $3 to support a wife and family, forty or fifty of this class of people living together. Other witnesses of similar experience said that to their personal knowledge the large majority of Chinese who came to British Columbia are from the lowest coolie labour from China. The witness said this,

he declared, because he had been in China himself, he had been there and seen these operations ; and they live here he said, in British Columbia, just as they lived there. An author, for many years interpreter and secretary of legation, acting minister of the United States, of Pekin, in his book said the word poverty does not convey at all the same idea in the two countries. In America a man is called poor who has a family to support on earnings of perhaps $2 a day. In China such a man would be regarded as living in the very lap of luxury. Here, when the labouring man cannot afford to have meat twice a day, said this author, he is supposed to be on the verge of hardship and destitution. In China, the labourer receiving what he considers good wages cannot afford to eat a pound a month. Poverty in this country means a narrow and limited supply of luxury ; poverty in China means actual hunger and nakedness, if not starvation within sight. In China they earn from 10 to 30 cents in silver each day. As silver is worth only half of our money, this means that they earn the equivalent of from 5 to 15 cents. The average is less than 20 cents silver, or 10 cents of our money. Unskilled labour in China sell their strength for from 5 to 10 cents each day. This, it must be remembered, is not only to support the man himself, but from one to four or five other persons. In China failure to be at work one day carries with it the inevitable consequence of want of any sort of food for the same period. It is difficult to realize, says the author, how they live at all. Their daily food, however, consists of steamed rice, boiled cabbage, bits of raw turnip pickled in strong brine, raw cucumbers, raw carrots or turnips. This is the description given by this author of the food consumption of the great masses of the Chinese people, not for the beggars or the poor, but the class of industrious working men and their families.

Rev. A. H. Smith, another author, twenty-one years a missionary in China, in his book of Chinese characteristics, corroborates all the statements given by the former author. He states also that in the northern parts of China the horse, the mule, the ox and the donkey are in universal use, and the Chinese economy is carried into the general practice of eating all these animals as soon as they expire, whether the cause of death be accident, old age or disease. Dead dogs and cats are subject to the same processes of absorbtion as dead horses. He says that he has personally seen several cases in which villagers cooked and ate dogs which had been purposely poisoned by strychnine to get rid of them. On one of these occasions some one was thoughtful enough to consult a foreign physician as to the probable results, but as the animal was already in the pot the survivors could not make up their minds to forego the luxury of a feast, and no harm appears to have come of their indulgence.

So important is the question of how these people live in China, what in short it costs to produce a competitor of white labour here, and what he can live upon in this country, that the above quotations from the report may not be out of place.

The evidence also proved that the Chinese labourers are sent here by companies, their passages were paid and head money coming into the country ; they have to serve their masters till the money is refunded.

Another witness, the Rev. Lewis W. Hall, Chinese missionary in British Columbia, had been in China two years, could speak the Chinese language, knew the district well where the Chinese labourers came from, said they lived on 2½ cents a day, that their yearly earnings were $5.88. He asks the question, is it advisable that the labourer of this country shall be brought in competition with such conditions ? In his experience these people continued in this condition of living in this country. Take the condition and position that they have made in the capital city of British Columbia, Victoria. In that city there is a total of 3,273 Chinamen, of whom 288 are merchants. There are only 92 women in a population of 3,273, there are only 63 native born male children and 82 native born females. There are 530 Chinese domestic servants employed by whites, 198 market gardeners, 84 tailors, 48 saw-mill hands, 886 workers in the canneries, 197 laundrymen, who operate 40 washhouses, 638 miscellaneous labourers, and 177 out of employment. Thus it is seen that out of a population of 3,273, there are 3,132 adult males. The disproportion of males to females is even greater in other places than it is in Victoria. Out of a Chinese population in Vancouver City of 2,080, there are only 27 females, and in many of the towns where there are hundreds of Chinamen there are no Chinese women at all. Out of a population of 16,000 in British Columbia there are only 122 Chinese children attending the public school. Now if we take the white population of British Columbia, there are 161,272. Out of this we have 54,500 adult males, 30,000 adult females, and 23,613 children attending the public schools. Thus it is seen, in connection with the white population of British Columbia, that, for every adult male, there are three inhabitants. If this proportion is applied to the Chinese there ought to be a Chinese population of 48,000, and at least 5,500 children. Supposing the entire Chinese population of Victoria were replaced by white adult males, under the present condition of the male white population this would represent a population of from 10,000 to 12,000, equal to one-half the present population of Victoria, with children attending the schools, the churches, building up homes, filling the conditions of citizenship, and giving that mutual support to all the avocations and trades necessary to the healthy growth of the community. Thus we can see clearly, as proven by the report,

that the number of Chinese in British Columbia does not convey any accurate idea of the extent to which the white population is being replaced by Chinese ; for if you replaced all the Chinese with whites you would not only have their families, as indicated by the present average white family, but you would have the increase occasioned by their presence to supply their wants in every sense.

The unsanitary condition of these people is proven by the evidence given by the sanitary inspectors and the health officers of British Columbia. The story is told, the discription given, the evidence sworn to by responsible men, by the sanitary inspector of Victoria, James Wilson, by the health officers of the city of Vancouver, by the evidence of the several doctors of the province, by Dr. Roderick Fraser, medical health officer of Victoria. These doctors unanimously concur in the opinion that the Chinese are a menace to the health of the community.

Dr. Alfred T. Watt, superintendent of the quarantine for British Columbia, considers that the Chinese are especially subject to tuberculosis. He says that 19 out of 32 deaths of Chinamen were due to tuberculosis ; that there is more of this amongst the Chinamen than amongst other people.

Mr. Clive Phillips Wolley, an executive officer of the sanitary commission for the province, gives very strong evidence in favour of the position that the Chinese are a detriment to the health of the community. The unusual prevalence of consumption among the Chinese, coupled with the fact that the greater number of domestic servants sleep in herds in Chinatown and return to work directly from these places, according to the united opinion of the health officers and medical authorities of British Columbia, presents a great danger from a sanitary point of view. Their existence is constantly bringing about conditions favourable to the spread of the white plague, not only amongst themselves but amongst the white population. This is the class of people brought into the province of British Columbia amongst whom British subjects have to live and their wives and families, and against whom the permanent citizens of that province have to compete for a livelihood.

Take the Chinaman again in relation to the several trades and callings wherein he competes, how he affects the employer, how he affects the wage-earner, as seen in the development of the principal industries, such as land clearing, mining industry, the lumber industry and the fishing industry.

The commission has collected evidence of the operation of these several industries which demonstrates to us clearly the effect of Chinese coming into competition with the white labour of the province. It will be found that in all the principal industries and in every other trade and calling of unskilled labour he is not only employed, but has driven out the white man. To fully realize the extent to which this encroachment has been made and the injury it has wrought in keeping out permanent settlers and driving out those who are here, it is necessary that we should examine the facts in relation to each industry and calling wherein they are employed.

Take first the business of land clearing and land settlement, including agriculture and market gardening. The agricultural lands of British Columbia, while not as great in extent as in some of the other provinces, contain large areas of some of the richest lands in the world, the delta lands of the Fraser, and lands along the Fraser and other rivers, as well as high lands suitable for agricultural purposes and fruit growing. The heavy timbered uplands will be slowly cleared, because of the great expense. It does not pay now to employ Chinese labour for this purpose. Where it is to be done in large quantity machinery and explosives, used by white labour, must be employed, but in the meantime what is most desirable, even essential, to the settlement of the country, is that small holders should take up land, and while employed in other occupations, clear the land by degrees. Doubtless the delta lands will be first taken up, but were it not for the Mongolian labour rapid settlement would take place near the different downs and cities; why does it not? The reason is clearly set forth in the report of the commissioners. The would-be settler finds that the Chinese is employed in every field of unskilled labour, at a wage which even the employers admit, having regard to the present cost of living in British Columbia, precludes a white man to work for.

The manner of life and small cost of living enables the Chinaman to undersell in the market, and leave him a good profit. As the commissioners state in dealing with this question (page 185 of the report) :—

> They have no home to build up, they have no children to support, no contribution to churches, to schools, to make, cost of their clothes, board and lodging is trifling, they live in small shanties and crowd into rooms,—from ten to fifteen in a room. White labour will not hire where the neighbouring places have Chinese or Japs. On the other hand, settlement is prompted where farm labourers can take up land, where they can work for six months on their own land, and in other part of the year work for those who are able to hire them. The evidence goes to show that the presence of Chinamen retards settlement, promotes isolation and makes social life impossible, and the constant dread of this aggravated evil in the future in British Columbia there is no doubt discourages settlement.

Many of the land settlers in British Columbia have turned their attention to market gardening, as an incidental to their farm, but here again the Chinese control this part of the business by their cheap labour and their system of peddling their goods. This has made market gardening an impossibility to the white man, and although in the several cities of the pro-

vince the principle of a public market has been established and in some instances public market buildings erected, almost in every case they have been a failure. It is well known in British Columbia that important land holdings upon which large sums of money and enterprise has been spent that settlers have had to abandon them and the mortgagee has been permitted to take possession, and in many instances these good settlers have crossed the line where the law excludes the Chinamen, where they are not employed in the mills, and where he knows that he has a better chance for work. There is no doubt at all that this state of things is becoming worse and worse every year. It retards the settlement of the country, prevents it from becoming self-supporting, and interferes with the prosperity of the people. In support of this fact we have the verdict of the great body of the agriculturists of the province of British Columbia in favour of higher restriction or total exclusion.

Let me now deal with another industry in relation to the Chinese question. The total output of coal for the year 1900 in the different collieries of British Columbia amounts to over a million and a half tons, showing an increase of over 180,000 tons over previous year, with a total export of about one million tons. Neither Chinese nor Japanese are employed in the Crow's Nest Pass colliery. They are employed to a limited extent on Vancouver island. By the Vancouver Coal Company they are only employed upon the surface, and the largest exporter is in favour of the exclusion of further immigration. The general manager of the Wellington Colliery Company thinks there should be no restriction whatever, but the manager of the Dunsmuir Extension Mine says : (Page 260 of the report) 'There is no difficulty in getting the number of Chinese we require. If no more Chinese came in it would not affect us.' And Mr. Dunsmuir himself, the premier of the province, the principal owner of the large coal mines of Vancouver island, in the document called the 'Demands of British Columbia on the Dominion Government,' says that he is in favour of an increase of the per capita tax in such a measure as to surely limit the number of immigrants, and by the enactment of legislation similar to the Natal Act to regulate their employment while in the country.

The superintendent of the New Vancouver Coal Company, whose mines produce 600,000 tons, gave his evidence entirely in favour of exclusion at once ; so that not only some of the owners of the coal mines, but the superintendents of all the mines support the provisions of greater restriction. In every case they declare that the present supply of Chinese labour is sufficient to meet the demand for many years to come ; so that this evidence proves complete justification to the conclusion that further restriction or even exclusion of Chinese labour will not cause any appreciable inconvenience or loss to this industry.

What is true of the coal mines is true also of the placer and of the quartz mines. There are very few Chinese or Japanese employed in any of these mines, except in the Cariboo district, where some of the old mines employ quite a number of Chinese, and as seen by the evidence, the managers of these mines are favourable to increased restriction.

The metalliferous mines of British Columbia yield the largest amount annually of any of the industries of the province. Out of a total output of all minerals in the province, including coal and coke, namely, sixteen millions for the year 1900, the metaliferous mines yielded ten millions. This industry is steadily increasing, has been worked from the beginning almost exclusively with white labour, and the evidence of the large employers of these mines was to the effect that if there was no further immigration of this class of labour it would not retard the development of the industry. We have almost the unanimous opinion by these mining operators in favour of the further exclusion of Chinese immigration.

The lumber business of British Columbia employs nearly two thousand men ; about four hundred of these are Chinese and Japanese. There is only one of these exporting mills employing Chinese to any extent, and the manager's evidence was the strongest of any mill man in the province in favour of entire exclusion.

The total exports of lumber last year in British Columbia was over eighty-four million feet. Three mills exported about 97 per cent of the whole. The largest exporting mill is on Vancouver island ; they export thirty-eight million or nearly half of the export trade. This is the mill that employs Chinese to a greater extent than the rest, and, as I have said, the manager of this mill is in favour of entire exclusion. It is therefore clear, so far as this branch of the industry is concerned, the exclusion of Chinese immigration would not injure their business, as they support it strongly. This is an important instance, and I desire to quote a few passages from the evidence of Mr. Palmer, manager of the Chemainus Saw-mill Company, from pages 289 and 290 of the report :

> I think there are sufficient Chinese here at the present to supply all demands. I think all the business men employing labour would be willing to pay as much again to white labour as they pay to Chinamen. I do not think that any inconvenience would arise in our business if the Chinese were excluded. The change would take place gradually, as there are such a large number of Chinese and Japs here already, and if no more came in we would undoubtedly get white men and their families to come into the country. I think that the presence of Chinese has a tendency to prevent white immigration. Chinese are no good to the country, spend very little of their earnings in the country, send all their savings to China, and trade entirely with their own people.

There are many other mills in the province engaged in the local and eastern trade, which employ altogether about 1,600 men,

of whom about 400 are Chinese and Japs. Almost every one of the witnesses, managers of the mills, and in some instances, owners of the mills, were in a large majority of cases strongly in favour of exclusion and considered that there was an abundance of Chinese for all purposes in the province. The wages paid to white labour in Washington state are higher than they are in British Columbia. The general evidence given by the managers of the lumber industry was that there was an abundance of Chinese, that if no more Chinese or Japs were allowed in the country the industry would suffer no loss or even inconvenience, but on the other hand it would be a great benefit to the country. All agreed that this class of immigrants was undesirable as citizens, and all expressed strong opinions favourable to higher restriction. On the American side Chinese labour is not employed in this industry, and the American mill owners are strongly in favour of their present exclusion law.

The canning industry of British Columbia is as important as any of the great industries in the province. The number of Japanese and Chinese engaged in it greatly exceeds the number of them employed in any other industry. According to the evidence, more than one half of the labour employed in the canneries is Chinese labour ; in fact the canning process is almost entirely in the hands of the Chinese, and although the canners' evidence in some cases was strongly in favour of Chinese labour in this industry, it was admitted that the present supply already in the province was quite sufficient to meet all requirements and supply all demands for years to come ; and it is considered that the change by the process of only prohibiting Chinese from coming into the province, while such large numbers are already here, will make the change so gradual as to be all but imperceptible.

On the Sound where the Exclusion Act is applied it has not retarded the development of this industry.

If the present condition of things continues in this industry in British Columbia, it will not be long before the whole business of the country will be in the hands of a dozen exploiters and gangs of Chinese and Japanese.

It has been well established that the general industries referred to will not be interfered with by any exclusion law, the present supply being abundant for all purposes and for years to come ; this fact being well established beyond doubt by the employers themselves, and I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that even the employers of the province, whose position generally is one of taking every advantage of cheap labour have stated beyond doubt that it is desirable to restrict the inflow of Chinese and Japanese labour. The permanent settlers of that province are face to face with a serious effect upon two important factors of citizenship, namely, the unskilled labourer and the youth of the country. These are the people who ought to be encouraged to come to the country, but very many, both skilled and unskilled labourers, with women and children, already in the province and very many who have come to the province to seek employment have found the usual opportunities for it, especially in the lower grades of labour, already absorbed by Chinese and Japanese. Very many skilled workmen going to British Columbia find no opening in their trade. Being willing to take any position, these, with the larger class who have no special calling or trade, are debarred from almost every leading industry in the province, unless they are willing to compete at wages acceptable to Chinese and Japanese. In the city of Victoria alone there are 638 Chinese labourers, in Vancouver city there are 220 Chinese labourers, and by the evidence given by men in a position to know it is clearly proven that whilst there are many unskilled workmen in the cities, almost every avenue of work of this kind is already filled by Chinese or Japs. This evidence is beyond question as proving also the serious position that we have to face with regard to the employment of boys, girls and women, the occupations of this class being all taken up by the Chinese. This is especially important as it relates to the boys. I state on the floor of this parliament to-day that there are hundreds of boys, practically young men, who ought to be taking up the different kinds of labour in the province and thus assist their parents who are not in a position to keep them idle, who are completely shut out and wandering the streets without an aim or a purpose, because the Chinese are employed in the avocations rightly belonging to them. Thus the youth, the future hope of the country—are developing the character of idleness, and in every instance large numbers of them are going over into the United States. Very many have left British Columbia and have already gone there ; in fact I believe we are supplying that country on the other side, so far as the west is concerned, with the very best of our youthful labour and thus depleting our own country. I insist that this aspect of the question, depleting as it does this country of its future citizens, is a most serious grievance which ought to be at once rectified. As a matter of fact the employment of Chinese in all these grades of manual labour deters the youth from seeking employment because of the Chinese being employed at this work.

The Chinese monopolize entirely the position of domestic servants. It is considered by those who employ them in their homes that this is one of the instances where the Chinese are a great benefit to the country, and where it is repeatedly stated that it is impossible to get white females. We forget, however, that by the constant use and appropriation of Chinese labour in this business

we are making the proper training of domestic servants of the female subjects of the country an impossibility. There are plenty of girls in British Columbia at liberty to work as domestic servants, but they have no encouragement, they have to compete against the regular, docile, slavish, condescending methods of the Chinese domestic. He is willing to be there at all times, to do all things, to meet all exactions, to answer every demand. He is not a servant, he is a slave. Thus, the daughters of citizens of the country, have to compete against this kind of thing. Many have tried to do it, but the people generally have got so well used to the Chinese domestic--the poor slave who answers every call, meets every demand—that it is an impossibility for the free, ambitious white female domestic to meet these demands. Thus we are closing up what ought to be a school of training for females of the country. We are shutting them out from their natural avocation and they wander the streets in idleness whilst the Chinaman occupies the home.

Look at the case of merchant tailors. The evidence given by the report of the commission proves conclusively that whilst the Chinese labour monopolizes the menial and unskilled employments, in some instances they have very dangerously encroached upon the different trades and callings where higher wages are paid. In the city of Victoria the tailoring business has almost entirely been handed over to the Chinese. In 1891 there were eighteen white tailor shops and 150 men and women employed, with a yearly wage of over $109,000, at an average weekly wage of from $18 for men and $10 for women. In 1900 there were only twenty-one white men and thirty women in the whole tailoring business of the city of Victoria, and the yearly wages were $22,000 as against $109,000 ten years previously. In the same decade the population of the city had doubled.

One witness who was a high class tailor and has carried on the business for many years says that the wages of the white tailor in that city have been reduced fifty per cent through Chinese competition, that he had been driven almost entirely out of the business.

The same thing is true of the wholesale manufacture of clothing. This work of course is done principally by women and Chinese. This again has been taken almost entirely out of the hands of the whites by the Chinese. One firm who put in a plant costing $2,000 with the latest machinery, employed over forty hands, and the Chinese killed the business completely. Every one of the employers in this business agreed that the present supply of Chinese was ample and that no injury would follow if the Chinese were entirely excluded.

The same thing holds good with regard to other trades and callings—the boot and shoe manufacture, the cigar making, the brick making, lime burning, cordwood cutting, railway construction, freighting; all these have been taken charge of by the Chinese, and all these are avenues of labour which very properly belong to the white labour of the country, labour which means permanence and stability to the country itself. In this again, let me add, the operations of any of these industries, according to the evidence given by interested persons, will not be even inconvenienced by the exclusion of the Chinese. In every instance in connection with every trade and every business the one conclusion is proved that the present supply of Chinese and Japanese in the province of British Columbia is quite sufficient to meet the demands of the business. The one argument in the past—it has been put up by Chinese advocates, an argument of course which the government has had to pay some regard to—has been that the industrial development of the province made Chinese immigration to the province absolutely necessary. If the truth of that position is admitted for the sake of argument, the time has come, as I have just said when all companies with large investments and interests, and all their managers responsible for the most economic results that their business can bring, the principal business men in all the cities, with their large investments, unitedly agree at the present time that there is a superabundance of Chinese and Japanese in the province. The argument then in favour of entire exclusion is absolutely conclusive.

The merchants and the traders in the province are unanimous in favour of Chinese exclusion, and I would recommend the House to read the Commission's Report from page 610 to page 624; every one of the witnesses, the leading business men in the Coast cities, are unanimously in favour of entire exclusion. In Victoria, according to the figures of the Chinese Board of Trade itself, there are 238 Chinese merchants, comprising 109 firms, and doing a business amounting to over a million dollars. In Vancouver there are 143 merchants, comprising forty-seven firms, doing a business of over one half a million dollars. At Nanaimo there are fourteen merchants, doing a yearly business of $163,000. At New Westminster there are twenty-nine Chinese merchants, doing a business of $317,000. And amongst the whole of the whites, merchants and traders, according to the evidence, they are unanimously opposed to the Chinese.

The question then is: Are the people of British Columbia or is the public opinion of that province, favourable to further restriction or entire exclusion of the Chinese? The important question is: Do the persons representing all classes of business interests in the province, favour further restriction or exclusion? For the present, I am shutting out of the argument bona fide employees, for the sake of avoiding commonly accepted opinion that this agitation for

Chinese exclusion relates entirely to the trades unionists of the province. This class, I may say, whose evidence I consider is of as great an importance as others, I leave out of the present consideration for the reason that both skilled and unskilled labourers in the province are absolutely unanimous in favour of entire exclusion. But when I speak of the opinions of the others, I mean professional men, traders of every description; the largest employers of labour—the most of whom employ already in some degree Chinese and Japanese labour. What is the general opinion of these people, as the whole of their interests are at stake with regard to this question. Now, Sir, I have looked over the whole of that evidence, and there we have the heads of the principal dry goods merchants, the heads of the principal grocery merchants the head of the legal firms, the superintendents of the large coal mines, the superintendents of the metalliferous mines, the principal ministers of the principal churches, the managers of the lumber business, the representative men, and every conceivable interest in the province. Their evidence is there under oath, and almost unanimously they agree with the entire exclusion of the Chinese. If this request is not granted by this parliament, then the desire of the people of British Columbia is not answered. What good reason can any government give, what good reason can any parliament give, composed as it is, of the representatives of the people, for refusing to grant the people their desires ?

Similar agitations have been made on this self-same question in other countries, and what British Columbia is asking for and has been demanding for many years has been already accomplished and acquired in other countries. It is well known, and important for this House to consider, that in other countries where Chinese have emigrated to that their presence and exclusion has been agitated for very strongly. That is seen in the United States, Australia and Tasmania. As far back as 1876, a Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives was appointed to investigate the question of Chinese emigration, and I think it important that quotations from the report of that commission might be given to show that exactly a similar experience with our own was proven. The testimony of lawyers and of doctors, merchants, divines, judges, in fact of all classes, went to prove that there was no real prosperity derived from the presence of the Chinese, that they were ruinous to the industrious labouring classes, that they promoted a caste, that they were dangerous to free institutions, that they reduced wages to starvation point, that they made unskilled employments impossible, that they compelled young men to grow up in idleness, that the whole tendency was to turn industrial classes into an almost entirely servile class.

They found that the Chinese could subsist where the Americans would starve; they dispensed entirely with what was a necessity in modern civilization; to compete with them, said the American commission, is to drive out every American subject. It was also proven that the very presence of Chinese retarded white immigration to the Pacific States. This arose from the Chinese monopoly of farm and mechanical work, and the low price of their labour, which made it impossible for the new immigrant to live. This commission declared that free institutions, founded on free schools and intelligence, could only be maintained when based on intelligent and adequately paid labour; that adequate wages are necessary to give self-respect to the labourer and the means of education to his children; for family life is the great safeguard to political institutions. That Chinese immigration meant sordid wages, no public schools and the absence of the family; and they reported to Congress that this problem was too important to be treated with indifference, but that it was absolutely necessary to solve the difficulty unless their Pacific possessions were to be given over to an alien race. And in their concluding statements to congress they said it was the part of wisdom to anticipate the day when patience might cease, and that wise legislation ought to avert this evil, that impending difficulties of this character should not in this advanced age be left to the chance arbitrament of force, that these questions ought to be solved by the statesman and philanthropist, and not by the soldier. And the committee concluded its report by stating that in view of the fact that the well-known policy of the Chinese government is adverse to the immigration of its citizens, and that Great Britain has already, without offence to China, absolutely prohibited immigration to several of her colonies, we believe that similar action on our part will not destroy or disturb the friendly conditions now existing; but even if it were otherwise the harmony and perpetuity of our social and political institutions cannot be weighed in the same balance with mere material prosperity or commercial advancement. Your committee, therefore, unanimously recommend that immediate correspondence be opened up with the governments of China and Great Britain.

In 1879, a Restriction Act was passed in the United States, being vetoed by the President in the same year. A treaty, however, was entered into in 1880, ratified and proclaimed in 1881, between the United States and China, as to the exclusion of Chinese coming into the States. This, of course, especially provided for the immigration of Chinese labourers, and protecting as it did the Chinese already permenently residing in the States.

In 1882, an Act was passed giving effect to this treaty. In 1884 this Act was amended, suspending the immigration of Chinese

into the States for ten years, and imposing a penalty of $500, or a term of imprisonment for one year for every Chinese labourer brought in by the master of any vessel. In 1892 a further Act was passed, continuing the operation of all restrictive laws then in force for a period of ten years, and making provision at the same time for deportations for breach of law.

This treaty was the result of nearly twenty years of agitation. It is also to be noticed that by a Joint Resolution of the House, July 7, 1898, it was declared that there should be no further immigration of Chinese into the Hawaiian islands, except upon the conditions allowed by the law of the United States. These acts and treaties, with the regulations to enforce the same, constitute the present law of the United States with respect to Chinese immigration.

In the report of the Philippine commission in 1900, (volume 2, page 432), there is a memorandum of the Chinese in the Philippines, and coming from such a trustworthy source it is worthy of special notice. Their report was: That the principle of political economy is well known, which lays down the rule that in order for a country to obtain advantages from immigration the immigration should bring in capital, new industries or superior knowledge to perfect industries already in existence, or at least that such immigrants should apply their energies to pursuits productive of gain, not only to the immigrants themselves, but to society in general in the country in which they have established themselves, or that they finally become assimilated with the people of the country, thus giving, although indirectly, stimulus to certain professions and industries whose progress is a consequence of the increase of the number of inhabitants of the town. Chinese said they, in going to the Philippines did not comply with any of the conditions of this well-known condition of political economy, which are desirable points to be looked for in immigrants. Why should they be allowed to emigrate to the Philippines when their presence was not a guarantee of prosperity and progress for the rest of the inhabitants. It is impossible, they said, on account of the competition in which they lived to attain a position in the middle class of society. It was the custom of the Chinese to consume, as far as the necessaries of life are concerned, food, clothing, and articles which they import from their own country for their own purpose.

The report of the Canadian Royal Commission has made extensive inquiry into the application of the exclusion principle in the United States, has taken most important evidence in Seattle, in Washington state, in Portland and in San Francisco, and there we have evidence of a most important kind, having had so many years' experience with this class of people in the western States, and also considerable experience with the application of an Exclusion Act, brought about by treaty between the governments of the United States and China. The general effect of this restrictive legislation in the United States has been to gradually decrease the number of Chinese on the west coast, the greatest reduction, of course, taking place in California, where they were reduced from 72,000 in 1890, to 45,000 in 1900. The population of the State of Washington has increased from 75,000 in 1880, to 518,000 in 1900, while the number of Chinese have only increased from 3,186 in 1880, to 3,629 in 1900; while the population of British Columbia has increased from 49,459 in 1880, to 177,272 in 1900; the Chinese population for that same period in British Columbia has increased from 4,550, to 16,000; so that whilst the increase in the general population of British Columbia has doubled, the Chinese population has more than trebled. In Seattle they have a population of 80,000, and they have less than 500 Chinamen; whilst in Victoria, the capital city of British Columbia, with a population of only 20,000, they have a Chinese population of 3,300.

The whole of the evidence taken in the western States was overwhelmingly in favour of the present operation of the exclusion law in the United States. This opinion was given principally by employers of labour. They stated plainly that the exclusion caused no shock to the various industries; the change was gradual; the effect was unnoticed. And in the western States, as proven by the evidence given to our Royal Commission, it was clear that they regarded the question as being closed, and it could not be found that there was any class of the populace but were in favour of Chinese exclusion. The consideration of the continuation of that treaty between the United States and China is being dealt with at the present time. Special reference was made to the importance of the subject by President Roosevelt in his annual address, and when he declared emphatically his anxiety for a continuation of the exclusive measures, and there was every evidence that that would be carried out according to the present discussion on the question.

The Australian colonies prior to the formation of their present commonwealth, had passed restrictive legislation against the Chinese. The colony of Victoria as far back as 1855 imposed a tax of $50 and limited the number to one Chinaman to every ten tons of the ship's burthen, and imposed a penalty on the master of the vessel of $50 for every passenger carried in excess. They imposed a resident license tax on the Chinese of $20. In 1881 the same colony passed an Act limiting the number of Chinamen to one in every 100 tons of the ship's burthen, and imposing a penalty of $500 for breach of the law and a tax of $50 for every immigrant arriving in the vessel. Similar legislation to this has been passed

in Queensland, in South Australia, New South Wales, New Zealand, Western Australia, Tasmania; in fact, the whole of the colonies sent their representatives to a conference at Sydney, in June, 1888, and at this conference it was resolved that all the laws of the various colonies for the restriction of Chinese immigration should be assimilated upon a basis fixed by that meeting. The resolutions of that conference were embodied in a draft, which is as follows :

1st. That further restriction on Chinese immigration was absolutely necessary for the welfare of the people of Australasia.

2nd. That they considered that the desired restriction could be best secured through the diplomatic action of the Imperial government, and by uniform Australasian legislation.

3rd. That they make joint representations to the Imperial government for that purpose.

4th. That the Australian legislation must contain the following provisions :

(a) That it shall apply to all Chinese with specified exceptions.

(b) That the restriction shall be by limitation of the number of Chinese which any vessel may bring into the country, one passenger to every 500 tons of the ship's burthen.

(c) That the passage of Chinese from one colony to another, without the consent of the colony which they enter, be made a misdemeanour.

The first and fourth resolutions were endorsed by all the colonies except Tasmania and Western Australia; the third and the fourth resolutions were carried unanimously. As a whole, therefore, these principles represent the opinions of the people of Australia.

The Australian colonies felt that this was a serious question, and they made strong and decisive action to protect the interests of their people. They have of course considered Imperial interests and international obligations, and have always maintained the reputation of a law-abiding community, but they have insisted upon the exercise and operation of legislation which prevented their country from being overrun by an alien race, who were incapable of assimilation, who were strangers to their civilization, who were out of sympathy with their aspirations, who were unfit for free institutions, whose presence was a constant source of danger. As a consequence of this conference, the colonies of Victoria, South Australia, Queensland and Western Australia passed an Act prohibiting vessels from entering any of their ports in a larger number of Chinese than one for every 500 tons of the vessel, making a penalty of £500 for each Chinese in excess of that number. This Act was passed by these colonies in 1888 and 1889. In 1898 New South Wales passed an Act on the lines of the Natal Act, and attaching tremendous penalties to any breach of the Act. In 1888 New Zealand passed an Act imposing a head tax of $50, and one to every 100 tons of tonnage of such vessel; but in 1896 they increased poll tax to $500, and in 1899 passed an Act on the lines of the Natal Act, which was assented to in 1900. In Tasmania, an Act was passed in 1898 on the lines of the Natal Act; in fact, in 1888 the Australian colonies were urging the whole government to take diplomatic action with China to obtain treaties similar to those obtained by the United States in 1880. In spite of this correspondence, however, no progress was made to obtain such treaty.

In a letter dated April, 1888, by the attorney general and submitted by the premier of Tasmania in answer to the Secretary of State's circular on the subject of colonial legislation respecting Chinese immigration, the following statement was made :

The reference made by His Excellency the Chinese Minister to Her Majesty's international engagement induces me to observe that the exceptional legislation that has been adopted by the majority of the Australasian colonies on the subject of Chinese immigration does not violate any recognized rule of international comity, on the contrary it is a fundamental maxim of international law that every state has the right to regulate immigration to its territories as is most convenient to the safety and prosperity of the country, without regard to the municipal law of the country whence the foreign emigration proceeds.

Thus, the question in the Australasian colonies has been solved, and on December the 6th, 1901, the Alien Immigration Restriction Bill was passed by the parliament and the senate of the Australian Commonwealth.

The demands of British Columbia and its agitation on the question are exactly similar to those which agitated the people of the Australasian colonies and the United States. Strong action was taken by all the governments on the matter. Years of agitation have been made by petition, by provincial legislation of every description, by deputations of every kind, and at last the almost unanimous wish of the people of British Columbia has been given as evidence on oath before a Royal Commission appointed by this government; such evidence almost unanimously asking for immediate action, and either demanding much stronger restriction or entire exclusion; not only so, but the Royal Commission itself, after weighing all the evidence of that broad and expansive commission, have unanimously decided in favour of greater restriction, as follows :

1. We find that these representations of the people of British Columbia are substantially true and urgently call for a remedy.

2. We also find that the increase of the capitation tax from $50 to $100 is ineffective and inadequate.

3. We are of opinion that the further immigration of Chinese labourers into Canada ought to be prohibited.

4. That the most desirable and effective means of attaining this end is by treaty supported by suitable legislation.

5. That in the meantime and until this can be obtained the capitation tax should be raised to $500.

The only point of difference with the commissioners was the date when the capitation tax of $500 should come into effect. The majority of the commissioners agree that it should be done at once, a single commissioner thinks that $300 should be imposed pending the arrangements of a prohibitive treaty. If that is not accomplished in two years then he agrees to have the tax raised to $500.

This is the claim in the interests of British Columbia, and it seems to me this parliament should at once in this session carry into effect such a full and unanimous decision as arrived at by these commissioners after listening to all the evidence given under oath by the people in the province affected by these people.

For a few minutes I will deal with what I anticipate to be certain reasons that may be given by certain members of the House against further restriction or entire exclusion of Chinese. It may be said that this will affect our trade relations with China, and secondly, it may be said, and I have no doubt will be said, that this legislation is opposed to the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Let me first discuss the question of our trade relations with China.

There are several facts disclosed in the report of the commission with regard to the trade of this country with China that have an important bearing upon this question.

Canada's total trade with China in 1896: Imports equal $1,030,698; exports $659,758; total trade $1,690,456. In 1900: Imports equalled $643,433; exports for the same year equalled $256,307; total $880,704. The falling off of the imports relates chiefly to two items, sugar, molasses and tea. The falling off of the exports is covered principally by the item, cotton and cotton manufactures. It will be noticed that imports are more than double the exports, that the goods admitted free are double the dutiable goods. Notwithstanding the application of the Exclusion Act in the United States their trade with China has largely increased. The increase of their export trade is especially noticeable in the items cotton and wheat flour. The opinion of a number of prominent Americans, including the president of the Chamber of Commerce, Seattle, the Secretary of the Board of Trade and Commerce, Portland, and the Mayor of Portland, was that the Exclusion Act had not interfered at all with the trade of the United States and China; and after all the findings of the Royal Commission they report that they are of opinion that any further restriction or exclusion will not affect the trade with China.

The President of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle in answer to the question as to whether he thought the Exclusion Law had interfered with the United States' trade with China he answered 'not at all.' He said it was altogether against the policy of the Chinese empire to allow their subjects to leave the country, and it is not regarded by any of the American authorities that the Act has been in any way injurious to trade. Their trade with China is consequently on the increase, that the trade is growing, and we do not think that the Exclusion Act affects in any way the trade question.

Mr. Masten, Secretary of the Board of Trade and Commerce, Portland, in answer to a similar question said 'I do not think that any action taken by this country against the importation of Chinese has affected the trade in any respect.'

The Mayor of Portland gave similar evidence. Prominent business men in San Francisco corroborated this opinion in every instance, so that I do not think there is any probability of any trouble arising on trade matter.

With regard to Imperial interests, the British government itself has appointed a commission to inquire into the whole question of immigration into Great Britain, with a view of excluding undesirable immigrants, and in considering the British Columbia legislation it is to be remembered that the Colonial Secretary has repeatedly suggested the application of the Natal Act even against Japanese. We contend that whilst the government of this country guards itself against being made a slaughter market for cheap goods whereby the manufacturer is able to limit supply and fix prices, on the question of the free importation of cheap labour we are asked to accept conditions where the supply is unlimited and the prices unfixed. The whole country admits that our competitor is not our equal, can never become a citizen, we debar him from the national privileges, it is admitted that British labour cannot live decently upon the ordinary remuneration given to him, yet we have to submit to this unequal and degrading competition and assume all the responsibilities. If normal conditions equal to the privileges given to commercial interests are to be brought about, then we must have an entire exclusion of Chinese labour. If we are to build up a nation and not to think of the exploitation of certain resources then we must think of settlers out of which we can make Canadian subjects in the highest and best sense of the word. Population is undoubtedly what is wanted, not only in British Columbia but in this country. There is plenty of room, there are boundless tracts of country yet unexplored, mountains of minerals undeveloped, large expanses of land not yet made to yield crops to the settler. We have good conditions, liberal laws, free institutions, and everything which makes the struggle for existence fair and moderately

easy. One thing is wanted and that is population, and not the quantity of immigrants, but in every case the suitability of them. I am not sure that the nature of the immigrant brought in under the present emigration policy of the government is at all desirable. One thing is sure, whether he is suitable or otherwise, he is costly. If this parliament concludes in favour of Chinese and Japanese by refusing to exclude them, I do not see any reason that they can give for not throwing the gates wide open and admitting them as freely, not only as they would be willing to come, but making inducements for them to do so. If the decision of this parliament is in favour of Chinese immigration then the logical meaning of that ought to be that the enormous expense of the present immigration policy of the government in settling up the country is altogether unjustifiable when we have countless numbers of Chinese willing to come in without any expense at all to the country. That seems to me to be the logical position that this parliament ought to take, if it holds the view that entire exclusion against Chinamen is wrong. If we are to have a strong nation we must have a united people, thus the nature of the immigrant must be such as to make an affiliation possible with the present Canadians.

This does not exist at the present time in British Columbia. We are mixed up with large proportions of a servile race, and whatever permanently weakens British Columbia, weakens the Dominion, and weakens the empire, and any method of business operation which brings material gain to individual interests ought not to weigh for one moment against an injury to the nation.

Then as to the moral aspect of the question. I know it will be said by certain people that this question is opposed to the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. The morality of Chinese exclusion is not to be compared to the morality of international warfare. We do not propose to organize a system of slaughter against the Chinamen ; we do not even propose to expel those from our country who are already in it ; we have been and are quite ready to bestow on them the benefits of British institutions ; we are content at least to adopt nature's method of lessening the evil effects of a class of people by the ordinary process of natural destruction. We do not propose to send our armies to China ; we simply request them to stop at home. Honourable gentlemen who would sanction and endorse considerations readily in favour of international material warfare I suppose would hold up their hands in holy horror against the proposed legislation that we advocate. It is beyond the possibility of proof by those who oppose such legislation that it is possible to raise the Chinaman up to the appreciation of the moral and Christian people of this country or even to make him a good citizen. If that were possible to any conceivable extent it might be urged perhaps from a humanitarian standpoint that it would be our duty to receive them ; but as I look over the evidence of the late commission I find that the prominent Christian teachers in the province of British Columbia clearly show that it is not possible to make good citizens of the Chinese or in any perceptible degree to bring them under the influence of Christian teaching. I know in some cases where Christian teachers living in the east have held the contrary view, who have afterwards lived in the west and have changed their views. This is especially true to the politician of every grade. Whilst it has been difficult to have this legislation endorsed enthusiastically in this parliament, especially by the members of eastern Canada, it is not difficult and has never been difficult to get a favourable opinion from any of them when they are out in the west. I desire, therefore, to read some of the evidence of the leading ministers of the Christian churches in British Columbia.

It will be seen, by looking over that evidence and admitted by Christian teachers, that missionary work amongst the Chinese on the coast has met with little success, in fact where any of the ministers gave evidence at all favourable to the Chinese it was put on the ground that they were a servile class and that such a class was necessary to the higher development of the Anglo-Saxon race.

The Rev. W. Leslie Clay minister of the principal Presbyterian church in Victoria, who has lived there for seven years, states as follows : That where any single Chinese gives evidence of Christian reformation he is looked upon by his fellow Chinamen with great antipathy ; he is cast off by his friends because of having adopted Christian modes of thought and living. That he does not know of any of the educated classes of Chinese accepting Christianity. The presence of them in large numbers, he says, is not desirable, and states emphatically that he objects to more coming in. We should have a strong robust nation, he said, and our vast resources ought to be developed by our own citizens. He was asked the question on what ground would he exclude any part of God's creatures from any part of the world, and he answered that self-preservation was the first law of nature, that he would exclude them on that principle and that the Imperial government ought to make a treaty with China to that effect. They were a servile race. Asked as to what he thought the founder of the Christian religion would advise under the circumstances, he answered and said that he had endeavoured to interpret Christ's mind in the matter, and thought that Christ would approve of self-protection.

The Rev. A. S. Rowe, minister of the Metropolitan church, of Victoria, formerly of Toronto, considered that the presence of Chinese had a detrimental effect on the pro-

vince and an injurious effect upon white labour and on the markets. Their presence is a decided injury to economic conditions, and altogether a disadvantage to the community. The Chinamen are driving the white men out of the country. The Chinaman can never be made a citizen, and that is what we want, people that will take an interest in our laws and institutions and be an integral part of our community and not a menace to the community. He said he believed entirely, not in restriction, but in prohibition, speaking from a national standpoint. He thought Canada would be much stronger by the exclusion of the Chinese race.

Bishop Perrin, head of the Anglican Church, says: They come without a cent and are under obligation to those who bring them here. I do not think, he says, that things ought to be allowed to go on as in the past. They are allowed to come in and arrive with nothing. I think our mission is to go to China because our religion is the universal religion. He thought the Chinese ought not to be allowed to interfere with the dignity of labour in the mind of a true ideal workman. He was opposed to the present immigration. Encroachment of Chinese on the occupations of the people of the country was a dangerous and objectionable condition. I may state, he said,—and this is a very important point—that, while I was in England I was unwilling to recommend labouring people to come to British Columbia. I think there is a great future for British Columbia when the population increases.

The Rev. Lewis W. Hall, Chinese missionary of the Presbyterian church, says: There are large numbers of Chinese employed in and about the Union Mines. When a Chinaman becomes a Christian he is ostracised, shut out from his family, cut off from all intercourse, is made an outcast of his own race. We have no converts from amongst the merchant class. I do not favour the formation of a coolie class at all.

The Rev. Mr. Scott, Methodist minister, the First Methodist church, Vancouver:—

> I do not think it desirable to have the Chinese come. They do not assimilate. It would not be desirable if they did. I have no ill-will to those who are here, but I wouldn't permit any more to come. I think their presence unnecessary. I do not think we need them here in order to reach the Chinese nation as a whole, from the Christian standpoint. We can take Christianity to China without their presence here.

The question was asked, 'Do you believe in the universal brotherhood of man?' 'I do,' he said, 'and I believe in the common Fatherhood of God.' And would you deny the right of any man to any portion of this earth?' He answered:

> We are not universal nations yet; universal nationality and universal brotherhood are two different things. We would like to see universal Christianity, but that is still in the distant future. I don't expect to live to see any great approach towards the universal brotherhood of man. When the Chinese come to the province by the thousands affecting the industrial work of the labourer then the first duty is for the national government to protect its own people and send the aliens back to their own land.

The Rev. McBeth, Presbyterian minister, Vancouver: Any alien race which refuses to assimilate is a menace to the nation. 'I think,' he said, 'we have all the Chinese we can digest. Looking at this question we must have regard for the future of the country. Our children must have room for livelihood. Domestic servants are held in low esteem in British Columbia on account of the presence of Chinese.'

The Rev. John Reid, Presbyterian church, believes the Chinese ought to be excluded.

The Rev. Roland Grant, Baptist minister, ten years on the coast, was also in America for years—had had large experience with Chinese, said:—Assimilation with other nationalities is forbidden. In Portland, he said, with a population of 20,000, in 1880, Chinese population was 6,000. Since the application of exclusion of Chinese, Portland has a population of 100,000 and only 5,000 Chinese. I think we have the moral right to exclude. I think the operation of the Exclusion Act would be quiet and unobserved. The Chinese coming to this country as they do have a deteriorating tendency. A tax of $100 will not keep them out. The Exclusion Act is the proper thing.

The Rev. Mr. Bowell, Methodist minister: I consider the immigration of Chinese and Japanese to be detrimental to the interests of the country. They control the work that ought to be in the hands of white people. Many people have left the province, large families, not being able to get work. I regard them as a menace to the future well-being of the nation, and very seriously interfere with the employment of the boys, which is a very serious matter for any country.

The Rev. Mr. Minchester, Toronto: The presence of Chinese in British Columbia in some cases affect the white wage-earners favourably; in others prejudicially. If Chinese were coming into the country in large numbers I would favour restriction, not of Chinese alone, but I would restrict the large influx of foreigners from any quarter. I would base terms of restriction upon character and education. Foreign immigrants should be able to read some European language, should come into the country for some stated purpose should show some reasonable prospect of becoming permanent citizens.

The evidence then of a large majority of the witnesses under this head goes to prove that, the opinions of the leading Christian ministers in British Columbia who understand the question, who know its effects, who are in a position to know all the facts

relating to it, unite with those of others in the province in favour of the exclusion of Chinese. The opinion is practically unanimous that the work of Christianizing the Chinamen in the country is not attended with as satisfactory results as similar work in their own country. The great majority of these witnesses were positively opposed to a servile class or to the introduction in any way of a class that would tend to degrade or affect the welfare of the white labouring class. It is therefore clearly proven and reported so by the commissioners that in no appreciable measure will the missionary work with the Chinese as a nation be affected, and that the morality of this question is supported even by the leading Christian teachers in the province where the evil exists.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am drawing to a conclusion on this subject, and I desire to make a recapitulation of my points in order that they may be thoroughly clear to the mind of the House. I gave first a description of the quality of the report of that commission, which must be admitted by the House as being extensive and conclusive. Second, I presented the demands of British Columbia on this question, showing that for fifteen years the agitation has been going on, the unanimous voice of the provincial parliament by the passing of legislation of every description and resolutions and unanimous petitioning of the people. Third, I reviewed the work of the Dominion government on this question from 1884 up to the present time. Fourth, I described the scope of the inquiry and the finding of the commission, and proved conclusively that what the people of British Columbia had been demanding for many years had been demonstrated by the conclusion of the commissioners to be reasonable. Fifth, I showed how the Chinese affected the different industries: (a) how they affected the question of land clearing and land settlement, (b) how they affected the coal mining industry, (c) how they affected the lumber industry, (d) how they affected the fishing and canning industry. Sixth, I showed how the Chinese excluded unskilled labourers and displaced the boys, the great mass of British subjects, heads of families depending upon the operation of unskilled industries for a livelihood, but more especially the boys of the country, the future nation, driven to idleness, ought to be assisting the sustenance of their family, deprived of the ordinary employments of the province. Seventh, I showed how they affected the local industries; how local industries of many kinds had been entirely taken possession of by them, and how the whites had been driven out of the business altogether, as instanced by the merchant tailors, boot and shoe manufacturers, cigar makers, brickmaking, cordwood cutting, railway construction, freighting, and that in all the evidence given that the business would not be inconvenienced by Chinese exclusion. Eighth, I showed the opinion of the people of British Columbia—public opinion on the question; I demonstrated clearly that the evidence of every interest in the country, dry goods merchants, grocery merchants, lawyers and barristers, superintendents of large coal mines, superintendents of metalliferous mines, ministers of Christian churches, managers of the lumber business, representative men of every interest, were agreed for greater restriction and even exclusion. Ninth, I showed the agitation of the question in other countries, as seen in the United States, in Australia and Tasmania for many years back, how they accomplished and operated what we are now demanding; then the findings of our own commissioners, the unanimous decision in favour of an immediate increased restriction, and failing a prohibitive treaty, the law of exclusion. Tenth, I made some reference to the trade relations with China, showed the experience of the United States, operation of the Exclusion Act in that country had not in any way interfered with the trade, but on the other hand their trade connections had increased enormously. Then I looked at the moral aspect of the question, and by the production of evidence given under oath, by the leading ministers of the Christian churches of British Columbia, they were almost unanimous in favour of a prohibitive law, and very strongly in favour of an increased exclusion law.

I do not see how this parliament can refuse to at once comply with the wishes of the loyal and industrious subjects of British Columbia, and as the representative of that province, in complete accord with the opinion of the witnesses in the evidence given to the commission, and with the conclusion arrived at by the unanimous commissioners, I hope that this parliament at this session will take such immediate action as will comply with the requests of the people of British Columbia, and remove this grievance once and for all. I can assure this House that the feeling of British Columbia subjects on this question is intense, and whilst they have appreciated the increased head tax of 1900, and especially appreciated the appointment of the Royal Commission, and now that they find that the decision of that commission is entirely in accord with their experience and with their desire, it would be a most serious matter if this parliament does not immediately comply with their unanimous request.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I have listened attentively to the speech which the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) has just delivered upon the question of the exclusion of Chinese from British Columbia. I have tried to follow him closely, and I think I express the opinions of a

good many members on this side of the House when I say that we believe he has done his duty, and that he has made a very temperate as well as a very forcible presentation of the case from the standpoint of the province of which he is one of the representatives. I agree with him too, Sir, speaking for myself, and I concur in his opinion that he cannot see, in view of the report which the Royal Commission appointed by this government has made on that question, and in view of the unanimity of feeling which exists amongst the people of that province, how parliament can very much longer refuse to deal summarily and finally with this matter. I may remind my hon. friend that he has still another string to his bow. I think, if my memory serves me right, that immediately prior to the elections of 1896 the attention of the right hon. the First Minister was called to this question of Chinese immigration. His opinion on that matter was asked by some of his friends on the Pacific coast. I would not like to make any statement that was not in accordance with the facts, but I believe I am correct in saying that in response to the message which the right hon. gentleman received from his supporters in British Columbia on that occasion, he said that he would be guided by the opinions of his friends and supporters in that province in the action which he would take on that question if the Liberal party were returned to power. He has a number of able and loyal supporters from that province, and they have made a presentation of the case to him again and again. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has made an exhaustive and elaborate presentation of the case, and I would invite him now at the earliest moment to test the sincerity of his leader upon the question of the exclusion of Chinese from the province, by giving notice of a resolution to that effect, and having a vote of this parliament taken upon it.

I was much gratified to notice that the Minister of Labour was present during the whole time that my hon. friend was addressing the House. He has taken a good deal of interest on this question of protecting the rights of labour. I am sure that my hon. friend from Vancouver must have convinced him by the arguments which he has so temperately and so forcibly advanced to-day. I have no doubt that if the suggestion which I have taken the liberty of making to the hon. member for Vancouver is acted upon, and if he gives the House an opportunity of expressing its opinion on this matter, he may look for the cordial co-operation and support of the hon. Minister of Labour. At any rate, if the hon. member for Vancouver will do what I think he ought to do, implement his speech by action, if he will present to the House a resolution calling for the exclusion of the Chinese, he may be able to test the sincerity of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House and ascertain where they stand upon that question.

The hon. gentleman also made reference to the quality of our immigration, which I think is worthy of the very best consideration of hon. members on both sides of the House. He did not confine his remarks to Oriental immigration, he referred to other classes of immigration coming to this country from the east. I agree with him that quality in our immigration should not be overlooked, that we should endeavour to get the very best class of immigrants to come to Canada, and that the presence of undesirable classes, not only in British Columbia but in other provinces of the Dominion, acts as a deterrent to prevent the better classes that we desire to come to the Dominion, from entering our doors. I took the liberty already, during this session, of drawing the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, and I think of the Minister of Finance, to the allegations which were made in the annual report of the Commissioner of Immigration of the United States, as to the difficulty which the authorities on the other side of the line experience in keeping undesirable immigrants out of that country. In view of the fact that the hon. member for Vancouver has referred to the quality of immigration, I take the liberty again of drawing the attention of the government to the statements which the Commissioner General of Immigration for the United States has made in his report for the fiscal year ending June, 1901. After referring to the number of diseased immigrants who were returned by the officers of his department from United States ports to the countries whence they had come, he says :

> These represent, however, only such as applied for admission to the United States, and the bureau reiterates the opinion heretofore expressed that the vigilant inspection at our ports has resulted, to some extent, in diverting diseased aliens to Canada, whence they surreptitiously effect an entrance across our northern boundary line.

Now, Sir, in view of this statement of the hon. member for Vancouver, concerning the desirability of having none but the best class of immigrants coming to Canada, I think the extract I have read is worthy of the attention of the government, and I think they should direct their efforts to keeping out of our country this objectionable class, that, according to the report of the commissioner, is seeking entrance to the United States by way of Canada. I hope that the speech which has been made by the hon. member for Vancouver will have some effect upon the government, that it will stir up the Minister of Labour, that it will induce him to take some such steps as will meet with the reasonable demands which have been presented to the House by the hon. member for Vancouver.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some passing reference to an incident which is not, probably, unparalleled in the history of this House, but which is unique in its character, nevertheless, which took place during the sitting of this House yesterday. I refer to the extraordinary opinion which hon. gentlemen who occupy seats in this House entertain respecting each other; I refer to the extraordinary spectacle, if I may use that strong language, presented to the House and to the country yesterday by the hon. gentleman who represents North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in this House, and by his colleague who sits beside him, the hon. gentleman who represents the county of Russell (Mr. Edwards). The confession, if I may be permitted to use the term, which the hon. member for North Norfolk made, was certainly a most extraordinary one. I think it was well that even at this late date that confession should have been made, and I am glad that the hon. gentleman had the courage to make it. It is a most extraordinary one in its character. The hon. gentleman stated briefly to the House yesterday that he was a protectionist—a protectionist to the hilt—while his colleague at his right (Mr. Edwards) says he is a free trader to the hilt. The hon. member for North Norfolk declared that not only is he a protectionist now, but that he has been a protectionist steadily for the past twenty-five years and that he believes in moderate protection: that in 1875, 1876, and in 1877, he advised his leaders that the country required moderate protection and that the great bulk of the people of Canada were looking for legislation of that character. That statement was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, if I understood what he said correctly in the House yesterday. He said that he had advised the government of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie that additional duties should be imposed in order that the interests of the country might be protected, and having made this statement, he made the still further and most extraordinary statement that the late Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues were prepared to give the industries of this country an additional measure of protection and that the reason why they did not give that protection was because they met with so much opposition from their supporters from the maritime provinces. That, I believe, was, in brief, the statement which the hon. member made. Lest I should have misinterpreted what he said, with the permission of the House, I will read the 'Hansard' report of that particular part of his speech:

> I suspect, however, and I think I have good reasons for the suspicion—that the Mackenzie government were willing to advance the duties to 20 per cent or even to 22½ per cent. But, the Minister of Finance of that day——

I think the Minister of Finance of that day is the veteran parliamentarian who occupies the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce to-day.

> ——But the Finance Minister of that day was waited upon by a delegation of the members from the maritime provinces headed by the Hon. A. G. Jones, then member for Halifax, and was informed by that delegation that if any advance in the duties was made it simply meant that there would be a bolt of the supporters of the government from the maritime provinces.

So that, the honest convictions of the hon. member for North Norfolk and of the Liberal government of that day were set aside. The interests of the country were set aside. Patriotism on their part was set aside also in order that by acceding to the demands of the gentlemen who then represented the maritime provinces in this House, the Liberal party might secure a renewal of power from the electorate when the appeal was made in the summer of 1878. That seems to be the position in which the hon. member for North Norfolk has left his colleagues respecting their action in refusing the moderate demands of the country as far back as 1878 for a reasonable measure of protection to the industries of Canada. The hon. member for North Norfolk goes a little further and says:

> I wrote, as I say, to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie in June 1878 . . . . . I advised him to postpone the date of the elections and to take measures to have this question thoroughly discussed in every riding in the Dominion and to have this protective policy combated by good speakers everywhere.

The hon. gentleman, who was in favour of the principle of moderate protection for the industries of Canada, this gentleman who thought that the interests of the country would be promoted by the adoption of a reasonable measure of protection, this gentleman who asked his leader, the late Mr. Mackenzie, to give that measure of protection, this gentleman who says that he believes that Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues were in favour of giving a measure of protection to the industries of Canada and that the request was refused because the Liberal representatives from the maritime provinces figuratively put a pistol to the head of the government, says that he wrote to the late Hon. Mr. Mackenzie asking him to postpone the elections in order that a competent band of speakers might be sent out to convince the electors of Canada that the protection that he believed to be in their interest should not be granted them. I think this is a most extraordinary statement for an hon. gentleman to make. We are bound under the rules of parliament, and we unhesitatingly acquiesce in them, to accept that statement; but, I say that coming from an hon. gentleman occupying such an honourable and distinguished position as that hon. gentleman occupies in this House and in this country, it is one of the most extraordinary character for him to make. But, fortunately, or unfortunately,

the hon. gentleman's statement can be buttressed by a statement made by an even more distinguished member of this House than himself, the statement of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads this House. He practically endorses the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk in sentiments which fell from his lips at the banquet which was given in the restaurant of the Senate to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in May, 1900. If I have copied correctly from the Toronto 'Globe' of May 10th of that year, the utterances which are credited to the right hon. gentleman, he said on that occasion that :

> When the policy of the party was agreed upon Sir Richard Cartwright never wavered in his support of it . . In the days of Mr. Mackenzie, when the country was much depressed, there were many who believed that if the tariff was increased that policy would be justified by the necessities of the revenue, and that it would be a valuable policy for the country at large. . . . . but if the advice of Sir Richard had prevailed at that time this policy would have been adopted. If it was not accepted it was on account of other influences, which prevailed with the government of the day, and for 16 or 20 years Sir Richard bore the brunt of the obloquy of not having responded to public sentiment, whereas the truth was he was ready to respond to public sentiment.

That statement, it seems to me, confirms the statement which the hon. member for North Norfolk made respecting the action of the government of the late Mr. Mackenzie in dealing with the trade issues of this country. I say it with the greatest possible respect, it is a most extraordinary statement to have been made by the hon. gentleman who represents North Norfolk, but it seems to be confirmed by the statement which the right hon. leader of the government made at the banquet to which I have made reference. Patriotism and the interests of the country, so far as one may judge, were sacrificed on that occasion by hon. gentlemen opposite in the hope—the vain hope—that they might secure a renewal of office from the electors of this country. The hon. member for North Norfolk says that he was fully aware of the strength of the public opinion which existed in the country at that time, that he himself took time by the forelock, that he addressed many meetings in his own constituency against this very principle of protection in order that he might retain his seat in this House. We have the spectacle presented to us of an hon. gentleman who believed in the policy of protection from 1878 down to 1896, denouncing that policy and declaring against the legislation, brought in by the late Sir John Macdonald and the Conservative party, known as the national policy, which, he asserted, yesterday, in this House, was moderate in its character, was moderate protection, was protection in the interests of the people of this country. Is not that a most extraordinary spectacle for an hon. gentleman to present ? Is it not an extraordinary position for one to take who occupies the position that the hon. member for North Norfolk occupies in the House and in this country ? What an inspiration it will be to the young men of Canada to be told by the hon. member for North Norfolk that while he believed in moderate protection—and he tells us now that the legislation passed by the Conservative party was of this class, that it was moderate protection—that while he believed in that policy, that while he believed that a moderate measure of protection was necessary to promote the interests of the country, yet from 1878 down to 1896 he did not hesitate to condemn the policy of Sir John Macdonald, he did not hesitate to fulminate against protection and use his great power and influence throughout the Dominion to induce the people of Canada to desert the standard of Sir John Macdonald and give their support to himself and his colleagues.

Sir, the memory of Alexander Mackenzie is revered by the people of this country. There is a well known maxim which tells us : Speak nothing but good of the dead. I regret that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who was associated for years with Mr. Mackenzie in public life, who on many occasions expressed himself as favourable to the Mackenzie government, should be one of the first in this House to asperse the memory of Mr. Mackenzie. Colleagues of the late Alexander Mackenzie, who are equally responsible with that gentleman for the legislation of 1876, have now seats on the floor of this House, and some of them seats in the present administration. The hon. Alexander Mackenzie has passed over to the majority; he has entered into rest; he has gone to his reward, but his colleagues are here in the House to face the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) and, if he has vials of wrath to pour, it is on their heads he should pour them, and not on the head of the deceased statesman who cannot defend himself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) before attacking the motives which prompted Mr. Mackenzie to decline to give that reasonable measure of protection to the industries of Canada, which he (Mr. Charlton) thought they should receive, used these words :

> I had a great deal of pleasure a short time ago in listening to the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), and I can endorse most fully his encomiums as to the good character of the administration of the Mackenzie government, and as to his speculations as to what would probably have been the outcome of that policy had they continued in power.

These remarks seem to be quite inconsistent with these other quotations from the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) which

I have read to the House. How can he eulogize and endorse the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) for the good acts of the Mackenzie government, when that gentleman held the portfolio of finance in that government; when he agreed with the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) that protection was necessary for the welfare of this country, but who, feeling that the interests of his party might be sacrificed if they gave that reasonable measure of protection which he believed in, denied his principles, stood beside his leader and refused to give the people what they desired and what was necessary for their welfare ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely if Mr. Mackenzie is to be condemned, equally deserving of condemnation, is the Minister of Trade and Commerce for the laches of the government in that great crisis in the history of our country ? If I am rightly informed, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross) who sits on the left of the hon. member for Norfolk was a member of the Mackenzie government at that time, and he too is responsible for the action of that minister.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) No.

Mr. CLARKE. Then I have been misinformed.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) My last session was in 1874.

Mr. CLARKE. Then the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross) got out before the threat was made against the Mackenzie government by the members from the maritime provinces ? However, there are some living representatives of the Mackenzie cabinet in the cabinet of the present day. There is the right hon. the Prime Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. CLARKE. I shall withdraw the accusation. I am glad that the right hon. Prime Minister is not responsible for the acts of the government of 1876; he has enough responsibility to assume for the acts of the present government. However, if the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) and if the right hon. the Prime Minister were not members of the Mackenzie cabinet of that date, we have at all events the noblest Roman of them all; we have the Minister of Trade and Commerce who was certainly a member of the Mackenzie administration in 1876.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Yes, and the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) must be held responsible for the acts of that government. But, instead of condemning that hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), we find the member for North Norfolk endorsing him and praising him, and congratulating him on the speech he made in this House which he characterized as being a most ingenious deliverance. Well, it was an ingenious deliverance, and considering it from the standpoint of ingenuity alone, I join the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in congratulating the Minister of Trade and Commerce on that speech. But, Sir, between 1878 and 1896, let us remember that these two hon. gentlemen (Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Charlton) went throughout this country declaring that the policy of the Liberal party was a policy of free trade; that the policy of the Liberal party was opposed to protection; and in face of that we have the admission to-day from the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) that they both favoured a substantial addition to the tariff of 1878, and that the reason they were not able to accomplish a change in the fiscal policy of the Mackenzie government, was because of the threat made by the Liberal representatives from the maritime provinces that if it were done they would withdraw their support.

I do not think, Sir, that the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Charlton), is calculated to reflect credit on the character of the gentlemen who were concerned in the transaction, nor do I think it will add lustre to the achievements of the Liberal party of Canada. In what position is the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) ? Let us consider for a moment his position. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) declares that he is a protectionist to the hilt, while his desk mate from Russell, a gentleman who has represented that constituency for many years in this House, declares himself to be a free trader to the hilt. From 1878 to 1896, the hon. member for North Norfolk sat in his place in this House, and he consistently voted against the principle of protection during all that time. He never neglected an opportunity of condemning that policy, and of condemning those who framed it and put it into operation. His colleague from Russell who was a free trader then and says he is a free trader now, was consistent up to 1896 in voting against the protective policy, but he now plays a role almost as inconsistent as that of his hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), for since 1896—ignoring the pledges of the Liberal party, ignoring their promise of retrenchment, ignoring their declaration that they would destroy the policy of protection—he has since that time been one of the most faithful and steadfast supporters of the Liberal party who certainly have not adopted anything remotely approaching a free trade policy. Let us see what changes the Liberals have made in the Conservative protective tariff since they came into power. The Finance Minister told us in his budget speech that while in 1896 the duty collected on all importa-

tions into Canada was equal to 18·28 per cent; the duty collected in 1901 amounted 16·06 per cent. This statement shows us that a reduction of 2·22 per cent has been made by the Liberals on the tariff which was in existence in 1896, and under which tariff the Liberals out of office, said, the consumers and producers of this country were being robbed and crushed. A reduction was made in the Conservative tariff, therefore, only to the extent of 2·22 per cent, and the hon. member for Russell who still claims to be a free trader to the hilt, has no hesitation in supporting this government, and declaring by his vote that they have redeemed their pledges, when on their own statement they have only made this miserable reduction of 2·22 per cent on the duties imposed by the tariff of 1896. And, Sir, this miserable pittance of 2·22 per cent, includes the so-called British preference; includes the so-called preference which was given to the motherland as a proof of fidelity and attachment to British institutions. At least, so the ministers of the day say. Well, Sir, if that so-called preference had not been given, the reduction which the Liberal government has made in the tariff would be much smaller even than 2·22 per cent.

The hon. member for North Norfolk, while professing for 18 years to be a free trader, has now practically admitted that he was a protectionist, and we are bound to accept his statement. But, surely, if he is sincere, he must take one more step; he must dissociate himself from hon. gentlemen opposite, because he has given to us and the country the strongest possible evidence of their insincerity on this question of tariff reform. If the hon. gentleman believes in the principles he has enunciated, he certainly ought not longer to continue to support gentlemen who have no fixed principles respecting the tariff. We ought not to be surprised at the divergence of opinion that exists among the unofficial members of the Liberal party who occupy seats in this House, when we find so much divergence of opinion among the leaders of the party. We have had exhibitions of this divergence of opinion among them again and again. At the great banquet of the Manufacturer's Association of Canada, held in Montreal a few months ago, the Premier took to himself the credit of having a tariff that was almost perfect. He said:

> I do not know, you know better than I do because you have to deal with it more than I do—it may be that there are blemishes in it; but whether there are blemishes in it or not, I suppose on the whole the manufacturers are pretty well satisfied.

Upon several voices saying 'No, no,' the right hon. gentleman added:

> That only shows that there is room for improvement.

Naturally exception was taken to the statement that the tariff was almost perfect, and when the right hon. gentleman heard the cries of 'No, no,' he at once turned round and said, 'That only shows that there is room for improvement in it.' There is certainly a great deal of room for improvement in the tariff; and if the resolution presented by the hon. leader of the opposition met with the approval of the members of this House, a decided improvement would be made in the tariff, and substantial benefit done to the interests of the country thereby. The Minister of Finance was also present at that banquet in Montreal, and he said:

> A friend whom I met here to-night, an honoured member of your association, said: 'I want the tariff to be out of politics.' So do I; nay, more, I venture to say, and I hope I can say it without going beyond the line which no man should pass beyond at this non-political union, but I hope I can say that the tariff is largely out of politics to-day, and that if you will take the trouble to read the discussions at Ottawa you will come to the conclusion that there is not much difference of opinion between the two great political parties in Canada upon this great question.

Sir, the resolution which has been submitted by the leader of the opposition proves that there is a substantial difference between the two parties on this question of tariff reform. If that difference is not greater at the present time, it is due to the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have largely abandoned the position they held up to 1896, and have adopted the view of this side of the House, that a substantial measure of protection is necessary to the existence of the industries of the country. But there was another minister present at that banquet, and he gave no uncertain sound as to where he stood on this question of tariff reform. He said:

> The United States takes us by the throat every time in trade matters. I cannot see why our Canadian customs should not be as self-protecting as theirs. (Cheers.)
>
> I care not about words nor theories. The first principle is to defend ourselves. Do not think I belong to a government which thinks alike.

If we ever thought so, our minds have been disabused of that idea long ago. He went on:

> You have no idea what a cabinet meeting is. They fight like blazes sometimes. (Loud laughter.) I have been brought up in a protectionist school and I have not renounced my faith.

That is the attitude of a gentleman who occupies a very prominent position in the government of this country to-day; and I think I may say that that minister has no stauncher supporter in this House than the hon. member who represents the county of Russell (Mr. Edwards). We have thus the right hon. gentleman who occupies the position of premier claiming to be a free trader, and having associated with him in his cabi-

net men who are avowed out-and-out protectionists. This method of conducting the affairs of the country may be in accord with constitutional practice, but I think it is unique in the history of Canada.

The hon. member for North Norfolk referred to the Anglo American Commission. The important position that hon. gentleman occupies in the ranks of the Liberal party—or probably it would be fairer to say the important position he occupied in the ranks of the Liberal party two or three years ago—was seen in the fact that of all the able men in the party who are not members of the cabinet he was selected as the gentleman best qualified to deal with matters of such vital importance as those affecting the relations of Canada with the United States. He was selected from amongst all the followers of the government to become associated with two or three members of the cabinet in dealing with these perplexing questions. That hon. gentleman knows in his heart of hearts that if he were as frank on this subject as he was yesterday in declaring his protectionist principles he would tell this House that when that commission went to Washington, they were utterly at sea as to the wants and requirements of this country, and that he himself had very largely to prepare the statistics on which the commission depended for information as to the trade and trade interests of this country. These gentlemen were as indefatigable as their predecessors in endeavouring to bring about a settlement of the questions at issue between Canada and the United States; but what was the result of all their meetings? Practically nothing, and yet the hon. gentleman said in his speech yesterday:

> The condition of trade between these two countries at the present time warrants us in saying to the United States: Give us reciprocity in natural products. Not that we will promise you any mitigation of our tariff system. We will not agree to put a single article more on the free list. We will not agree to reduce our duties unless we choose to do so, we are entitled on the basis of the conditions as they are to-day to reciprocity in natural products.

Although that commission met again and again and failed to accomplish anything, and although the right hon. premier said it was not going to Washington any more, yet the hon. member for North Norfolk thinks that they ought to go once more. For what purpose? To try to negotiate a reciprocity treaty in natural products alone. He says:

> But I am anxious to see that Joint High Commission meet once more. I am anxious to ascertain, as a result of that meeting, whether these questions can be satisfactorily adjusted or not. When we have definitely ascertained one way or the other, we shall know what course we ought to pursue; and if we cannot get fair play, we can at least place ourselves in a position where we shall not receive the contempt of the American people and where we can at least resent an injury.

Sir, up to 1896 efforts were made time and again by those who were intrusted with the responsibility of administering public affairs in Canada, to obtain a reciprocity treaty with the United States on conditions such as are proposed to-day by the hon. member for North Norfolk—a limited reciprocity treaty. They went in 1892 or 1893, I forget which, with the object of endeavouring to obtain freer trade relations with the United States. But how were they criticised when they returned to this House, having failed in their mission, as the hon. gentleman and his colleagues failed also? They were told more than ten years ago by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the parliament of Canada that they were bound to fail because they did not approach the question of reciprocity from the proper standpoint. On that occasion the right hon. gentleman said:

> The hon. gentlemen did not want to succeed on the basis of unrestricted reciprocity; they wanted to negotiate only on the basis of restricted reciprocity; and as mentioned in the letter of Mr. Blaine to Congressman Baker, which it is useless to cite again in the House, the American government had intimated again and again that they would not negotiate on any other terms than that of unrestricted reciprocity. So their mission was bound to fail from the very outset.

That statement was made deliberately, with all the responsibility attaching to a statement made in this House, by the hon. gentleman who occupied the position of leader of the Liberal party at that time. And yet we have the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) opposing to-day, ten years after it had been declared by the First Minister that the American government would not negotiate on any other basis than unrestricted reciprocity, the amendment offered by the leader of the opposition, on the ground that we ought to make another attempt to obtain a trade arrangement with the United States on conditions which the leaders of the Liberal party have declared again and again to be absolutely impossible. I cannot understand why this commission should be asked to go to Washington to endeavour to obtain trade relations with the United States of a wider measure than those which exist to-day, if the statement of the right hon. the First Minister, made ten years ago, had any foundation in fact, and I am sure that he must have believed every word he said on that occasion.

But there is this point which strikes me forcibly. If Canadians desire to retain their self respect, they will stop sending delegations to Washington to ask for wider and better and closer trade relations with that country. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was quite right in saying that the policy which has prevailed among the politicians of the United States for near-

ly forty years has not been one of amity or friendship towards the people of Canada. Yet the people of Canada, notwithstanding this hostility, have been able to hold their own, and now, thanks to the tuition of the leaders of the Conservative party, they have found a market for their surplus products in the old land, which is now declared by the First Minister to be the best market for all our produce. Why, then, should we jeopardize or disorganize our trade with the mother country in the fatuous, futile attempt to get better terms from our American neighbours ?

One of the causes of the comparatively slow growth which has characterized the Dominion during the past twelve or fifteen years has been that hon. gentlemen, representing nearly one-half of the people, have declared again and again that access to the markets of the United States for our surplus products was essential to the prosperity of this country ; and no capitalists could be induced to invest in the industrial enterprises in Canada until the question of our tariff and trade relations with the United States was settled once and for all. The hon. gentleman who occupied the position of leader of the Liberal party, prior to the time when the right hon. gentleman assumed the responsibility of that position, expressed himself as follows, in his valedictory to the people of Canada, as far back as 1891 :—

> The writing of this letter is the most painful event in the political life of which it is the close. Absolute free trade or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States has been maintained as the sole plank of the Liberal party ever since 1887.

This statement was made on the 5th or 6th of March, 1891, and if that hon. gentleman had remained in Canada, he would have found out that unrestricted reciprocity continued to be the principal plank in the policy of the Liberal party until 1895. How could these gentlemen expect that this Dominion, notwithstanding the vastness of its resources and the possibilities of the future, would so develop industries as to keep pace with the times, when they were continually preaching that the only hope for Canada, that the panacea for all the trade evils under which this country was labouring, was free access to the United States markets, in return for which we were to give the United States manufacturers free access to our markets ? Substantial progress, under such conditions, was impossible.

Let me read a few passages more from this document, the valedictory of the Hon. Mr. Blake. He said :

> Permanence was essential to the success of unrestricted reciprocity. No manufacturer would fix or enlarge his capital in the country of five millions at the risk of being cut off from the country of sixty millions. Our neighbours, instead of engaging in manufacture here, would take our markets with goods manufactured there. And our raw materials instead of being manufactured on this ground, would be exported to be finished abroad.

That is the statement of a gentleman who occupied for years the position of leader of the Liberal party. He declared that this policy, under which it was impossible to promote the industrial development of the country, had been the sole plank of the Liberal party, and he concludes that valedictory by declaring :

> I believe absolute free trade with the United States, best described as commercial union, can only come as an incident or well understood precursor of political union.

He was sustained in the opinion that we could not make much progress without unrestricted reciprocity by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Speaking in 1894 in this House (see page 327, 'Hansard') that hon. gentleman said :

> Yet no great prosperity can be attained by the people of Canada, unless and until we establish friendly, amicable relations with the United States and obtain access to their markets.
>
> Canada, to-day, above all things and before all things, must be made—if it is going to prosper—a cheap country to live in and to produce in ; must have access to larger markets and notably the most important of all markets—that which lies to the south of us.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have been in office since 1896. The responsibility of promoting the interests of this country has been in their hands since then. If they were sincere in the belief, to which they gave expression again and again, that this policy of absolute, unrestricted reciprocity was necessary for the development, welfare and prosperity of this country, what steps have they taken to bring it about ? They appointed a commission, which met again and again but which did nothing, and the statement has been made and repeated in this House that the deliberations of that commission came to naught because of the insuperable difficulty of the Alaskan boundary dispute. That is the statement made here and elsewhere during the last twelve or eighteen months. But it would not surprise me at all, when the whole history of the sessions of this commission both in Quebec and Washington is made known, to find that there were other matters besides the Alaskan boundary question which stood in the way of a settlement of the trade differences between the two countries. I have in my hand a journal called the 'Expansionist,' which has already been quoted with regard to the questions at issue between Canada and the United States. I find in it an article on Canada and the United States by Mr. Osborne Howe. In this article Mr. Howe says :

> It is no more than fair to say that the Maine congressman (referring to the late Mr. Dingley) so far appreciated the advantages of a trade policy which our country must later on adopt, that he proposed to the Canadian commissioners to recommend to congress the repeal of all customs duties upon Canadian products if the government of the Dominion would agree

to make a like repeal of its duties upon merchandise, the products of the United States.

That statement is made by Mr. Osborne Howe. He declares that Mr. Dingley agreed to make a recommendation to congress to give us free access to the American markets provided we gave the Americans free access to our markets. Mr. Howe said further :

The present needs of revenue from the customs, and the discrimination which a practical carrying out of this plan would have made against imports coming from England, were considered by the Canadian commissioners to be sufficient justification for their refusal to favourably entertain this proposition. In effect it would have involved the adoption by Canada of the tariff system of the United States with a sensible loss of legislative independence. The sessions of the Joint High Commission apparently came to an end in consequence of an insuperable disagreement over the question of the Alaska boundary line ; but it is inherently probable that a method would have been found of compromising this difference if satisfactory headway had been made towards coming together for the formation of a reciprocal trade treaty. In the absence of this centripetal influence, it seemed, when a contention arose over the boundary question, that there was nothing to be gained by prolonged and inconclusive discussions, hence the sessions came to an end.

That is the statement made in this journal, the 'Expansionist,' by Mr. Osborne Howe, as to the real reason why the commission, appointed at the instance of hon. gentlemen opposite, came to naught. And in 1899, under date March 24th, I find in the London 'Times' this paragraph :

That Canada alone has much to gain from a satisfactory settlement of the trade and boundary questions in dispute is an entirely fallacious presentment of the case. The interests of the United States are quite as deeply involved as those of her continental neighbours, and many of the well informed advisors of the Canadian government perceiving this to be the case are exerting pressure rather to bring about a rupture of the negotiations than to contribute a settlement.

The hon. member for North Norfolk knows whether these statements are justified or not, but I would not be at all surprised, when the secret history of these negotiations comes to be known, to learn that there were other matters besides the Alaskan boundary question, upon which a very substantial disagreement took place between the commissioners of both countries.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

GRAND VALLEY TRACTION COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 21) respecting the Port Dover, Brantford, Berlin and Goderich Railway Company and to change its name to 'The Grand Valley Traction Company.'—Mr. Heyd.

On section 1.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Will the chairman of the committee (Mr. Hyman) kindly explain the changes made in this Bill.

Mr. C. S. HYMAN (London). The original Bill included a section, numbered four, to which some objection was taken by the committee on the ground that it allowed different bonding privileges in regard to different sections of the road. The committee felt that that was not in accordance with the usual custom ; and, after consideration it was withdrawn by the promoters. Then, under the last clause of the Bill, the company were asking for an extension of seven years, and the committee decided to give them an extension of two years to commence and five years to complete.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The bonding privileges, I understand, extend to the whole road ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, just as they were originally.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

WINDSOR AND DETROIT UNION BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 24) respecting the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company.—Mr. Cowan.

On section 1.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Will the chairman of the committee please explain the changes in this Bill ?

Mr. C. S. HYMAN (London). The original Bill proposed an extension of five and seven years. The committee, in accordance with the precedent that they have established in other bills of a like character, gave the committee five years to complete.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And how many to commence ?

Mr. HYMAN. I may say that there were two other Bills practically of the same character considered by the committee, and as they were bridge Bills it was thought by the committee that the companies would be entitled to five years from the passing of the act. In the case of this particular company, it is really only four years, because they have come here almost a year before the expiration of their powers under their original charter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no time fixed for commencement.

Mr. HYMAN. No, but—

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). How then, is the time for commencement fixed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). May I be allowed to explain ? The company have to commence within two years from the time they receive powers—this being an international work—from the congress of the United States. And, to limit them, so that the charter may not be held if the conditions change, or the mind of this House should change regarding the granting of these powers, they have to complete the work within five years of that time. They have to commence within two years, which is our rule. They really have no existence and cannot do anything until they have acquired joint legislation from the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. There is nothing about when they are to commence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is provided for in the charter is that they must commence within two years, and they cannot commence until they acquire legislation from the United States Congress. After they acquire that power, at any rate, they must complete the work within five years or return to this parliament for a renewal.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that our rule is that they commence within two years, but our rule has no force after this statute passes. We are amending the whole statute. Some of the other Acts which we passed provide that within two years after they got their charter from the American authorities they must commence work, and they must finish it within five years. This specifies it must be finished within five years, but says nothing with regard to when it shall commence after they get their authority from the United States.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think that is provided for in the original charter.

Mr. SPROULE. We are amending that clause of the charter which relates to the beginning and finishing of the road, and after that is passed, it is the only law which will govern, I assume.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the bridge is commenced.

Mr. HYMAN. No, the bridge is not commenced. The committee most carefully considered this whole matter, looking upon the undertaking as somewhat different from a railway company; and it being an international measure and dependent upon legislation from the United States, it was felt that five years ought to be put in instead of two. It might be impossible to get legislation within one year, and probably they are getting no more than they are entitled to in that sense.

Mr. SPROULE. We have not taken that view with regard to these Bills heretofore. We have always made their commencement contingent upon legislation in the United States, because that Act might be passed early or late, but it commenced to count from the time of passing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am inclined to think, and I thought when I spoke before, that the charter was not amended, and had the original clause providing that they must commence two years after they receive their authority from the United States Congress. But the clause as drawn by the promoters of the Bill, I think, would meet the views of the hon. gentleman for this reason, that the work has to be built within five years from the granting of this charter, otherwise it becomes null and void. So they have only five years to procure legislation and finish the work. That is stricter than other Bills.

Mr. INGRAM. There are two other Bills on the same line.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A charter of that kind might be held for a good many years, and it does not expire unless they receive legislation from the United States Congress. In this particular case, as the clause is drawn, the charter becomes null and void unless they commence the work within five years.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

QUEBEC AND LAKE HURON RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 26) respecting the Quebec and Lake Huron Railway Company.—Mr. Malouin.

On section 1.

Mr. C. S. HYMAN (London). I will mention to the committee that the only amendments made to this Bill are one or two verbal changes. The promoters have asked for four and seven years for the extension, and the committee decided they should be given two and five years, which is the ordinary clause. The other change is in the wording of clause 2, by which the committee strike out the words 'in addition to,' and put in the words 'as well as,' giving the company power, if they desire hereafter, to make a gauge of six feet ; but they must have at least a standard gauge.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the object of a six foot gauge ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is explained by the promoters of the Bill. In certain contingencies they might require to carry very heavy loads over their road, therefore they

simply ask for the privilege of laying another rail if they so desire. But they can only do that providing they have a standard gauge.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

BUFFALO AND INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANIES.

On section 1.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 31) respecting the Buffalo Railway Company and the International Railway Company.—Mr. Osler.

On section 1.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we should have some explanation in regard to this Bill.

Mr. C. S. HYMAN (London). This Bill simply provides for the substitution of another name, but a couple of amendments have been made as an addition, in the following terms :

But such substitution shall not in any way impair, alter or affect the liabilities of the Buffalo Railway Company, nor in any wise affect any suit or proceeding now pending, or judgment existing either by, or in favour of, or against the company, which notwithstanding such substitution may be prosecuted, continued, completed and enforced as if this Act had not been passed.

It was felt by the committee that there should be a clause of that kind inserted simply as a protection to any creditor that there might be of the road. In addition there is a second clause which is practically to the same effect as the provision of the Ontario statute :

2. The vesting in the said company of the business, profits, rights and incidents appurtenant thereto and all other things belonging to the Niagara Falls Park and River Railway Co., by any agreement made between it and the said company by the said statute of Canada does not deprive or assume to deprive the legislature of Ontario of its powers and rights in respect to the Niagara Falls Park and River Railway Co., or the jurisdiction and control of the commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park as by the said statute provided.

I am inclined to think that is fully covered by the preceding clause, but there was a desire that this second clause should be inserted as an additional protection.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you make provision against an action against one company and leave it out in the other case ?

Mr. HYMAN. I think that is precisely all covered by the original clause. I think the first clause covers the second one. The second clause I read is part of the original Ontario Act. I may say that it was the desire of the Ontario government that this should be inserted.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HYMAN.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—Mr. Sutherland (Essex).

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Indian River Railway Company.—Mr. Béland.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I had been drawing the attention of the House to the position occupied by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and to the statement which he made respecting his relations to the adoption of a moderate policy of protection. He declared that he had favoured in 1876 a moderate policy of protection, a policy such as had been introduced by the Conservative party and carried in 1878 or 1879, while at the same time he steadily offered opposition to that policy from its adoption down to 1896. I was also drawing attention to the fact that, from the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was practically in the same position, and I quoted an extract from a speech delivered by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on the occasion of a banquet tendered to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1900, to the effect that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had also favoured a moderate measure of protection, but, that he had been overruled, or coerced, by his colleagues in the House who then occupied seats and represented constituencies in the maritime provinces ; that from the adoption of that policy of protection down to 1896 he had been denouncing it, notwithstanding the allegation that prior to 1878 he had favoured it. I also referred to the statement made, and repeated again and again, that the Liberal party had declared that Canada could enjoy no general or real measure of prosperity unless and until we had obtained access to the markets of the great republic to the south of us for our surplus agricultural products ; that the Liberal party had charged that the Conservative delegates, who went to Washington again and

again to try to secure a treaty that would enlarge trade between the two countries, did not go with the desire or the intention of being successful, because they had confined their efforts to offers of restricted reciprocity when the Liberal party, had declared that it was impossible to make any agreement with the statesmen of the United States except on the basis of unrestricted reciprocity. I quoted also from a statement of the 'Expansionist' newspaper to the effect that Mr. Dingley had favoured the passage of a measure through the congress of the United States that would provide for the free admission of Canadian products to the markets of that country on condition of our granting them a like privilege by the admission of American products free into the markets of Canada, but that the proposition had been declined. I may say here, Mr. Speaker, that, speaking for myself, and I believe, speaking for every hon. gentleman on this side of the House, if the Canadian commissioners who visited Washington in 1898, or 1899, were offered unrestricted reciprocity and refused to accept it, upon the conditions that I have named, they acted well and wisely in the interests of the country, because, I think it was better that in that case, as in many other cases that might be cited, that party should abandon its position rather than that the interests of the country should be sacrificed. I attribute their change of policy to the fact that having come into office, they realized the responsibility attaching to their position, they realized to a greater extent than previously that Canada has as much to lose as to gain by the adoption of the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, that Canada has as much to give as to obtain from that policy; and that having committed themselves to this policy of a so-called British preference they could not meet the views or wishes of their American colleagues on that Joint High Commission.

There are no two opinions to-day as to the fact that the country is prosperous. We rejoice in that fact and we can congratulate the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in being able to make the statement he made the other day as to the prosperity of the country. We hope that prosperity will continue for many years to come, but, we challenge the accuracy of the statements which have been made from time to time by hon. gentlemen opposite as to their part in bringing about that prosperity. We have invited them to make a statement as to what they have done to promote the prosperity of the country. Have they lowered the taxation of the people of this country? On the contrary, taxation has been very much larger than it was before they assumed office. They have not provided any new markets for the surplus products of the farmers of this country. Our farmers still find their market in the old land. They are not selling as much of their products in the United States; they certainly are not selling more in the United States than they did prior to 1896, while larger quantities of American food products are brought into Canada now than then. I invite hon. gentlemen on the other side, to point us to a single item of their policy by which they have provided any markets in addition to those in existence in 1896. I defy them to point to any such policy. Our Canadian farmers have been steadily cultivating the British market—a market which the Liberals out of power declared to be a second hand and second rate market. And, Sir, it was because the farmers of Canada turned a deaf ear to the representations made to them by the Liberals prior to 1896, and accepted the advice given by the leaders of the Conservative party, that they should cultivate the British market because it was the best and safest and likely to be the most abiding; it is due to that fact that we have such a development of trade with the English market to-day. The substantial increase which has taken place in the sale of Canadian agricultural products on the British market, has amply justified the predictions made by the Conservative party and has confounded the pessimistic prophecies made by the Liberals before they attained power.

And, Sir, to what is the present prosperity of Canada to be attributed? What have the Liberal government done to contribute to that prosperity? What policy have they put into force which would tend to make us prosper? Sir, the prosperity which has obtained on the American continent during these past five or six years, is due to other causes, and is not due to any policy propounded by the Canadian government. Let me quote the opinion of an American author on this point. He says:

> Prosperity must always begin with the producer. Something must be obtained from the soil which can be sold for money.

Canada has prospered since 1896 because of a succession of abundant harvests, because of the cultivation of a larger area of her fertile lands in the North-west, and because of other things which I shall take occasion to enumerate. The figures prepared by the Bureau of Statistics at Toronto reveal a wonderful condition. If you take the value of Ontario field crops, and of animals and their products, in 1896, and compare it with the value of the same products from 1897 to 1901, the gratifying fact is shown that while these products in 1896 were valued at $125,813,000, the average yearly value from 1897 to 1901 has been not less than $156,570,000, or, in other words, the agricultural products of Ontario have been worth $30,000,000 a year more from 1897 to the present date, than they were in 1896. That is a very substantial reason why this country has been blessed with great prosperity during the later period. If we take into consideration the further fact, that larger areas

of land have been placed under cultivation in Manitoba and the North-west territories, we can realize why the volume of business has been steadily increasing from that part of our Dominion. There have been valuable discoveries and exploitations of mineral lands since 1896; the wonderful riches of the Klondike have been developed, and all these causes combined have brought about our prosperity. Is it not strange that hon. gentlemen opposite do not hesitate to take to themselves practically all the credit for this improved condition of things? I fancy that if they compared the improvement which has taken place in the United States with the improvement which has taken place in Canada, these gentlemen would not be so ready to congratulate themselves as they are. What has been the cause of the prosperity in the United States during the same period? You will recollect that as late as 1894 the condition of things in that great country was such as to cause general alarm—trade was prostrated; banks were failing every day, large industrial institutions were being closed. This unsatisfactory condition was due to a general depression, to the lack of a ready and profitable sale for the surplus food products of the country, and because of the failure of crops in certain sections. Let me quote to you the opinion of Mr. R. S. Baker, who has written very fully on the development of the trade of the United States, and on the causes which have led to the prosperity there since 1896. He says:

It is curious and wonderful to see how exactly the industries of the world tread in lock-step, and how the man of the soil, the farmer, towers huge and powerful at the head of the line. When his tread is slow and heavy, the iron master, the transporter, the miner, the manufacturer, must also tread slowly—and depression and hard times are abroad in the land. But when the man of the soil increases his speed, those behind him move more rapidly; for he represents the worlds primary need—food.

In the fall of 1897 there was an enormous crop of wheat in the United States, the largest by all odds in many years. At the same time the wheat crops in Russia and India were short, to the verge of famine in the last named country, and the great consumers of Europe, England especially, were compelled to turn to America for food to a much greater extent than usual.

Then in the fall of 1898 came another amazing wheat crop, more than 675,000,000 bushels, the largest wheat crop in the history of America.

There were also large and richly profitable corn and oat crops, and the south raised the greatest crop of cotton in its history, rising from 8,700,000 bales in 1897 to upwards of 11,000,000 bales in 1898.

The author of this work on the prosperity of the United States goes on to show what followed:

In less than three years time, between 1897 and 1900, so great were the trade balances in our favour that over a billion dollars of American indebtedness was wiped from the ledgers of Europe. Wages for labour increased rapidly in every part of the country, and never was there such a sudden and yet substantial expansion in the various manufacturing industries.

In the single state of Kansas, the farm mortgages which in 1890 amounted to the vast sum of $240,000,000, much of it bearing the exorbitant interest of 12 per cent, had been reduced in 1899 to less than $41,000,000.

On June 30, 1899, there were over 5,200,000 depositors in savings banks in the United States, compared with 4,800,000 in 1894 and 3,800,000 in 1889, a gain of 1,400,000 in ten years. And each of these depositors had more money to his account than ever before, the average amount on deposit rising from $369 for each person in 1894 to $419 in 1899.

The deposits in all the banks, national and state, as well as savings, representing upwards of 13,000,000 individual depositors, actually doubled in ten years, amounting in 1899 to the enormous sum of $7,514,000,000.

In 1893 no fewer than 74 railroad companies, representing the vast sum of $1,781,000,000 in stocks and bonds, went to the wall, and there were large numbers of failures in 1894, 1895 and 1896. In 1899, there were failures of only 10 roads with a little more than $50,000,000 in stocks and bonds, the best record by all odds since 1882.

A glance at the number of commercial failures will show how they decreased, from over 15,000 in 1893, with an enormous total of liabilities of nearly $347,000,000, to only 9,337 failures in 1899 with liabilities of less than $91,000,000.

If time permitted I might quote further reasons for that great prosperity in the United States, which has been brought about because of the redundant harvests which have blessed that country, because of the shortage of the crops in other parts of the world. The same reasons for our prosperity have obtained in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not give credit for the prosperity to these causes, but they exultantly exclaim that Canada has made more progress during the last five years than during the previous twenty years. If they made a comparison of the trade of Canada with the trade of the United States during the same period we might not have so much reason to complain of their attitude in this respect.

But Canada has been prosperous and would have been prosperous without the assistance of hon. gentlemen opposite. The splendid harvests we have had would have caused the measure of prosperity we have enjoyed. The test of the soundness of the fiscal policy of this country is to be found rather in the condition which obtained in Canada from 1891 to 1896, when a period of universal depression prevailed throughout this continent. If hon. gentlemen will examine the record of the trade of Canada from 1891 to 1896, and compare it with the record of the trade of the United States for the same period, they will find that, slow as was the growth of this country, it was more satisfactory and substantial in proportion to our population than was the growth of the great republic to the south of us. In 1891 the total imports and exports of Canada amounted to $218,385,000, and for the

next five years—that period of universal depression from 1892 to 1896—the average annual trade of Canada amounted to $238,690,000, an increase of $20,000,000 per annum during each year of that period of depression.

Now, let us turn to the trade statistics of the United States for the same period. In 1891 the imports and exports of the Republic amounted to $1,729,397,000, and for the next five years—1892, 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896—there was no increase in the trade of the country. On the contrary, there was a decline of $65,000,000 per annum, the average annual imports and exports for the period being $1,664,144,000.

But hon. gentlemen say that Canada has made more progress in the last five years than she made in the preceding twenty years. Let us examine the record of Canada's trade for the fifteen years from 1881 to 1896. In 1881 the imports and exports of Canada amounted to $189,902,427, and for the succeeding fifteen years that trade averaged $211,537,804 per annum; in other words, it showed during that period an annual increase of nearly $22,000,000 over the total trade of the year 1881.

Now, we have heard a good deal about the prosperity of the United States. Let us make a comparison between the prosperity which obtained in Canada from 1881 to 1896 and the prosperity which obtained in the United States during the same period. In 1881 the total value of the United States imports and exports of merchandise was $1,545,041,974, while for the succeeding fifteen years up to 1896, the average trade of the Republic was $1,538,553,125. In other words, while the trade of Canada during that period of fifteen years showed an average annual increase of $22,000,00, the trade of the United States showed an average annual decline of no less than $6,500,000. If the policy which prevailed in Canada from 1891 to 1896, when depression was universal, enabled this country not only to hold its own, but to make reasonable progress, that fact affords the strongest possible evidence we can have as to the wisdom and the patriotism of those who framed the fiscal policy which then existed in this country.

But we have heard a great deal of the progress which has obtained in Canada since 1896. When hon. gentlemen opposite make a statement of that kind, they take good care not to tell us of the progress made in other countries during the same period. They used to be very fond of quoting statistics to show the progress of the United States. Let us look at the statistics of the trade of that country since 1896. We have seen that for the fifteen years prior to that year the average annual imports and exports of merchandise in the United States amounted to $1,538,553,125. The annual average during the five years since then has been no less a sum than $2,028,557,833, or an average annual increase of no less than $490,004,708. This is the strongest possible proof we can give of the enormous expansion which has taken place in the trade of that country during that period. The imports and exports of merchandise in the United States were $190,000,000 less in 1895 than they were in 1891, while they were $771,429,026 greater in 1901 than they were in 1895, an expansion equal to double the total value of the imports and exports of Canada in the past year.

But, Sir, this marvellous expansion was not confined to Canada or the United States. Let me quote a few figures to show how the trade of the United Kingdom expanded during the same period. I shall have to take the statistics from 1891 to 1900, because these are the latest I could get in the library. In 1891 the exports and imports of the United Kingdom amounted to $3,618,537,000; in 1893 they dropped down to $3,313,676,000, and in 1894 to $3,315,154,000; in 1896 they climbed up to $3,587,253,000; while in 1900 they amounted to the enormous sum of $4,267,974,000. The trade of the United Kingdom for 1900 exceeded that for 1894 by the enormous sum of $950,000,000, while the trade for 1900 exceeded the trade for 1896 by the sum of $680,000,000.

It is a singular fact that during the year 1891 Lord Salisbury was in office; it was the last full year in which he was premier prior to the advent of Mr. Gladstone. He was succeeded by Mr. Gladstone in 1892. The first full year of Mr. Gladstone was 1893. He was followed by Lord Rosebery in 1894, and Lord Rosebery was in turn succeeded by Lord Salisbury in 1895. In 1891, as I have pointed out, the total imports and exports of the United Kingdom amounted to $3,618,537,000.

During the first year of Mr. Gladstone's administration they decreased more than $300,000,000. The same story was told during the administration of Lord Rosebery. But after Lord Salisbury attained office, succeeding both Liberal premiers, the trade of the United Kingdom went up again by leaps and bounds. Yet we have never heard, either in Canada or the old land, that anybody attached any blame to Mr. Gladstone because of the shrinkage of trade after he assumed office or gave any particular credit to Lord Salisbury because of the enormous expansion of trade which took place since he assumed the premiership in the latter end of 1895. But hon. gentlemen opposite would like to make us believe that, by some political sleight of hand, they have been able to increase the trade of this country in the gratifying proportions in which it has increased from 1896 up to the present.

Let me point out that the wonderful expansion of trade which has taken place in the United States during the past five years has been rendered possible by the attention the Americans have given to the all important question of transportation. Mr.

Baker, whose work on the prosperity of the United States I have already quoted, declares that a bushel of wheat, or an equivalent quantity of flour, can be shipped from Minneapolis to almost any point in western Europe for about 20 cents. This includes no fewer than three transhipments—at Duluth, Buffalo and New York; and that it costs almost as much to ship the same wheat from Liverpool to Manchester, in England.

The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) claims to be seized with the importance of this question of transportation. Might I ask him what scheme he has devised and perfected for the improvement of our transportation facilities? It is true that we have had the Intercolonial Railway brought into Montreal. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said that when the Liberal party came into office in 1896, they found the western terminus of the Intercolonial Railway in a ploughed field. Well, what special advantage has come to the taxpayers of Canada by reason of its having been extended to Montreal? Are the taxpayers, are the producers of the country, getting any benefit from the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into that city? If we examine the returns of the past year, I do not think we will find there any matter for congratulation. It seems to me it would have been better had these hon. gentlemen left the western terminus of the Intercolonial Railway in a ploughed field rather than incur the enormous expense and reap the meagre returns from that expenditure, which are shown in the Public Accounts.

We have heard a great deal about making Montreal the national port. For two or three years past we have been listening to schemes for the construction of additional wharfage and the erection of additional elevators and the equipment of that port generally. Well, I would like to know what has become of the Conners syndicate elevator scheme? We had that on the boards two or three years ago, but there seems to be nothing left of it now. We also had another proposition some time ago for the construction of elevators, which also seems to have fallen through; and the present condition of things in our so-called national port cannot be at all satisfactory, if we are to pay any attention to the statements made by those well qualified to judge. I take the liberty of reading to the House an extract from the address of the retiring President of the Board of Trade of Montreal, Mr. Henry Miles, delivered a few weeks ago. What does he say with regard to the equipment of the Montreal harbour:

> In regard to the equipment of our harbour, the position is unsatisfactory. The attitude prevailing in the direction of these affairs is such that I fear the alienation of the sympathies of parliament from our national port. Nothing has actually been accomplished towards this equipment, and the idea of a 'free port' is submerged for the time being. Differences of opinion and contention, I would like to see put to one side; let us have the work proceed.
>
> There is a great common interest involved, the welfare of the commerce of the country and of the welfare of our city. We have a right to demand the setting aside of everything that appears to delay the accomplishment of success in this great national undertaking.

The position of affairs in the port of Montreal must be a serious one or the retiring President of the Board of Trade would never have given utterance to the words I have just read. It is time something definite was done, some scheme of transportation laid out and completed. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars pottering here and there throughout the country, but no plan has yet been adopted which has given the producers of the west the slightest relief or assistance.

Does the management of our government railways during the past few years give any cause for rejoicing to those who advocate the nationalization of our railways, telegraphs and telephone lines? From 1892 to 1896, we spent on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway $1,643,074.65, and on the Prince Edward Island Railway $8,300.49, making a total expenditure from 1892 to 1896 on capital account of $1,651,375.14, and during those five years we lost in the operation of those two roads $943,552. Since hon. gentlemen opposite came into office what do the figures show? They show that the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway from 1897 to 1901 on capital account amounted to the enormous sum of $8,414,441.21, and on the Prince Edward Island Railway $373,261.83. Or, in the past five years, we have spent on capital account on both these lines, $8,787,703.04, and during those years we lost no less than $901,424 in the operation of those roads. In other words, in round figures, in the last ten years, we have spent over $10,000,000 on capital account on these two railways, and the receipts have fallen almost $2,000,000 short of the actual expenses in connection with their operation.

I would like to know how much longer this condition is going to last? Are we to go on spending, on an average $1,000,000 a year on capital account, more than one-half of which should be charged to operating expenses, and lose besides from $300,000 to $600,000 per year in the operation of these roads? It might be some consolation to us if we knew that our brothers down by the sea were getting some advantage in the shape of cheap freight and passenger rates, but I am told that the schedules of the Intercolonial Railway show that while the people of the maritime provinces have to stand, in common with the other provinces, an annual loss in the operation of the government roads, they are charged at least as much for freight and passenger service as are those served by

roads not under the control or management of the government.

I wish now to refer briefly to the so-called British preference which is mentioned in the amendment presented by the hon. the leader of the opposition. I may say that the idea of giving a preference to the workingmen and the manufacturers of the old land was a rather popular idea. It seemed to be appreciated and accepted as a good policy by the great majority of Canadians, when that policy was inaugurated. But it was hoped that when the Liberal party came into office—accepting the statement of the right hon. gentleman who is now premier as being made in good faith—an effort would be made to secure for the products of Canada some preference in the markets of the old land. But, unfortunately, in that matter, as in many others, we were doomed to be disappointed. We know, that, in 1896, the premier declared in London that it would be a good thing to obtain a mutual preference, and that when the Liberal party should get into power they would send commissioners to try to obtain that mutual preference. Well, twelve months after, when the Prime Minister was on his way to attend the Jubilee in London, in 1897, he practically declined to accept any preference. He said :

> I claim for the present government of Canada that they have passed a resolution by which the products of Great Britain are admitted on the rate of their tariff, at 12½ per cent, and next year at 25 per cent reduction. This we have done, not asking any compensation.
>
> There is a class of our fellow citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for 'quid pro quo.'
>
> The Canadian government has ignored all such sentiments.
>
> We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. We have done it because it is no intention of ours to disturb in any way the system of free trade which has done so much for England.
>
> What we give you by our tariff we give you in gratitude for the splendid freedom under which we have prospered. It is a free gift. We ask no compensation. Protection has been the curse of Canada. We would not see you come under its baneful influence—for what weakens you must weaken us.

That is the statement made by the right hon. gentleman at Liverpool, in June, 1897. On the 6th of October following, speaking in the city of Toronto, he declared :—

> If I had thought I could have obtained for the products of Canada preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain, not only would I have been wanting in patriotism, but I would have been wanting in reason. I would have been simply an idiot if I had not obtained such preference for the products of Canada.

Sir, it is a difficult thing to reconcile these two statements. But we were disappointed, to say the least of it, when the distinguished Canadian who represented Canada on the occasion of the Jubilee did not make more strenuous efforts to obtain for the farmers and other producers in Canada some advantage in return for the advantages which, he claimed, the Canadian government had given to the manufacturers and workmen of the mother country. He entertained the view that he was giving something to Great Britain. But the Minister of Finance (Hon. W. S. Fielding) who, probably, knew better the effect of what was being done, said that they were giving nothing. He said :—

> We do not by our resolutions offer anything to Great Britain alone. We recognize the fact that Great Britain by her liberal policy is in a position to avail herself of this offer immediately, but we make our offer not to Great Britain only, but to every nation which is prepared to accept it. We make it to every country which is willing to establish fair and reasonable trade relations with Canada.

And the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said :—

> I say with respect to the offer we now make, that it is not a preferential offer at all in the true legal sense of the word. That offer is open to all the world. The Americans may avail themselves of it and so may the Germans and the Belgians.

And from all the statistics I have seen, the Germans and the Belgians are availing themselves of it.

> The whole world are welcome to avail themselves of it on the same terms and the same conditions on which England may take advantage of it. Where is the preference there ?

Where is the preference there ? In 1901, according to the statement made by an hon. gentleman since this debate began, the average rate of duty on all imports coming in from the United States was 12·05, while the percentage on all goods from Great Britain was 18·23, notwithstanding this wonderful preference. The British imports paid half as much more duty as the imports from the United States. And, if you take the dutiable imports entered for consumption in 1901, you find that, while the average rate from the United States was 24·83, the average rate on goods from Great Britain was 24·74. So nicely had the tariff been arranged before this so-called British preference came into force, that it was found and is found to-day that the average rate on dutiable goods from Great Britain is practically the same as that on dutiable goods from the United States, notwithstanding the so-called preference.

But we have testimony as to the effect of this preference, from a gentleman whose qualification to express an opinion will not be challenged in this House. We have the statement of the gentleman who was, and, I believe still is, the secretary of that great free trade organization, the Cobden Club, from which the right hon. premier deigned to accept a medal because of his services to the empire in giving this so-called British preference.

Writing to the 'London Times' on September 30th, 1898, this gentleman said :—

The two great competitors for the Canadian market are the United Kingdom and the United States. In spite of the so-called British preferential tariff, the proportion of the total trade secured by the United States continues to increase and the proportion secured by the United Kingdom continues to decline. The explanation of this fact is that the bulk of the goods exported from the United States to Canada are admitted free, whereas the bulk of the goods exported from the United Kingdom are heavily taxed. The Canadian financial policy is to encourage the trade of the United States and not that of the United Kingdom.

That is the deliberate statement of the secretary of the Cobden Club. And we are asked to continue to endorse and sustain that which, according to this statement, contributes to increase the volume of trade with the United States and to decrease proportionately that from the mother country. In 1901, the free goods from the United States were valued at $56,884,730, while for the same year the free goods from Great Britain amounted to $11,316,510. The free imports from the United States were five-fold greater than those from the United Kingdom. In 1896 thirty per cent of our imports were from Great Britain and fifty-three per cent were from the United States. In 1901, under the operation of the preference, our imports from Great Britain were twenty-four per cent, while our imports from the United States had increased to sixty-one per cent. This indicates that Mr. Harold Cox knew what he was writing about when he indited the epistle to the 'London Times' from which I have taken the liberty of making an extract. But what made the preference popular in Canada was the fact that it was declared that twenty-five per cent at least, of British labour must be put into the goods imported into Great Britain to be completed and exported to Canada before they could obtain the preference. I obtained a copy of the circular issued by the commissioner of customs to explain to the officers of the department what goods should be entitled to the preference. Here is part of what he says :—

In estimating the labour of the United Kingdom entering into the production of articles manufactured therein partly from imported material, the extent of such labour may be reckoned by the value of the manufactured article ready for shipment at the place of production after deducting therefrom the value on entering within the limits of the United Kingdom, represented by the component parts of such articles which are the produce of countries not entitled to the benefits of the preferential tariff.

That is a rather involved sentence, and it is difficult for a layman to interpret what it really means. But I believe, and I think my opinion will be sustained, that the clause when properly interpreted will mean—and it has been interpreted in that way by those who have taken advantage of the preference—that in estimating the proportion of value of British labour that must enter into the production, the person exporting may count his profit as part of the labour entering into the goods. If that is the case, British labour to the extent of even five per cent need not be employed in finishing or completing these goods, which may then be brought in under the preference. Goods have been brought in to the extent of hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars from the continent to England, assembled there, put into new packages and sent out here as the finished products of factories and workshops of Great Britain, to the great injury of many important industries of this country.

Sir, I think that in the matter of protection, the workingmen and manufacturers of Canada have a greater claim upon us than the workingmen and manufacturers of Germany, or of Belgium, or of Holland ; and if the preference is to be in name even a British preference, a much more substantial evidence of the value put upon it in the United Kingdom must be procured than that which is provided under the regulations adopted and in force in the Customs Department at the present time. But let me quote the opinion of one of the leading and most influential journals of the United Kingdom concerning the methods adopted to take advantage of this preference by the manufacturers of the continent. This is from the Belfast 'News' of January 23 last :—

How Foreigners Rob Canada.

Since Canada granted a preference tariff to Britain, tons upon tons of German and other foreign textiles have been brought over to England and reshipped to Canada, after a so-called process of 'finishing,' in order that they may be classed as goods partly of British manufacture. In some cases this 'finishing' in England consists simply in taking off the German, French, or Austrian labels, doing the goods up again, and then giving them a British name or label. There is no branch of trade in which this style of smuggling is carried on to the extent that it is in the textile trade.—(Belfast 'News,' January 23, 1902.

I will read a cable despatch which appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' of January 9, 1902. as to the condition of things which existed in England at that time :—

What is expected in England as a result of the prolongation of the period of economic disturbance in Germany is a conversion of the market here into a dumping ground for the surplus manufactures with which the fatherland is now heavily overstocked.

If the manufacturers of Britain, having the constituency to serve that they have, having the facilities to manufacture that they have, if they fear as a result of the prolongation of hard times in Germany that Britain would be made a slaughter market, have not the manufacturers of Canada a right to complain that advantage is being taken of this British preference, so-called, to make this country a slaughter market for

the surplus products of Germany, that are doing such damage to the textile trade even of the old land itself ? In its review of the conditions of trade in 1901, the London 'Times' says :—

> The crisis in Germany was also not without its effect on the woollen industry, the Bradford trade especially suffering.

And, Sir, when our woollen manufacturers appealed to the government of the day and asked them for relief and assistance because of the unfair competition to which they are being subjected by the abuse of this so-called British preference, they are told that if a duty of 23 per cent is not sufficient to enable them to carry on their business, it had better be wiped out. Sir, it is said that this preference, so-called, has given Canada an advantage in the markets of Britain ; that to all intents and purposes Canada has a real preference in the British market. That assertion has been repeated again and again by hon. gentlemen. Our so-called British preference was introduced and came into force in Canada on April 23, 1897. For the year ending June 30, 1898, that is the year following the adoption of this British preference, the United States farmers sold $63,000,000 worth more to Britain than in 1897. The so-called preference was increased from 25 per cent to 33 per cent in July, 1900 ; and for the year ending June 30, 1901, the sales of Canadian farmers to Britain decreased $5,000,000 as compared with 1900, while the American farmers increased their sales to Britain by no less than $36,500,000. The American farmers sold Britain over $75,000,000 worth in 1901 more than they did in 1897. The increase in the sales of American farmers to Britain in 1901, as compared with 1897, when this tariff first came into force, exceeded by many millions our total sales of farm and animal products to Britain in any year since 1897. In all these calculations I have not taken into account one dollar of the sales of cotton or of tobacco leaf by the United States to Britain. The preference has not very seriously, so far, affected the farming interests of the United States. It is said that the preference would induce the British people to buy more largely from Canada than from any other country. That statement has been made on the authority of the First Minister. Speaking at Bowmanville in October, 1899, he made use of these words, as reported in the Toronto 'Globe' :—

> The merchants of England, the men who have to buy articles in the markets of the world no longer go to the United States to make their purchases. They come to Canada and this is the direct result of our preferential tariff.

Now, let us see how that works out. In 1901 the United States bought $27,000,000 worth less from Britain than in 1896, and they sold her $226,000,000 worth more, that increase for one year amounting to more than our total sales to Britain in any two years. That is how this British preference works out. Australia gives no preference to British goods. In 1900, the latest available return, Australia sold $10,000,000 worth more products to Britain than in 1895, and purchased almost $50,000,000 worth more. These figures show that the preference had very little if any effect in increasing our trade, only in so far as it has allowed continental and foreign goods to be shipped through Britain to Canada, and so reap the benefit of the lower duty to the detriment of our own manufacturers and workingmen.

We are being punished, Mr. Speaker, because of the adoption by Canada of this so-called preference. We have been and are being punished by the German Empire because of our desire to show our fealty and attachment, by means of this preference, to the United Kingdom. I find in a despatch to the Montreal 'Witness' February 12, 1902, that American commission merchants will in future have to give a certificate of the place where grain is grown before it will be admitted under the most favoured treaty into German ports. It has been asserted that an American commission merchant bought Canadian grain and shipped it from New York to German ports. The German authorities were advised that such was the fact, and the result has been that they now compel the commission merchant in New York to send a certificate or affidavit to show that the grain going into Germany has not been grown in Canada. Sir, it seems to me that such an insult to the people of this country should not be permitted any longer ; that we should treat Germany as Germany treated us, and is treating us ; that if Germany discriminates against our surplus products that are available for use in the fatherland, the Dominion of Canada should discriminate against the surplus products of Germany that might be imported into this country.

Sir, I do not know that I should say any more with regard to this question of the British preference. But before I sit down there are one or two more figures that I would like to quote. Notwithstanding this so-called preference, we did not buy a dollar's worth more from Britain in the last five years than we did in the five years preceding, when there was no preference. The figures are as follows : The imports from Great Britain, from 1892 to 1896, amounted to $187,325,594 ; from 1897 to 1902, they amounted to $186,781,122. Now, let us see how our purchases from the United States for the past five years increased. We have purchased $176,088,990 worth more from the United States during the past five years than we did in the five years preceding. The figures are : Imports from the United States, from 1892 to 1896, $277,602,193 ; from 1897 to 1901, they were $453,691,183. The increase in our imports from the United States during the past five years lacks only about $10,000,000 of being equal to our total

imports from Britain during the same period. In 1896 the balance of trade against Canada in favour of the United States was $14,125,614, while in 1901 it had increased to $28,102,778, or within a fraction of 100 per cent. In the past five years our exports to Great Britain amounted to $494,383,499 and our imports from Great Britain amounted to $186,781,122. The balance of trade in our favour and against Great Britain was $207,602,377, while, in the same period, that is 1897 to 1901, our exports to the United States amounted to $281,213,582, and our imports from the United States to $453,691,183. The balance of trade in favour of the United States as against this country in five years, amounted to $172,477,601. In the last five years we sold $213,169,917 worth less to the United States than to Great Britain, and we bought $266,910,061 worth more from the United States than we did from Great Britain. That is the record which the past five years shows as to the trade between Canada and the United Kingdom on the one hand and the trade between Canada and the United States on the other. Yet, the government, through its mouthpiece, the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), says that we have nothing to reform, and the Finance Minister declares that the tariff has been practically taken out of politics. Well, Sir, I claim that there is a great deal to be reformed in the fiscal system of this country and that the resolution presented by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is on the right line, that the time has come when a declaration of a definite policy of protection should be announced by the parliament of Canada, a policy under which we would not be meeting with appeals from year to year from manufacturers and workingmen asking for the reasonable measure of protection to which they are entitled to enable them to carry on their business against the fierce competition which exists in the United States and elsewhere throughout the world.

In making his Budget speech, the hon. Minister of Finance declared that the one disappointing feature of the year's affairs has been the census returns. I am sure that there can be no difference of opinion as to the sense of disappointment that we all experienced when the announcement was made as to the total population of Canada. We had been led to expect by the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite and by the statements put in the mouth of His Excellency several years ago that we might look for a substantial increase during this decade in the population of the country. The increase from 1881 to 1891 was 508,429, and during the last decade from 1891 to 1901 it was only 505,644. I see that when the announcement of the figures in 1891 was made the right hon. gentleman who is now the premier, in his place in this House, said :

Mr CLARKE.

Is it possible that the advisors of His Excellency in putting the statement in his mouth that the country was prosperous, were really serious and sincere ? . . . . Is it possible that they can hold such an opinion in the face of the census returns ?

This last census has not even shown an increase of 508,429 that the preceding decade showed, or an increase of 11 or 12 per cent.

. . . . .In the last decade our population has grown just one bare half million. . . . . It is a mockery to speak of prosperity in the face of such a state of things . . . Why ; our population has increased at the rate of only 11 per cent. . . . . At the present time we should at least have six or seven millions, but we have not five ; and yet, forsooth, hon. gentlemen opposite talk of prosperity. . . . . I say it with all candour that if hon. gentlemen opposite were at all awake to the duty of the hour, they would . . . .frankly admit that for a young country which is bound to have a great future, it is in a lamentable condition when it cannot retain it's own population.

If that statement was true as to the condition of things in 1891, is it not lamentably true, in the face of the result of the taking of the last census ? The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) in 1891 declared :

I say, Sir, that there is no test of the real progress and advancement of a country like ours which can compare for one moment with the test applied by the growth of population, and when we see such results as those I have just depicted taking place in a country like this, with such unlimited resources and capacities for employing a large population, these facts alone condemn, as nothing else possibly could, the policy which has brought about these results.

What excuse have hon. gentlemen opposite to offer because of the meagre results which have been shown from this census ? All they can say now is that the census of 1891 was fraudulent, that the country made no increase in its population from 1891 to 1896 and that the increase in the population all occurred since they came into office. There is no proof of this statement except those pages which have been laid on the Table of the House alleging a certain condition of things to exist in certain municipalities in the province of Quebec. No proof has been offered except these sheets which are before us, and they have not been verified, as to the serious charges which have been made against those who were responsible for the taking of the census of 1891. We have within the sound of my voice in Ottawa the gentleman who was the chief census commissioner in 1891. He is the statistician of the Dominion of Canada. If, before these statements were laid on the Table of the House, he had been given an opportunity of examining them and of passing an opinion upon them, they might have been of some value. But, placed there as they are without being verified or examined by the chief census officers who have been

and are being accused of the greatest fraud, I say that they are unworthy of the consideration of the House for a single minute. I have tried myself, in regard to one constituency in Quebec, to get some definite information, but, at the time I rose to address the House, I was not able to get the information which I desired and I cannot make any comparison respecting it. But, Sir, there was within reach of hon. gentlemen opposite means whereby they might have examined into the accuracy of the census returns for Ontario. They have been declaring that so far as the Dominion was concerned no progress was made in the matter of population until 1896. I have here the municipal statistics of Ontario. Hon. gentlemen opposite used to quote these statistics approvingly. They endorsed them, they banked upon them. These statistics are available to-day to the end of 1899. They contain statements as to the municipal population of the province of Ontario, and if hon. gentlemen opposite had been accurate in their statements, or if they had desired to be accurate, they would have consulted these municipal statistics before they made their statements as far as the population of Ontario was concerned. These statements disclose the fact that the population of Ontario, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen have been saying, has been increasing, not as rapidly as we could have wished, but, still increasing. I find that between 1891 and 1896, the period in which hon. gentlemen assert there was no increase, that there was an actual increase of over 50,000. In 1891 the population of the municipalities of Ontario was 1,922,121, while in 1896 the population of the municipalities of Ontario was 1,972,286, showing an increase in the municipal population of Ontario, in these five years in which hon. gentlemen opposite say there was no increase, of no less than 50,165. In 1896, according to the report of the Bureau of Statistics of Ontario, the population was 1,972.286. It had increased over 50,000 from 1891 to 1896, and from 1896 to 1899, the latest available statistics, the population increased from 1,972,286 to 2,010,748, showing an increase for the three years of 38,462 additional. According to the official census returns the province of Ontario has a population of 2,167,978, and the municipal census of the province for 1899 shows that it had a population of 2,010,748. If you take the increase which has occurred since 1899, together with the population of the unorganized territories and add it to the municipal census, you will have the strongest and best possible argument as to the unfairness and the untruthfulness of the statements which have been presented by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the stagnation which occurred in Ontario.

Now, a word about the exodus. The exodus was stopped ; at least, we were officially informed by the government that the exodus had stopped. In 1899 these words were put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General in the Speech from the Throne :

> It affords me great pleasure to be able to congratulate you upon the large degree of prosperity which the people of Canada at present enjoy as evidenced by . . . the increased number of immigrants who have become permanent settlers among us. To these evidences must be added another which is even more gratifying, the almost total cessation of the considerable exodus of our population which at one time was a regrettable feature of our affairs.

The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island who moved the Address in reply said :

> Instead of the exodus repatriation has set in. We found after the census returns of 1891 came in—these cold, unfeeling and heartless census returns—that at the end of ten years we had lost not only all the immigrants that came into Canada, but half of the increase of our population besides. I am glad to be able to say that the exodus from this country to the United States has ceased and I trust has ceased for ever.

The seconder of the Address said :

> One of the most happy results of our policy has been to put a stop to the exodus which in years past has proved the curse of our country, and to induce our immigrants to settle down in our midst, instead of finding their way over the border to strengthen our rivals.

What must be the feelings of the hon. gentleman now in the quietude of his island home, when he peruses the result of the census for 1901 ? He was despondent over the result of the census of 1891. That census showed that from 1881 to 1891 his own province of Prince Edward Island had decreased in population by 227, but the last census returns show that during the past decade, Prince Edward Island decreased in population by 5,820. The decrease during the past ten years was twenty-five times greater than the decrease in the ten years preceding, and yet the hon. gentleman spoke of the census figures of 1891 as being cold and unfeeling and heartless. If we examine the condition of the maritime provinces, there is very little room for congratulation. The increase in Nova Scotia was 8,720 ; in New Brunswick 9,830, making a total for these two provinces of 18,550, and deducting the decrease in Prince Edward Island, the net increase of the three maritime provinces is 12,730 for the last decade, as compared with an increase of 10,041 in the decade preceding. But there is one important feature in connection with these census returns which I think ought to be emphasized. In 1891 Cape Breton county had a population of 34,244, and in 1901 the population had increased to 48,361. The increase in the population of Cape Breton was 14,117, while the increase in all the three provinces was only 12,730. Deducting the increase in Cape Breton county, all the rest of the maritime provinces show a decrease unfortunately of 1,387. Sir, what is the cause of the increase

of population in Cape Breton county ? What kept that population there ; what caused it to increase so rapidly ? Let me quote to you a few words spoken by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in 1897, which are to be found at page 1128 of 'Hansard' of that year :

> Hon. gentlemen opposite felt they were justified in entering on a policy for the special development of the iron industry, and in doing so they granted bonuses on iron and steel billets. . . . . We know that large sums have been invested in this industry. We know that large iron industries exist in the country, and while we may not approve of the policy under which they are established, we have no desire to see them snuffed out.

And the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) continued the bounty to promote the iron and steel industry in Cape Breton.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was no iron or steel industry in Cape Breton at that time. It all grew up under the present government.

Mr. CLARKE. It was to develop that industry that the Conservative government initiated a policy which the Liberals of the day said was a bad policy, and the Conservatives gave a bonus to promote this iron and steel industry, which the Liberals very fortunately continued, with the satisfactory result that the population of that county has increased by 14,000.

Sir, we on this side believe in a policy that will foster and develop industries not only in Cape Breton but in every other county in Canada where such industries can be developed. That is what the resolution of the leader of the opposition means, and notwithstanding the gratifying results which have been obtained from that policy in the past, I have no doubt that the Minister of Finance will vote against the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden).

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. CLARKE. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Does the hon. gentleman know what reason the president of the Dominion Iron and Steel industry gave as the chief cause that led to the establishment of the iron and steel industry in Cape Breton ?

Mr. CLARKE. I presume the primary reason was the advantageous situation of Cape Breton to the raw material which enters into that industry and to its shipping facilities. But added to that primary reason were the bounty and the protection which was accorded to that industry by the Conservative government of Canada.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I would like to add that that is not in accordance with the statement made by the president of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, who ought to know.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes ; it was exactly what he said.

Mr. CLARKE. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman (Mr Johnston) would hand me that statement because I have not had the opportunity of seeing it and therefore I cannot say if the hon. gentleman is right or not. Now, let me say a few words about this exodus which was officially declared by the government to have stopped. In April, 1899, the attention of this House was drawn to the following despatch which appeared from Boston in the New York 'Commercial Advertiser' :

> Boston, April 19th, 1899.—The influx of Canadians to New England this spring is the heaviest known for many years and is causing the Canadian government officials some uneasiness. The backward spring in Canada, higher wages and improved outlook in manufacturing towns on this side of the line are the causes for the movement. It is estimated that almost twenty thousand persons, a large proportion of whom are French Canadians, have crossed the line this season. Usually at this time the tide of travel favours Canada, but this year the annual exodus is very limited.
>
> The influx has upset the plans of the Canadian government, which proposed to take thousands of French to Quebec and settle them on free land. The labour market here is oversupplied and lower wages for farm labourers are predicted. Many of the cotton mills report that they have more applications for employment than they can accept.

On the 26th of April of the same year, 1899, the hon. gentleman who then represented Restigouche drew the attention of the House to a despatch appearing in the press of the lower provinces and referring to the exodus which was taking place from Dorchester, Moncton, Sackville, Tignish, Fredericton, Truro and other places. In the following year Mr. H. F. McDougall, who represented Cape Breton drew attention to a despatch in a Montreal paper which read :

> St. John, N.B., April 4 (special).—The exodus from the maritime provinces to the United States is larger this spring than for many years. Every train and steamer leaving St. John for Boston carries away some young men and women from the city or the interior.

The hon. gentleman implemented that despatch by this statement :

> I may say that two or three weeks ago, I was travelling on the Intercolonial Railway train, and every car was so crowded that there was hardly standing room. The baggage car on that train broke down, and it took two hours at Rivière du Loup to transfer the baggage to another car to allow the train to proceed. I would like to ask if the government are doing anything to stop this exodus ?

These were the statements made, the despatches read and the reports presented to this House as to the increased exodus which

was taking place in the maritime provinces in 1899 and 1900, notwithstanding the statement put into His Excellency's mouth that the exodus was a thing of the past. But let me refer to the Ontario statistics again for a few minutes. They show that for the last three years for which statistics are available since hon. gentlemen came into office—1897-8-9—the births exceeded the deaths by 56,017, while the immigrants who came into Ontario in those years numbered 11,091, making a total increase in the population of the province from 1897 to 1899 inclusive of 67,108, while the census shows the increase of the population of the whole province of Ontario for the ten years to be only 53,657.

Take the statistics of births and deaths in Ontario for the ten years from 1890 to 1899, and what do they show ? They show that during that period the number of births was 446,811, and the number of deaths, 244,060, or an excess of births over deaths in the province during those ten years of 202,751, while the immigration figures prepared under the auspices of hon. gentlemen's friends, the government of Ontario, show that for the same period 63,025 immigrants arrived in the province. If we take the excess of births over deaths and the number of immigrants together, we find that the population of the province increased from 1890 to 1899 by 265,796, while the official census returns show a gain for the ten years of only 53,657; so that there are 212,139 not accounted for.

When we ask hon. gentlemen opposite, in the face of these facts, to explain to us where these people have gone, the answer is that the census returns of 1891 were inaccurate, fraudulent, and not to be relied upon. I took the liberty two or three weeks ago to ask in the House the following questions :

1. What was the total number of replies, by provinces, received to the circular issued on or about the 1st day of March, 1901, by Mr. Thomas Coté, Assistant Census Commissioner, to certain clergymen, asking for the name, the age, and the occupation of every person formerly resident in the parish or territory over which such clergyman exercised spiritual oversight, who had emigrated to the United States during the twelve months preceding the said 1st day of March, 1901 ?

2. What was the total number of persons so reported as above as having emigrated to the United States from each province of the Dominion during the year ending with the 1st March, 1901 ?

The answers I received were as follows :—

1. Seventy replies in all were received, sixty-five from the province of Quebec, one from New Brunswick, three from Ontario, and one from Prince Edward Island.

2. The number of persons reported by the parish priests as having emigrated to the United States during the twelve months preceding the 1st day of March, 1901, is 870 ; twelve in New Brunswick, seventy-nine in Prince Edward Island, 779 in Quebec. There are also 108 families reported as having left the country, but their names and the number of their members were not given. One family was reported from Ontario and 107 from Quebec.

Sixty-five replies from Quebec, from sixty-five parishes, presumably disclose the regrettable fact that in one year, from the 1st of March, 1900, to the 1st of March, 1901, 779 individuals and 107 families left the country—two years after the hon. gentlemen had declared that the exodus had been put an end to. And yet hon. gentlemen lay the flattering unction to their souls and lead the people of Canada to believe that under their benign sway the exodus has become a thing of the past. A journal published at Huntingdon, in the province of Quebec, the Canadian 'Gleaner,' in November, 1901, referring to the statement of the right hon. premier that the exodus was past, made this statement :

We would like to call attention to a statement made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the truth of which is not borne out by every-day experience in this district.

We do not know whether it be true or not that Americans are going by shoals into the North-west, but we do know that there is no stop to the emigration of our young men and women from this district to the United States, and what is to be said of this district can be said of every section east of it, with this difference, that the outflow increases as you near the Atlantic.

The United States Industrial Commission's statistics of immigration contain some interesting particulars. The commissioners declare that had the immigration statistics from Canada been continued from 1885 down to the present time, the immigration from Canada would apparently have fully held its own. This report has only recently been issued, and it is available for the inspection of every hon. member of this House.

What do the last census returns of the United States show ? They show that in 1880 there were 717,157 Canadian-born persons resident in the United States; that in 1890 the number had increased to 980,938; and that in 1900 it had increased to 1,181,778. Of the total number of Canadians in the United States and Canada together in 1890, the numbers were, in every hundred, eighty-three in Canada and seventeen in the United States, while in 1900 the figures were : Eighty-two in Canada and eighteen in the United States. This does not look much like a stoppage of the exodus.

There is just one other test which I would like to apply to this question of the exodus. The official trade returns of the United States make the following showing as to the value of household goods and effects entered free of duty into the United States from Canada during the past five years :

1897	$1,175,000
1898	964,000
1899	1,037,000
1900	1,144,620
1901	1,042,237

These are the facts with regard to the exodus, and I am sorry to say they do not justify the roseate statements which hon. gentlemen opposite have made again and again to the effect that the exodus from Canada to the United States has entirely ceased. We all desire, Mr. Speaker, to see that exodus stopped, and stopped for ever. We desire to see a condition of things existing in Canada under which we can at least retain our own population. The great bulk of the people who leave Canada to go to the United States go there to engage, not in agriculture, but in industrial pursuits—in the factories, the mills, the foundries, the workshops and the mines of that country. They are a great loss to Canada, and our policy should be, by giving sufficient protection to our various industries, not only to retain in the country our own people, who are after the best class of settlers, but to see to it that those who come from the old world to make a home in the new world shall seek Canada rather than the great Republic to the south of us. That country's industries and interests have been built up very largely by the adoption of a policy of sufficient protection, and if the same policy were adopted in Canada—a policy such as that recommended in the resolution presented by the leader of the opposition—I believe that in a very short time the exodus would become a thing of the past and that every Canadian, able and willing to work, would find plenty to do in our own broad Dominion, and our population instead of, as in the past, creeping along at a rate of increase of from eight to ten per cent in ten years, would keep pace in growth with the population of the most virile countries in the world, and increase by at least 2 per cent per year. There is something wrong in the condition of affairs or our population would not continue to leave us as it has been doing. We should endeavor to retain that population in our own country, and that we can only do by so amending our tariff as to give that additional protection to our working people and farmers which will enable them to live on this side of the line in peace, prosperity and contentment.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) I listened, Mr. Speaker, with much attention to the very able speech delivered by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). That hon. gentleman is not only among the ablest debaters upon the opposition side, but is one of the best informed men on that side, and distinguished as an astute and cunning parliamentarian, who can use to the best advantage the material at his service. And as I listened, I could not help thinking what an unanswerable argument he could have made had he only a good case.

During the course of his remarks he took occasion to have a tilt at the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) for the inconsistencies displayed by that hon. gentleman in his political career, and he also gave some attention to the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), but I have no doubt that these gentlemen will be able to answer for themselves. He also made some reference to what he was pleased to describe as the political inconsistencies of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, but he was very careful not to make any reference to the speech which that hon. gentleman delivered the other evening. He made not the slightest attempt to reply to the unanswerable argument made by that hon. gentleman with regard to the census of 1891, in which he proved how effectively that census had been stuffed by the enumerators employed by the late Conservative administration. But we have no need for reference to statistics, in order to know that our young men are no longer leaving in the numbers they did previous to 1896. We know, as a matter of fact, that although the exodus has not been entirely stopped, it has been considerably checked. We know that the waste lands of our North-west are being rapidly filled up. We know that the young men of the maritime provinces, and particularly Prince Edward Island, are remaining in greater numbers in Canada today than during former years. Many of those from Prince Edward Island have settled in Cape Breton, and many others are going to the North-west.

But the chief fault found by the opposition, so far as I have been able to gather from the present debate, with the present administration is that the taxation of the country has not been reduced. They claim that this government is taking from the people a very much larger sum than they ought. But these hon. gentlemen must not forget that it is this government which has reduced the taxation of the country. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House has admitted that the customs duties have been reduced some 10 or 12 per cent.

Mr. CLARKE. Two per cent.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). I beg my hon. friend's pardon. The rate of duty has been reduced by 2·63, which would make a total reduction in taxation of 10 or 12 per cent. And we must bear this fact in mind, that every reduction which this government has made in the rate of taxation has been opposed by the opposition. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how then, with any show of consistency, can these hon. gentlemen claim that the taxation of the country ought to be reduced? In the one breath they oppose any reduction, and in the next

they blame this government for not reducing the taxes still further. If these hon. gentlemen are sincere, let them bring in a resolution declaring that the duties are too high on certain articles and ought to be reduced. For it must not be forgotten that the customs and excise duties of this country are spread over a great number of articles ; and if these hon. gentlemen desire that any further reductions should be made they should mention on what class of goods they wish to have the rates of duty lowered. But so long as they decline to do this, they cannot be credited with any sincerity in the statements they make.

What does the resolution submitted by the hon. the leader of the opposition mean ? If it means anything, it means that if he and his party should be returned to power they will introduce higher taxation. What then becomes of their plea that our taxation is already too high? If anything were needed to show the political insincerity of these hon. gentlemen, if anything were required to show how utterly dishonest and inconsistent they are in their public policy, it is this plea on the one hand that the taxation of the country is too high and on the other hand that the present administration is to blame for not making it higher.

Then these hon. gentlemen complain that our expenditure is enormous. Well, Mr. Speaker, what is the amount of the expenditure of the present administration, over and above that of the previous one, on consolidated account. Taking service for service, it is just about $3,000,000. When hon. gentlemen opposite complain that our expenditure is enormous, they forget that the present government has had to undertake a great many services which the previous government was not burdened with at all. For instance, it has to expend $1,500,000 per annum on the administration of the Yukon, and it has placed to the credit of our sinking fund $500,000 more per year than did its predecessor. Our Post Office Department also costs $300,000 a year more than it did under the previous administration. Our railways are also costing more, but for all these expenditures returns are coming in which counter-balance them to some extent, and besides these expenditures are occasioned by the extra services which this government has to undertake, and I contend that for the extra $3,000,000 expended on consolidated account, ample returns have been given the country. Does not everybody know that as the country developes, as it increases in population, our expenditure must necessarily increase ?

This resolution, submitted by the hon. leader of the opposition, declares in favour of an adequate protection for the agricultural industry as well as the manufacture, but everybody knows that there is no possibility of protecting the agricultural industry by a custom tariff. If we are going to have protection for the agricultural industries, we must have it by a system of bounties. And, speaking on behalf of the province from which I come, which is exclusively devoted to agriculture and fishing, I claim our fair share of protection. If protection is to be given to other industries, we want a bounty of five or six cents a bushel on our potatoes, 10 cents a bushel on our oats, 15 or 25 cents a bushel on our wheat, a bounty on our horses, which are of excellent quality, a bounty on our horned cattle, on our cheese, butter, eggs and wool, and all the other products of the farm. And, I presume the same will be claimed by the farmers throughout the Dominion. The hon. leader of the opposition will find, if he has to face the question of giving the farmers and fishermen of this country adequate protection, that he will have to raise millions and millions of dollars over and above what is raised now. And, I suppose when everybody is taxed to make everybody else rich times will be very prosperous indeed.

Now, a word with regard to what has been said about outside manufacturers making this country a slaughter market. I suppose, if hon. gentlemen opposite were returned to power they would not and could not increase the taxation to any enormous extent, they probably would not increase it more than 10 or 15 per cent. And, if what they say is true, that the manufacturers of the United States and Great Britain are making a slaughter market of this country for the excess of their products, do you suppose, Mr. Speaker, that a slight increase in the duty would prevent them from continuing that course ? On the other hand, if protection has the effect of enabling the manufacturers of a country to increase the prices of their products at home to such an extent that they can afford to sell in other countries at slaughter prices, the excess of their products, that, to my mind, is the strongest argument possible against this system of protection.

The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) spoke of the large expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway. Since these railways have come under the present management—I know, because I have travelled over them many times—they have been greatly improved. The equipment of the Intercolonial Railway, and even more on the Prince Edward Island Railway, had been allowed to fall into a deporable condition by the late administration. Under the present management, the rolling stock is improved the road-bed is improved, the service is improved in every respect, and these railways are now in a much more efficient condition than they were for many years before. All this costs money, of course. But the deficit on these railways is less than it was in previous years.

Hon. gentlemen opposite, comparing Canada with the United States in respect to

manufactures, seem to think that we are in a very much worse position than the United States. But if we compare our population with that of the United States, we find that we are not very far behind them in the proportion of manufacturing carried on. There is this to say—the exports of our manufactures are increasing year after year, and they are increasing faster under the present administration than under the previous one. The whole country has prospered in a way unknown for years before. Our waste places are filling up, the granaries and elevators in the North-west are bursting with plenty; the banks of our country are filling up with the savings of the people; our manufacturers are extending their exports, while occupying the home market; and the home market is increasing with the growth of our population and the greater purchasing power of our people. Is not this state of things good enough? Is it possible to improve upon it? Why should hon. gentlemen opposite seek to disturb such a state of affairs? I consider the true national policy of this country is to give the manufacturers, so far as it is possible, their raw material free of duty, and then give to the farmers and fishermen the best possible transportation facilities that is in the power of the government to give them, so as to enable them to move their products to the seaboard and the markets of the world, and to give the farmers also the best facilities for placing their products in the markets of the world in the best possible condition. Having done that, the government can safely leave the rest to the brain and brawn of the people. I have no fear of the result. That is the policy that has been pursued for the last few years, and that will be pursued, no doubt, by this government while making such changes in the tariff as may be necessary when that subject comes up for consideration next year. With a continuance of that policy the prosperity of the country will continue. And when the appeal is made to the great jury, the electors, a few years hence, they will endorse the administration of this government as they have endorsed it in the past. For the reasons I have given, Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I have been delighted to listen to the grand speakers on both sides of the House. I take it that I am the second farmer to take part in the debate. The main argument from the government side of the House seems to be that we have good times. And the hon. gentlemen on this side who have spoken have agreed, and have voiced the general sentiment in declaring their gladness that prosperity reigns in Canada. But though I have listened carefully to hon. gentlemen who have spoken in support of the government, I have not heard one argument brought forward, one instance given, to show that the good times have been due to any action upon the part of the present government. There must be a reason for these good times, but I have yet to hear a single word that would go to show that the government has had anything to do with it. And, if the supporters of the government have tried to impress upon the people the idea that the prosperity is in any way due to the government, they have tried to convey a false impression, for the government has had no part in it. When the foundation of a house is well laid, the builder can put a good house upon that foundation. But how would you like it, Mr. Speaker, if a man you employed last in building a house and who did nothing but put a few rows of shingles on the roof, should stand around and compliment himself by saying 'I made a grand job of that house'? The late Sir John A. Macdonald laid the grand foundation for this Canada of ours. He inaugurated that grand national policy that brought the people prosperity and built up the country. The attitude of this government to those matters reminds me of a case in my own neighbourhood. There was a tenant farmer, and a good farmer, who cultivated his land in the very best shape. He put in about sixty acres of fall wheat. But, for some reason he had to leave in the winter. Another farmer came in, and he cut the crop, which gave a magnificent return. He did nothing but harvest the crop, and he said, 'Ain't I a splendid farmer?' reaping the benefit of other men's judgment in good agriculture. The present government stand in a very strange position when they claim we have good times. They cannot tell us the first thing they have done to make times better.

Now, I have noticed from time to time our hon. friends opposite claim that the farmer cannot be protected. I do not agree with that statement for a moment, and no honest farmer in Ontario will agree with it. Why did the last representative of the county of Peel in this House rise and ask this government for more protection on pork? That is the manliest and best thing that he did during all the time that he represented that delightful county of Peel, and he got more credit from the farmers of that county for that one act than he did for everything else that he did during ten years. The Minister of Commerce asked not very long ago for protection on biscuits. Biscuits are made from wheat grown by our farmers. If protection to the biscuit maker does not benefit the farmer that raises the wheat to make the flour for those biscuits, then I do not know anything about protection. The more biscuits he makes out of wheat grown in this country, the better for the farmers who grow the wheat.

Now, we hear a good deal about free corn brought into Canada. I ask if Canada

cannot produce the feed that we need. I put that plain question to the government. What is the effect in Canada when our farmers have a large crop of coarse grain in the shape of oats ? Do not oats have a tendency to decline in price ? There is not an hon. gentleman in this House who will deny that. When the crop of oats is small the tendency is for the price to rise ; there is not a gentleman in the House who will deny that either. Now, when we have a small crop and let in American corn, it has a tendency to keep the price of our grain down even though we do have a small crop. Every sensible farmer knows that. Our corn should be protected, not only by the 15 cents a bushel which the Americans put upon Canadian corn going into that country, but our corn should be protected to such a degree that American corn cannot come in and spoil our prices. Our people now have got to turn their attention to coarse grain, because we are not good at growing wheat in the east, and the west is going to supply our wheat. Everybody knows that a close market is the best market for a farmer, and if you give the Americans a close market in Canada for their surplus corn, how can you expect our coarse grains to go up in price ? A rich man who has paid for his land, and has got his family well settled, can afford to buy corn to feed cattle. But is that fair to the man who is dependent on the grain he grows ? For example, this year there was little corn brought into Ontario because there was a short crop in the United States ; consequently our farmers get better prices in the province of Ontario for oats and barley than they did when the corn crop was good in the United States. Is that not a sufficient proof that we need protection on coarse grains ?

Then take the article of pork on which the late member for Peel asked for protection. It is a well known fact that the Americans cannot produce as good pork made out of their corn as we can produce made out of barley, oats, wheat and so forth. When a man comes into this country he buys a lot of land, puts up a warm pen, buys American corn and feeds it to Canadian pigs, and it takes a mighty good man to tell whether a hog has been fed on corn, or on barley, oats and wheat. These pigs go into the British markets and they have a great tendency to destroy the value of our pork in the British markets. That is another great evil that American corn has done to Canada. Buyers in the city of Toronto refuse to buy Essex county pork, because it is fed on corn, and pay the same price we get in the central counties of Ontario. Everybody in Ontario knows that it is a fact that buyers refuse to take corn fed pigs from Essex and prefer pigs fed in the middle counties of the province.

We hear people from the west talking about free trade, but still they want protection on horses. They do not use the word 'protection,' because they do not like it, neither do they like the words 'national policy.' But they want in some way or other to get protection from the scrub American horses that come into Manitoba, and into the east also. They do not want any horse allowed to come in unless he is valued at $50. Now, that is what I call a fraudulent protection. The fair, square and honest way would be to put on a good protection that will keep out scrub horses as well as corn, for scrub horses hurt our native market in the same way as corn hurts our coarse grains in Ontario. So there is another way in which the farmers of Canada can be protected. We do not need to go to the west to see the evil that scrub horses are doing in Canada. In the province of Ontario, in some of the towns near my own constituency, this fall there were 20, 30 or 40 scrub ponies from Texas. They are bought in Texas for a dollar or two each, put on the train and brought over to the border, they pay $2 customs, and are sold for $15 to $30, taking away our cash to the United States. Can you not protect us on horses ? I think we need it.

Now, there is another thing I have noticed since this session began. Petitions have been pouring in here daily from the farmers of this country asking for protection. Protection for what ? Protection for our cattle and horses from the railroads, and asking that the railroads be compelled to build such cattle guards as the law provided they should. But I notice this government did not seem anxious to promote that Bill last year, because it was sent to the committee, which is the burying ground of cattle-guards. This year it was again sent to the same burying ground, notwithstanding that petitions in its favour came in from farmers from almost every county in the province. I hope the government will at least give us that protection.

Now, I have noticed a tendency towards protection on the government side of the House. The Minister of Finance came out last year bold and strong, not a knee shaking, and said there was going to be no more tinkering with the tariff. This year he comes out and says the tariff might be materially changed towards greater protection. At the same time we see some hon. gentlemen opposite declaring for free trade and others for a higher protection. For instance, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) advocated protection, and he said he represents a farming constituency extending for 20 miles round his town. These things ought to encourage the government to give us more protection.

I think that the farmers of this country are broad-minded men. If they cannot see at once that they are going to derive a benefit from a high protective tariff, they are broad enough minded to see that the home market is the best market and that the more people we can induce to remain in the

cities and produce the articles that they require, at the same time consuming the commodities that the farmers produce, thus affording a home market, the better it will be for them. The more prosperous the cities are the more prosperous will the farmers be and if we can establish cities with manufacturing industries as large and important as those of the city of Toronto, for instance, we will benefit from the home market which will be afforded us. We know that we would be able to get better goods from those industries than we could get abroad, while, at the same time, we would have the advantage of the home market. Is there an hon. member in this House who can say that the reduction of the tariff has enabled the farmers to get their machinery cheaper? Have binders been reduced in price? They have not. Has barbed wire been any cheaper? Every man in this House knows that it is dearer, that it is now manufactured in the United States and that the factories here are closed up. Is that an advantage to the Dominion of Canada? Every industry that we can secure for Canada, the better it will be for the country because it will afford employment for an increased population. And instead of spending millions of money in bringing foreigners into Canada who, I am afraid, will not do much good in this country, we should make an effort to keep our young men, by increasing the opportunities for work. I notice that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has for twenty-five years declared himself against his own will, against his own judgment; yet, I look upon him as a man of good judgment. There is no better debater in the House and there is no broader-minded man than he. But, he is only now where I have been since I have been a boy. I claim that I have been honest since I was a boy up to this time in holding the views that I think are in the interest of the country to which I belong. I am afraid, I am sorry to have to say it, that if this is a sample of the feeling of the Liberal party which aspired to be at the head of public affairs during all these twenty-five years, the country could not expect much from that party. That hon. gentleman said that the preference was given to Great Britain to show good will. Who ever showed bad will to Great Britain? If there was bad will who caused that bad will? If there were any utterances by public men in the Dominion of Canada to cause bad will, they were the utterances of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) when he said that a customer in the United States was worth three in Great Britain. That statement can be found in the 'Hansard' of the House. More than that he said that we owed Great Britain nothing, except for bungling the affairs of the Dominion of Canada. If there was anything to create bad feeling instead of good will, this is the man who created it. Such men as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and the hon. member for North Norfolk, who were serving their party instead of their country, are the men who are responsible for that if there is any responsibility for it at all. I come now to one hon. member of this House who is an ardent supporter of the government. I have watched him since he came into the House. He gets up, shakes his finger at the government and says that they can go so far and no farther. He is a free trader up to the hilt, and he dares the Prime Minister, points his finger at him and says: I will leave you, but he does not say how far he will go. He says that he does not believe in stealing, but that if he steals he will go out on the highway and do it like a man. He says that the millionaries of the United States have stolen the millions they possess; yet he proposes to let down the fence, admit these millionaries to a larger territory so that they can accumulate more millions in the Dominion of Canada. What do hon. gentlemen think of such a policy as that? I cannot see any reason why that hon. gentleman is such an ardent free trader, or why this government should admit corn free of duty, because, in our section of the country they do not want it. We do not understand why this course should be pursued, unless it be that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) had influence enough with the government to let corn in free, so that he could feed the high-bred cattle that he was able to purchase in Chicago at $6,000 a head. It may be that he wants cheap corn to feed these cattle upon. Is this policy fair towards the men who produce and sell cattle where they can and who feed them on grain raised in the Dominion of Canada? It is not fair to the ordinary farmer. Was it the influence of the same hon. gentleman which secured so many positions for the veterinary surgeons, or is it the intention of the government to do something for every candidate who was defeated in the last election? I can remember a short time ago when a rich man who sold pure bred cattle in this country was at the expense of getting these animals examined. Who should pay for the examination of an animal when it is sold? A breeder may sell an animal for $1,000 or $2,000, or $1,700 or $1,800, and if he does who should pay for the examination of that beast? Certainly, the man who sold the beast. There is not an hon. member who dares to stand up in this House and state that the country should pay for the examination of that beast. Yet, the government must provide places for these defunct and defeated candidates and heelers and we are now paying a large amount every year to veterinaries to examine rich men's cattle; men, who do not pay as much to the coun-

try as I do. The hon. Minister of Agriculture may think it was a good thing when he put this large burden on the people. His ladyship is not in the House at present. You will excuse me, Mr. Speaker. He being small of statute, and having his hair parted in the centre, I could hardly help it. We are told, continuously that the people ought to be everlastingly obliged to the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) for giving us penny postage. I will ask a fair question. There are farmers in this House. How many letters a year does the ordinary farmer post? Every man who has a farm, or was raised on a farm, knows how many letters a farmer posts. Will the number average twenty-five, or thirty, or forty, or one hundred? There is a dollar a farmer has made out of postage. How much will the monopolies, the millionaries, the trusts, the loan companies, the bankers, the lawyers, the merchants gain? Who gains by penny postage? Is it not the merchant, the banker, the lawyer, and the departmental store in the city? Do not they gain enormously by the penny postage?

Therefore, we see that the poor farmer is protected to the extent of $1 a year, while the merchants in the cities are protected to the extent of thousands of dollars. And this is done by the Liberal government, who tell us that monopolies and rich corporations should not be encouraged. The Minister of Finance told us that he would not tinker with the tariff. I agree with him that it is a bad thing to do so, but I am afraid that my faith in his statement will be shaken, for I believe that he is going to tinker with the tariff in the interest of the tobacco manufacturers who waited upon him to-day, and who represent the same ends as the great tobacco monopoly which has been introduced into England. The more you tinker with tariffs the more you will have to tinker with them. I believe the tariff policy of a government should be on a solid foundation, because if you change the tariff from time to time it creates unrest in the country and leads to very injurious results to our general trade. The amendment of the leader of the opposition speaks of a 'declared policy,' and when the Conservative party in Canada makes the announcement that they are going to do such and such a thing, and when they declare that they will carry out a certain policy when they get into power, the people of Canada may rest assured that the Conservatives will carry out their pledges. The Conservatives differ from the Liberals in that respect it will be noticed. I have often been asked why it is that wages are higher now than they were when Sir John Macdonald was in power. That I can answer easily. Sir John Macdonald built the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he opened the rich lands of Manitoba and the North-west to which our young men and young women in the older provinces are going, thus creating in the older provinces a scarcity of labour. That is one reason why wages are high now. Another reason is that the war in South Africa has taken away a number of our young men, and that money is being circulated in this country for the purposes of war supplies, giving increased employment, and so this war, unfortunate in many respects, has been to that extent a benefit to us. Not one of these gentlemen opposite has been honest enough to acknowledge the part that the war in South Africa has played in contributing to our present prosperity. Now, Sir, I cannot see for the life of me why politicians should not be as honest as clergymen. I believe that every man should be honest. Was not Sir John Macdonald an example of honesty in public life? For years and years he devoted his life to the conduct of the affairs of this country, and he died in harness, a poor man without a dollar in the bank. There was a man to be looked up to by the people of Canada. Where will you find a clergyman of any denomination more honest than he? But what do you see going on to-day. Why, we see gentlemen on the other side of the House dodging and shifting from one position to the other. We see some members of the government holding different views from the other ministers. We see one Liberal getting up in the House to announce a policy utterly at variance with the policy announced by his leader. That is not honest, and I venture to think that the leader of the government does not believe that it is honest. When he sees one of his supporters rising in the House and shaking his hand at him as much as to say: I will not follow you, but when the vote comes voting blindly for whatever the Liberal party announces, what opinion can the right hon. gentleman have of such a man. I hope, Sir, that the time will come when the Conservative party will be in power with a declared policy, such as is announced in the resolution of the hon. leader of the opposition, for which I shall have much pleasure in voting.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, this debate has taken a strange turn and a wide range. It has become the occasion of the profession of political faith as regards trade and tariff matters. The House has had some surprises in that connection. We have found that certain gentlemen, who we supposed held fixed views in regard to tariff questions for many years, not only do not hold these views now, but that they never held them. The House was surprised to hear that statement from one gentleman of prominence, and for my part I must refuse to that hon. gentleman the merit of inconsistency which he claimed for himself. He was not inconsistent, on his own showing. He was not inconsistent in his belief; he

was only inconsistent in his profession. That is not generally called inconsistency; it has another name—hon. gentlemen can apply that name for themselves. I do not think, however, that the hon. member who put himself in that light before this House and before the country, is now in a position to demand credence for any form of political belief that he may see fit to enunciate. He wound up his remarks by probably the strongest protectionist speech ever heard in this House, and taking the hon. member at his own valuation, we know exactly what value to put on his arguments in favour of protection. In political life it is not only the speech that counts; it is the man behind the speech. And, Sir, when a man declares himself not be honest in his profession, then, no matter what he says or how well he says it, it falls with light effect on the public ear.

This being an occasion of professions and of surprises, as I have said, I will add my contribution to the general interest by declaring myself a protectionist. I read the resolution submitted by the leader of the opposition in which he calls for a 'declared policy of adequate protection to the labour, agriculture, manufactures and industries of Canada.' I endorse the principle of protection to the labour, agriculture, manufactures and industries of Canada, but I am sorry to say—this may be another surprise—that I cannot vote for the resolution just the same. The reason for that is, that judging from what the leader of the opposition said, possibly we do not give the same meaning to the word 'protection.' Possibly what he calls protection I would call robbery. When I speak of protection, I speak of protection to the general interests of the country, but when he speaks of protection, he speaks of protection to a special interest in the country. I am anxious to protect the labour, the agriculture, the manufactures and the general industries of this country; but if I interpreted correctly the remarks of the hon. member and the remarks of every hon. member who supported him, whether on this side of the House or on the other. I would infer that his understanding of protection was protection to manufactures by means of high tariffs—that and nothing more. I cannot agree that that is protection, or that such a policy is a national policy. I will not trouble the House with many figures in dealing with this question to-night; but I find, in reading carefully the speech of the hon. leader of the opposition, that that hon. gentleman quoted figures as to the exports of Canada. Now, the exports of Canada are not the whole of the products of Canada. But I will assume—and I think it will be admitted that it is sufficiently close for the purpose of the argument—that the proportion shown by the exports of our country is a fair indication of the actual production of the country. I find that in 1901 Canada exported as follows:

Products of the mine..	$40,000,000
Products of the fisheries	10,000,000
Products of the forest.... ..	30,000,000
Animals and their products..	56,000,000
Agricultural products..	38,000,000
Manufactures	17,000,000

The five producing industries which I have first mentioned exported a total of $174,000,000 and the manufacturing industries exported $17,000,000 in that year. My idea of protection, then, differs from that of the hon. leader of the opposition in this. He wishes to protect those industries which produce a total of $17,000,000 of exports at the expense of those industries which produce $174,000,000 of exports. I would protect all the industries. He would protect ten per cent of our industries at the expense of the other ninety per cent. I do not call that protection. I call it robbery.

There is another feature of the hon. gentleman's resolution to which I will draw attention, which I confess I do not exactly understand, when I read it in the light of the remarks which he made in introducing it. While he believes in a declared policy of high tariff in favour of manufactures, he also believes in a policy of reciprocal trade preferences within the empire. The one idea does not go with the other. He said that it was possible that a preference to Great Britain which would be of inappreciable benefit to her might still be injurious to Canada by reason of its closing one manufactory. If that occurs under our present preference, how is he going to prevent it occuring under the reciprocal preference which he proposes to bring about? If it is an injury to Canada to close one of its manufactories, then how is he going to prevent hundreds of those manufactories being closed by admitting not only British goods, but goods from every other British colony into Canada on terms of reciprocal preference? It is no use for the hon. member to say that he can at once protect his friends, the manufacturers, by a high tariff, and at the same time give the other producing industries of Canada the benefits of free trade within the empire. The one condition does not go with the other. It is impossible that the one can go with the other. If he is in favour of the one, he is against the other. For these reasons, although I am a protectionist, and also an imperialist in trade as in loyalty, I am sorry to say that I cannot support the resolution of the hon. leader of the opposition.

It is not, however, with regard to this resolution that I desire especially to speak to-night. When the hon. Finance Minister began his presentation of the budget, I think there was a general feeling that it was an uneventful matter. It was, as he said, another chapter in the continued story of Can-

ada's prosperity—something that is very pleasant, but is not wildly exciting. But before the hon. minister concluded his presentation, and particularly since other members have taken part in the debate, it appears to me that we are possibly on the verge of a radical departure in our tariff policy and in our trade relations, if not in our political organization. The remarks of the hon. the Finance Minister upon which I base this statement were as follows :—

I have occasionally pointed out the desirability of a reasonable measure of tariff stability. Nothing would be more likely to unsettle business than a practice of introducing frequent tariff changes. Hence, we have resisted applications for many small changes and we think it well to do so to-day. But I would not have it understood that this view can always be held. As time passes, conditions change in our own country and it will be well for us to take note of this, so that we may adjust the tariff accordingly. Nor is that the only reason that might require some change. Conditions arise in other countries of which we are obliged to take account. We do not propose that we shall stand still and that this tariff shall remain unchanged, but we think the time is not opportune for making changes at present.

There are several reasons which operate in our minds against entering upon a policy of tariff changes to-day. We have just completed the taking of a census, and while some of the results are available others of much importance have yet to be prepared. Among these are the returns of the operations of our industries. In considering the tariff in relation to the industries of the country, it is desirable that we should have before us, with ample time for consideration, the industrial statistics of the recent census. A further reason against present change is that we are having certain negotiations with other countries in regard to trade of a more or less formal character.

The first point that strikes me in regard to this announcement of the hon. Finance Minister is that it took a great many reasons to prevent changes, and radical changes in the tariff being made this session—changes which would include our relations with other countries; changes which would be particularly arranged to suit our own industries, using the word 'industries' in exactly the same sense as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition uses it, namely, as relating only to the manufacturing industries of the country. Why do I reach that conclusion ? The hon. the Finance Minister did not say so. I reach it for this reason. Because, although those of us in this House who are, by reason of circumstances or otherwise, in favour of a low tariff, have accepted the present tariff, we have not done so because it fully meets our views, and yet, so far as I have heard, not one of us has approached the Minister of Finance to demand radical or far reaching changes, or in fact any changes at all. Therefore, when the Finance Minister speaks of changes, he is not referring to changes brought to his notice by the low tariff friends of the government. Consequently he must refer to those asked for by their high tariff friends. I may say that I do not think that the high tariff friends of the government are at all confined to this side of the House. I am perfectly satisfied that all the Finance Minister and his colleagues have to do is to bring down a tariff with sufficiently protective features in favour of the manufacturing industries of this country, and they can have the support of three-fourths of the opposition in carrying those measures through and keeping the government in office afterwards. That has been the political history of the manufacturers of Canada in the past. If I do not read history wrongly, in 1878 the manufacturers of Canada sold themselves for a protective duty, and I believe that to-day, judging by their utterances in this House and elsewhere, they are just as ready to sell themselves again politically for a further increase in the tariff.

Those of us then who are in favour of a low tariff are in a serious position, and I would like to say to the Minister of Finance that in making the announcement which he did, in his presentation of the budget, he has placed every supporter of the government, representing a constituency in which the low tariff idea predominates, upon the defensive in his own constituency before his own friends. It is, therefore, necessary on this occasion that members holding that position should make themselves understood, so that whatever misunderstanding there may be as to the intentions of the government, there should be none as to their position with regard to those proposed changes. Speaking then on behalf of a constituency in which the industries are not such as are susceptible of protection by high tariff as are the manufacturing industries, I am compelled to voice my objection to any changes in the tariff which will be in the direction of protecting still further and unduly our manufacturing industries at the expense of the other industries of this country. There was a time when it was believed that a high tariff could be made to protect every industry. That time has gone by. We have had the experience of years since then, and we know that not only has a high tariff been unable to secure prosperity to the general industries of the country, but has even been unable to support and uphold the manufacturing industry itself. Instead of a high tariff being a protection against the failure of industry, it has been a failure itself. So that to-day there is no chance of any man or set of men going up and down the length and breadth of this country and persuading the representatives of the great producing industry that there is any benefit to them in the protection of manufactures. The manufacturer must be judged on his own merits, He must not expect in the future to ride, as he has done in the past, into popular favour on the backs of those in-

dustries which really are the foundation of the greatness of our country.

I was struck very much by the powerful arguments brought to bear on this as well as on the other side of the House, in favour of an increased tariff on imported manufactures. I was struck by the argument which went to prove the tremendous preponderance of wealth and manufacturing enterprise in the United States. It was held out to us that we must increase our protection or our country would be made a slaughter market by the manufacturers of the United States. That was the argument, but really, reading between the lines, following that argument out in detail, it struck me that the trouble was not at all with the manufacturers of the United States but with the manufacturers of Britain, under the British preference which prevails to-day. And that while our hon. friends were proclaiming themselves in favour of Britain, and possibly to some extent of British preference, they were really trying to get public sentiment worked up in favour of a high tariff, so that the British preference would be put an end to. They were using arguments against the United States for the purpose of raising an additional tariff in all against England. Did any of these gentlemen who held out to us so strongly the danger of our makets being slaughtered by the products of the United States advocate the desirability of a retaliatory tariff against the United States which would not apply to the rest of the world? They did not. The idea was that we should retaliate against the United States by protecting ourselves against Britain.

Now, a word as to the extent to which the manufacturers of the United States are slaughtering their goods in Canada. Let us take, first, the case of agricultural implements. The sales in Canada of agricultural implements made in the United States are increasing greatly, they are increasing greatly in the North-west. In the town in which I live, there are four implement agencies, two representing Canadian manufacturers and two representing American manufacturers. All four are doing a good business. And to-day the American harvester, the McCormick or the Deering, is worth just ten dollars more than the Massey or the Frost and Wood implement in that town. Do you call that slaughtering the American product in the Canadian market? I do not. To-day, I am credibly informed, our friends of the Imperial—otherwise the Standard—Oil Company are peddling oil throughout the towns of Ontario in double-barrelled tank wagons. In one barrel is Canadian oil, and in the other is American oil. And the American oil costs the consumer just five cents a gallon more than the Canadian oil—just the amount of the duty. Mr. Speaker. Is American oil being slaughtered in the Canadian market to the detriment of Canadian oil? We have heard a good deal in previous sessions of the necessity of protecting the shirt and collar manufacturers in Montreal. There was some inequality in the tariff—I do not know what it was—that had to be adjusted in favour of these people, otherwise, they would be driven out of business because the Canadian market was being slaughtered by the foreign manufacturers. I happened in to a store on Sparks Street the other day to make a purchase. I was anxious to patronize Canadian industry, but the merchant who kept the store said he did not keep Canadian goods; that he kept only German and English goods. I found, on further inquiry, that I could buy a Canadian-made shirt for seventy-five cents; and my friend who did not keep Canadian goods, and who was doing business right along was selling English and Austrian-made goods for $1.25 to $1.50. Were these goods being slaughtered on the Canadian market? Now, let us have a word with our friends the manufacturers—just a word—with regard to this matter. These three lines of goods that I have mentioned—and I take it that they are only sample cases of the whole line of manufactures—are sold in Canada at higher prices than the Canadian products. Why? Simply because the Canadian product is inferior. There is no getting away from that conclusion. Why is the Canadian product inferior? Is it because the Canadian is not equal in skill to the Austrian, or the Britisher, or the American? Is it because there is not sufficient capital in Canada to carry out these enterprises? The Bank of Montreal lends money by the million in the city of Chicago and the city of New York, and is not the only Canadian bank that does so. Then, why are not the Canadian manufactures as good as the foreign? There is no cause but that the Canadian manufacturer went into business, in many cases, with the intention of making his profit out of the tariff and not out of his business, and because he was able to come back year after year to this House and get the protection he saw fit to claim. He did not consider that he had to manufacture in competition with the outside, and he did not do it, nor is he doing it to-day. And, until the manufacturer of Canada rises to the occasion and uses the mechanical skill that is here, uses the capital that is here, uses the opportunity that is here to give the Canadian customer as good an article as that customer can buy from the outside, he is not entitled to protective consideration by this House. I said a minute ago that I was a protectionist. I am a protectionist, and when Canada becomes a slaughter market for another country I shall be prepared to consider measures to prevent that from taking place. But that is not taking place to-day; we are not even in danger of it taking place to-day. It is Britain that is selling us cheap goods

and not the United States. And when these men come to us and ask an increase of tariff in favour of their manufactures, they are using false arguments, as I have shown, and are asking us to do what was done for them during the time of the so-called and mis-called national policy, which I hope this government will never consent to. I should be proud as a Canadian to know that the label 'made in Canada' was a guarantee of a good article. But I am ashamed, as a Canadian, that it is not so. And, if Canadian goods are not of good enough quality to sell in Canada in competition with outside manufactured goods, how are we to expect our Canadian trade in manufactured articles with the outside world to increase? We are to put up the duties on manufactured articles and squeeze the limit out of $174,000,000 worth of trade of our mines, fisheries, animals and agriculture. And for what? Will it increase by one cent the wages of the operatives in the mills and factories? It never did before. No; the object is to increase the dividends of the capitalists engaged in these industries—capital which is so fully represented in this House and so strongly represented on the other side particularly.

It seems, there has been a special attack made upon the government by our friends who are in the woollen industry. The woollen industry it appears, is hard hit by the British preference, and it cannot survive——

Mr. HOLMES. Pretends to be hard hit.

Mr. OLIVER. I am giving it credit for honesty. It is hard hit and cannot survive, if the preference is continued. Our woollen mills are being shut up, and the operatives thrown out of employment and compelled to seek employment in the United States. We are called upon to give adequate protection to the woollen industry. I took the trouble to look up the customs tariff and to make some little inquiry with regard to this woollen industry, and I would like to know what the woollen manufacturers want. Remember that Canada is a country with a long winter. Canada is a country where cheap woollens is of the highest importance to the people. Where a very trifling difference in the cost means a tremendous tax, particularly upon the labouring and poorer classes of this country. Woollen goods are a prime necessity, an absolute necessity, a universal necessity. Lower the cost of woollens and you benefit everybody, and particularly you benefit these great producing industries that I have mentioned. Increase the cost of woollens, and you injure everybody, and you especially injure these great producing industries that I have mentioned. You injure the labouring people; the poorer classes above all others. I say that when men come to this House and demand an increase in the duties on woollens, it is for them to show good cause why those duties should be increased.

Now, what are the duties on woollens to-day? In the customs tariff there is a duty in favour of the woollen manufacturers, if I read it right, of 35 per cent; 35 per cent against the world, 35 per cent against the danger of this country being used as a slaughter market by the woollen manufactures of the United States, a danger which, I may say, does not exist, as woollens are much dearer in the United States than they are in Canada. However, we have a tariff of 35 per cent in favour of woollens against the world, and with the British preference taken off we have a duty of 23 per cent against Great Britain, on woollen manufactures at large. I find that where other articles are required to enter into the manufactures of wool, such as alpaca, camel's wool, &c., these are admitted free for the benefit of our friends the woollen manufacturers—very properly so, too, I think. I do not know how many of our woollen manufacturers make shoddy, I hope none of them do. But I notice that probably in response to their request woollen rags were put on the free list. So they get a considerable part of their raw material free; they get protection of more than one-third against the world, and 23 per cent against Great Britain, 3 per cent more than the manufacturers of agricultural implements get to-day, 3 per cent more than the horse-raisers of the North-west, or of Canada generally get to-day, 3 per cent more, I may mention, than the raw wool, the product of the farm, receives to-day. That is to say, raw wool gets a protection of 3 cents a pound, and giving an estimated price of 15 cents a pound for wool, that leaves 20 per cent in favour of the farmer, while the manufacturer gets 23 per cent under the preferential tariff. I notice also that woollen yarn is protected to the extent of 30 per cent, while yarn which comes in for the purpose of manufacture pays only 20 per cent.

Now, I ask in all conscience, if these woollen manufacturers are not satisfied at present, what do they want? They are protected against the slaughter market of the United States by more than one-third of the cost of the imported article; they have cheap food, cheaper than it is in Great Britain; they have water power such as does not exist in Great Britain; they have capital in this country ample for all needs; they have protection more than many other industries have. Now, what more do they want? Do they want these great producing industries of the mine, the forest, the sea and the farm, to pay such extra price on the goods which they manufacture as will enable them to carry on their business by antiquated methods and antiquated means? If their demand means anything it means that, and I am here to say that in my humble estimation that demand should be refused in the interest of the whole of the people of this country.

I will carry the argument further. I am quite aware that you cannot eat your cake and have it. I want to be understood as saying that if this woollen manufacturing industry cannot exist in Canada under all the favourable conditions which it has at present, better that it should pass out of existence, that the capital employed in it should find other fields of employment, that the labour employed in it should find other fields, than that the people of this country at large should have to pay an unreasonable amount for one of the greatest necessities of their lives, and particularly that the poorer classes should be taxed unduly for the benefit of a few capitalists. I do not think that any such conclusion is in prospect, I do not think that we stand in any such danger. But I certainly say that if the choice has to be made, let these gentlemen understand distinctly that there are men in this House prepard to make it. They themselves are to be the judges. When we in the Northwest find that a certain article of our production cannot find a market, we are told to change our production, and we do. We have to; and if we do not, I do not know any tariff on earth that would save us. We did not find that our friends, the opposition, when they were in power, ever took the trouble to try to shape the tariff so as to save us when we were badly off in regard to markets. Neither have they a right to demand that we should do unreasonable things simply because they are incompetent in the management of their own business.

I notice that one of our friends alluded to protection on buggies. He claimed that the buggy industry was in danger of serious damage because of a lack of protection. I find that buggies have 35 per cent protection. That if you buy a buggy in the United States and bring it over to Canada, you have to pay one-third of the original cost to our hon. friend the Minister of Customs, before you can bring that buggy in. Now, if that is not a sufficient protection to Canadian buggy manufacturers, I want to know what they desire. For I find that the wood, even, though in a partly manufactured state, that is required for the making of that buggy, is allowed to come in free. I heard one of our friends speak on the subject of cutlery, our cutlery trade was going to be ruined. I find that cutlery has a protection of 30 per cent, very nearly one-third. I find further that if our friends the manufacturers of cutlery only desire to do a finishing business and do not really desire to go into the business of actually manufacturing the article which they sell as of Canadian make, they have the privilege of importing those parts of cutlery which go to make up the finished article, under a duty of 10 per cent.

I won't trouble the House by going through the whole tariff list. But I will say that my study of the present tariff has led me to the belief that it has been a subject of more careful adjustment than I ever thought it was, and that there has been more done to relieve the tax on the consumer and at the same time help the manufacturer—which we all wish to do—than a careless glance at the tariff pages would give anybody to understand. In regard to the reductions in duties that have taken place, and in regard to the effect of these reductions it has been said that the reductions only amounted to such and such a per cent. I do not know whether that calculation is correct or not, and I do not care, but I do know that the reductions of the protective duties on iron and steel, which had done no good to this country and had simply been a tax upon it, were a benefit to our manufacturers which they certainly availed themselves of and which we are all very glad of. There was an advantage, a distinct advantage to the country in the readjustment of these iron duties, the story of which is not told by the mere amount of the reduction.

I am no enemy of the manufacturers. I am anxious to see the manufacturing interests of this country prosper, as I am anxious to see every other industry prosper, but, I cannot agree to a declaration of policy whereby that industry is to be singled out to be benefited at the expense of all others. You say that it is not, in terms. Well, it does not need to be in terms. There is a difference between an industry which is chiefly an exporting industry and an industry which chiefly finds a home market. The one is capable of being affected by a protective tariff, and the other is not correspondingly capable of being affected by a protective tariff. If you put a duty on woollen goods, you enable the price of woollen goods to be raised, but if you put a duty on wheat you do not raise the price of the wheat of the farmer as long as he has to export the millions and millions of bushels that he raises. I was struck by the argument of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) where he said that the population of Canada consumes 22,000,000 bushels of wheat a year, and that it should be possible to ensure a home market to our people to that extent. Possibly it would, but what about the balance of the crop? What is he going to do about that? Is he going to protect the farmer on 20,000,000 bushels of his crop, enable the farmer to bleed every other industry in the country and still compel him to sell the balance of his product in the world's market at the world's price? That is the best he can do for the farmer, but it is not the best he can do for the woollen manufacturer who makes only for the home market. Every cent which is added to the duty is a cent in the pocket of the capitalist who owns the woollen mill. That is

the difference between protection as applied to the manufacturers and protection as applied to a great producing industry.

I said that I was a protectionist. Mr. Speaker, I am a protectionist. I believe in the policy of protection. I believe it is the first business of a government to do what lies in its power by legislation, administration or otherwise to protect and advance the interest of the people of the country of which it has charge. I want to see a protectionist policy on behalf of labour in this country. I want to see a policy that will protect labour against the degredation of unfair competition. We have heard a great deal on the subject of Chinese labour in British Columbia. Let me say that if there are 16,000 adult working Chinamen in British Columbia that displaces, possibly, not 16,000, but, certainly 8,000 adult white labourers, taking one white man to be as good as two Chinamen. Sixteen thousand Chinamen displace 8,000 white men, but, the 8,000 white men would probably be 8,000 heads of families and would mean not 8,000 people, but 40,000 people in that province—40,000 added to the strength of our nation; instead of 16,000 towards the weakness of our nation. For the labour of the country is the vitality of the country. It is on the strength and force of the labour of the world that the industrial machine depends just as much as it is on the pressure of steam in the boiler that we depend for the running of our machinery. If we have plenty of the right kind of people we can do business, and if we have not, we cannot. If we allow the right kind of people to be displaced by the wrong kind of people we do ourselves an injury. I say that I am in favour of a policy of protection to labour, protecting labour from the degradation of low wages and unfair competition in so far as that can be done. It is all a mistake for us to consider that it is merely the capitalist and his capital that has to be considered in the successful running of the affairs of the country.

The foundation of everything is the labourer and his labour and any system of taxation which takes an unfair proportion of the public revenue from the labourer is an injury to the country as much as it is to the labourers themselves. Last night, or the night before, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) asked: How is it that there is only one free trade country in the world, that all the other countries of Europe and America are protectionist? How can it be that these are all wrong and that Great Britain alone is right? On the other hand, let me ask him in what other country has there been, under paralleled circumstances, any such industrial or commercial development as there has been in Great Britain under the system which has prevailed there. There is no comparison between the progress of Great Britain and the progress of any other country, and the one thing in which Great Britain is placed above any other protective country is that the British workingman is the man who pays the least taxes of any one in the British islands. He is the man, who by the British system is relieved of taxation practically, and there you have the secret of Britain's industrial supremacy so far as that supremacy has been achieved, and so far as it has been maintained. I say that in this country, our system of tariff and our system of taxation ought above all things be framed so as to lay the least burden upon the labouring man and upon the results of his labour to himself and his family.

I am a protectionist in this: That I wish to see our country grow, and grow great I submit that there is nothing in which our country has lost so much, and has fallen so far short of achieving greatness, as in the stupendous loss of population which has taken place within the last thirty years. During that period Canada has lost over a million of her native born children. Canada has been losing them decade after decade, and if she is not losing them to-day then we have reason to be pleased. But we have more than reason to fear that she is still losing them in larger numbers than is good for the country. I am in favour of a policy which will actively endeavour to retain our own population in our own country for its advancement and its building up. I heard my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) say that he was in favour of that idea, and he proposed to attain it by providing protection to manufacturing industries. Well, my hon. friend's friends were in power for nearly twenty years. They had a policy which they called the national policy and one of the great purposes of that policy was to do that very thing. They had time enough to work it out to a successful conclusion if success was possible under it. The result of the census has shown that success was not achieved, and therefore I believe that success under that policy was not possible. It is impossible to herd the surplus people of this country in manufacturing centres, which manufacturing centres depend on the balance of the people for their support and their prosperity. The thing is an impossibility. Let me place this fact before hon. gentlemen: Canada offers to-day the greatest field for the employment of intelligent labour that is offered by any country in the world. Canada has opportunity for every one of her children and will have such an opportunity for decades and decades to come. That opportunity lies in the country west of Lake Superior—in Manitoba, in British Columbia, in the North-west Territories and in the Yukon. It is by attracting the overflow of the people of our eastern provinces to our western provinces that we will retain their nationality and retain their labour

and their enterprise for the benefit of our own country. That is the way in which we can do it, and that is the only way in which we can do it. You may say: Why is it not being done; why has it not been done; or perhaps you may say: Is it not being done. Well, I am sorry to say Mr. Speaker, that it is not being done, that it has not been done, and that it has been the declared policy of the government of Canada for many years—the declared policy of the present government and of the preceding government—not to use means to induce the removal of population from one part of the Dominion to the other. I stand here to-night to say that that declared policy has been the greatest curse from which our Dominion has suffered; that that policy of knowing nothing and doing nothing in regard to the removal of our population from one part of the country where they had not opportunity to the other part of the country where they had boundless opportunity, has been the reason why so many of our people have gone to that other country where they had opportunity as well. In view of the census returns, in view of the facts which are now before us, I say that it is time for our country to drop its know nothing and do nothing policy in regard to retaining our own people for our own country, and to recognize the fact that of all the countries in the known world, this Canada of ours is the country which sends out the greatest proportion of its people as emigrants to other countries. If we realize that, and if we realize as I believe—and as I think we all believe—that our own people are the best people we can have for the settlement and development of our country; surely here is a policy that is worthy of the best attention of our best minds and the best efforts that our government can put forth. There is only one means by which the exodus can be checked, can be stopped, and that is by turning our overflow of population into the field which we acquired for that very purpose thirty or forty years ago. If we did not acquire the North-west for that purpose we did not acquire it for any reasonable purpose; because, if you settle that country with an alien people it has such a preponderance of resources and of opportunities that the question presents itself: What becomes of your Dominion; what becomes of the country that you are supposed to be building up? How long can you hold it as a part of this Dominion when that country is filled with an alien people and outnumbers the population of Eastern Canada by ten or twenty to one. It is of the first necessity towards the building up of a Canadian nation that you must use every endeavour to put every son of Canadian soil into that western country where, and where only within your borders there is room and opportunity suited to his intellect and ability. You must do that if you are to retain Canada as a great country and build it up as a united Canada.

I am a protectionist in other ways. In view of the developments; the industrial, commercial and transportation developments which have taken place in the country to the south of us; in view of the developments along similar lines which have taken place in Canada; in view of the march of events throughout the world, I say that the policy of protection which requires most urgent attention at the hands of this government of Canada, is the protection of the masses of the people engaged in these great producing industries—the mines, the fisheries, the forest, and the farm—the protection of the masses of the people from the transportation monopolies, from the manufacturing monopolies, from the capitalistic monopolies, of every kind which are riding the United States to death and which will ride us to death if we let them. This is the danger in which we stand in Canada to-day, and this is the protection we require. It is not that our manufactures need protection against those of the United States, but it is that our people need protection against combinations of capital applied to transportation, industrial, and commercial development, along all lines. These are the questions which I urge upon the government of the day the necessity of considering. I ask for protection of interests which have added to the wealth of this country $174,000,000 in one year rather than that those interests shall be sacrificed at the demand of interests which have added only $17,000,000 to the wealth of the country in the same time. I ask that the greater interest be considered and not the lesser. I ask that these interests be considered fairly and equitably, and that no injustice be done them. I ask for no injustice against the manufacturing industry either; but I object entirely to that industry being spoken of as the industry, and every other industry being set to one side.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 24, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Macdonald, East Huron) moved:

That the Select Committee to whom was referred Bill (No. 11), an Act to provide for the

establishment of a medical council in Canada be empowered to employ a shorthand reporter.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Edwards.

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Ross Rifle Company.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Dominion Cotton Company, Limited.—Mr. Legris.

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the North Shore Power Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

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

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Knapp Tubular Steamship Company.—Mr. Calvert.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright) moved:

That the third report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the debates of the House for the present session be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) further to amend the Pilotage Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Explain.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is a Bill introduced to amend the statute of 1900, and it has for its object to do away with compulsory pilotage on vessels drawing less than 16 feet of water sailing between the great lakes and ports on the St. Lawrence.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPREME COURT—ASSISTANT JUDGES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 77) to provide for the appointment of assistant judges of the Supreme Court of Canada in certain cases.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Explain.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The object of this Bill is to provide that in case of a judge of the Supreme Court being disqualified by reason of illness, or because he is interested in a case pending in the court, it may be in the power of the Governor General in Council to appoint a judge to take the place of the judge who is so disqualified. This is to prevent certain inconveniences to which the Bar has been subjected in the past. It is provided in the Bill that the judge to be appointed shall be selected from the same province to which the judge who is disqualified belongs.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Of what rank ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The High Court, of course. The proposed law is similar to that which we have in the province of Quebec and also in the province of Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of disqualification does it apply to ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Illness or absence; the ordinary reasons which apply in the other provinces.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE CENSUS—DESCRIPTION OF THE METIS.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I wish to avail of the very first opportunity to call attention to what I consider to be an improper description of a certain class of our community, which is to be found in the seventh bulletin of the census for the year 1901, which has just been placed in my hands.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Had not my hon. friend better wait until the motion is made to go into Committee of Ways and Means ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I have only a few words to say, and I do not wish to make a motion or to raise a debate. On the second page of this bulletin, the Metis of the Dominion of Canada, or, what are commonly called the half-breeds, are described as Indians. I do not say that this was intended to be an insult, because I believe it was unintentional, but nevertheless the description is incorrect. The Metis do not deny their Indian blood; in fact they are proud of it, but at the same time they object very properly to be called Indians. I see no reason why, because some of them happen to have perhaps one-hundred and twenty-eighth part of Indian blood in their veins, they should be described as Indians, which to a certain extent would brand them in the public mind as belonging to an uncivilized portion of the community. I protest against the half-breeds of Manitoba—more properly called the Metis—whether French, Scotch, Irish, or any other nationality, being described in the census returns as Indians. Now that attention has been called to this mistake, I trust it will be

corrected at once, and that another bulletin will be issued properly describing the Metis. In the name of the Metis, I protest against that mistake in the census, and I believe my hon. friends from the west will join me in that protest.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I understand there is no motion before the Chair, Mr. Speaker, but I propose to put myself in order by moving—

The PRIME MINISTER. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) not to move the adjournment of the House now. The hon. gentleman can make his remarks when the House is moved into Committee of Ways and Means.

SPRAGUE'S FALLS MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Mr. Emmerson.

On section 10,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any provincial legislation in New Brunswick upon this subject? In the province of Nova Scotia there are provincial enactments governing the rights of persons to secure their logs upon rivers and to drive their logs down the streams. In incorporating a company of this kind, I think we should be careful to have regard to provincial legislation of a general character which might control the operations of the company, and not insert any provision which would be inconsistent with such legislation.

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). That subject was considered by the subcommittee which had charge of this Bill. These are international waters which are referred to in the Bill. In the province of New Brunswick we have of course enactments governing the rights of lumbermen who use inland waters.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see that the Bill restricts the operations of the company to international waters. The powers given to the company may be exercised on waters under the direct control of the provincial legislature of New Brunswick. Section 10 purports to deal with the mode in which persons having property that comes within the booms of the company shall retain their property. We should be careful not to frame the Bill in such a way that the company would assume the position of being beyond the control of provincial enactments with regard to that particular subject. I would like to hear from my hon. friend the Minister of Justice on this matter. Does he not think that provincial legislation with regard to a matter of this kind should be left severely alone?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon Charles Fitzpatrick). If my hon. friend will read section 10, he will see that it does not interfere with provincial legislation at all. It says:

> The company shall not take or hold within its booms any prize or unmarked logs. Any person interested may go upon the property of the company at any reasonable time and in any reasonable manner, search for such prize or unmarked logs, but the company shall have its proper proportion of the proceeds therefrom.

I apprehend that the draftsman must have had in view the idea that the provincial legislature would determine what the proper proportion is, because the words are so vague that they do not mean anything unless the provincial legislation is borne in mind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it not be well to insert a clause to make the matter plain. For instance, the provincial legislature may have fixed limits of time or may prescribe what is a reasonable manner for going on the property of the company to search for logs. If so, I think the company should be confined to those regulations. Would my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill have any objection to insert words to make that clear?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We might go through the other provisions of the Bill, and then have the committee rise and report progress for the purpose of having that question looked into.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Very well.

On section 12,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not exactly understand why those words should be embodied in the Bill. If a line of poles is to be erected on the company's own property, these words are not required. If they are to be erected on the public highway, the consent of the municipality should be obtained. If on the property of others, the company should pay any damages caused.

Mr. EMMERSON. The parties interested went before the committee, where the whole matter was fully discussed. Then it was referred to a special sub-committee and all agreed upon these provisions.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). This is a question which is exciting a good deal of attention, namely, the right of telegraph and telephone companies to put up their poles and wires on streets and highways, regardless of the rights which municipalities were heretofore supposed to possess. The easiest way to secure to the municipalities those rights would be to include in the Bill a provision making the putting up of poles and lines subject to the approval of the municipal corporation interested and under its direction.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. A great deal of misapprehension exists with respect to the rights of municipalities over telephone and telegraph companies. Chapter 37 of 62-63 Victoria makes it absolutely impossible for these companies to enter streets or highways or public parks under control of municipalities without the consent of these municipalities.

Mr. SPROULE. And the work must be done under their direction.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it then that this Bell Telephone Company is asserting in the courts its right to erect its poles and lines without the consent of the municipalities ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Bell Telephone Company was incorporated previous to this enactment, and they say it does not apply to them.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it does not matter whether we put the clause suggested or not, the municipalities still have control and can exercise it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Certainly. I am not prepared to say that the Bell Telephone Company does not come within the provisions of the statute I have just referred to, but I am not expressing any opinion on that point.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis). This Bill was referred to a sub-committee and a clause was there incorporated in it which removes the objection of the leader of the opposition. That is section 9, which has not yet been read, and which is the model clause adopted in the Bill incorporating the St. Lawrence Power Company last year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand from the promoter of the Bill that this clause, which gave the company the power of expropriating mill sites at certain places, has been eliminated ?

Mr. WADE. Yes, it has. The company is given the power to expropriate land for its tramway and on which to erect its mills and dams, but these it has to expropriate under the provisions of the Railway Act. It is the same as the model clause adopted last session with regard to the St. Lawrence Power Company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there a general clause at the end giving us jurisdiction if we have it not ?

Mr. WADE. No, there was some doubt as to whether this parliament has jurisdiction to pass this legislation, and the promoters decided that they would go to the provincial legislature.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think clause 13 might remove the objection, but would suggest that clause 12 stand until clause 13 is discussed.

Clause 12 allowed to stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The original clause 13 is struck out and the following substituted :

The company, for the purpose of constructing and maintaining its works, may, with the consent of the municipal council or other authority having jurisdiction over the same, enter on any highway, square or any other public place, and as often as the company thinks proper, may, with the like consent, break up and open any highway or public place, subject however to the following provisions :

(a.) The company shall not interfere with the public right of travel, or in any way obstruct the entrance to any door or gateway, or free access to any building ;

(b.) The company shall not permit any wire to be less than twenty-two feet above such highway or public place ;

(c.) All poles shall be as nearly as possible straight and perpendicular, and shall, in cities, be painted, if so required by any by-law of the council ;

(d.) The company shall not be entitled to damages on account of its poles or wires being cut by direction of the officer in charge of the fire brigade at any fire if, in the opinion of such officer, it is advisable that such poles or wires be cut ;

(e.) The company shall not cut down or mutilate any shade, fruit or ornamental tree without the approval of the corporation of the municipality in which it is situate, and then only so far as it may be necessary ;

(f.) The opening up of streets for the erection of poles, or for carrying wires under ground, shall be subject to the direction and approval of such person as the municipal council directs ; the council may also designate the places where such poles shall be erected ; and such street, square or other public place shall, without any unnecessary delay, be restored, as far as possible, to its former condition by and at the expense of the company ;

(g.) Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to authorize the company to enter upon any private property for the purpose of erecting, maintaining or repairing any of its works, without the previous assent of the owner or occupant of the property for the time being ;

(h.) If, for the purpose of removing buildings, or in the exercise of the public right of travel, it is necessary that the said wires or poles be temporarily removed, by cutting or otherwise, the company shall, at its own expense, upon reasonable notice in writing from any person requiring it, remove such wires and poles, and in default of the company so doing, such person may remove such wires and poles at the expense of the company. The said notice may be given either at any office of the company, or to any agent or officer of the company in the municipality wherein are the wires or poles required to be removed, or, in the case of a municipality wherein there is no such agent or officer, then, either at the head office, or to any agent or officer of the company in the nearest or any adjoining municipality to that in which such wires or poles are ;

(i.) The company shall be responsible for all damage which it causes to ornamental, shade,

or fruit trees, and otherwise for all unnecessary damages it causes in carrying out or maintaining any of its said works.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to know if the Minister of Justice has considered whether this should or should not be a provincial Bill. There is nothing in the Bill, as I understand it, that would lead one to suppose that it was other than a provincial corporation. Its operations seem to be confined to one province, and it does not seem to propose to branch out into agencies. On what ground does the company seek to establish incorporation here ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The justification for the introduction of the Bill here is found in the fact that the St. Croix river on which the company's operations are to be carried on, and in connection with which alterations are to be made, is an international river, dividing Canada from the United States.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Still, I would suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice that the company is being granted power extending far beyond the St. Croix river. Its business might be carried on elsewhere than on this river. It seems to me, without having given the subject very much consideration, that the proper way to deal with a scheme of this kind would be for the company to secure a provincial charter giving it the powers that are covered by this Bill, and then, if it should become necessary, on account of the enterprise of the company extending to the St. Croix river, to secure a very brief Act from this parliament giving any necessary powers which only this parliament could give. But, so far as nine-tenths of the matters covered by this Bill are concerned, the provincial legislature is the body that should regulate the future business of this company, I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that he should take this matter into consideration and have some general practice established as to matters of that kind. It occurs to me at the moment that the plan I propose is the more logical plan of the two. Pursuing the course that is asked for here, you have this parliament invading the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature simply for the reason that some portion of the company's works may touch a subject which is peculiarly within the jurisdiction of this parliament.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may say that the whole question arose two or three years ago in connection with the Tobique Manufacturing Company. The government of New Brunswick, protested officially against the granting of such powers by this parliament. The Bill is in this position, that the promoters, when the suggestion was made, said that it was their intention to apply at once to the provincial legislature, and that they would have two charters.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Mr. WADE. They are anxious to get to work early in the spring, and they felt that if they waited till they got a charter from the New Brunswick legislature they might be delayed. It does not make much difference whether they get here first or there.

Progress reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 59) respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. McCormick.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Cosmos Cotton Company.—Mr. Flint.

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Maxwell.

QUESTIONS.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH THE MAGDALEN ISLANDS.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. How many trips were made by the steamship 'Amelia' to the Magdalen Islands in the season of 1901 ?

2. What is the tonnage and carrying capacity of said steamship with regard to freight and passenger accommodation ?

3. Have any improvements been made to her in the winter of 1900 ?

4. If so, what is the nature of such ameliorations or improvements ?

5. Is it the intention of the government to give the people of the Magdalen Islands a more frequent service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) :

1. The steamer 'Amelia' made thirty-five trips to Magdalen islands and return during the season of 1901.

2. The tonnage is 356 gross and 103 net ; cargo capacity, 15,000 cubic feet or equal to about 2,000 barrels ; holds certificate for 250 passengers ; sleeping berth for 20 passengers in saloon and same number in forecabin.

3. and 4. The further additions made to the steamer last year for passenger accommodation were three private cabins in the saloon amidship, fitted with two berths each, also there was rearranged a large cabin aft which was used for officers' quarters with sleeping berths for 10—both saloons steam heated, electric lighted and connected with electric bells. It is claimed that the accommodations have been more than adequate for the number of passengers carried. The berths were not all occupied on any trip last season.

5. It is not at present in contemplation to do so.

MAIL CARRIAGE—ANTEN MILLS AND HENDRIE.

Mr. BENNETT,—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Who is contractor for carrying of mails between Anten Mills and Hendrie, County of Simcoe ?

2. What is paid to contractor per annum for such service ?

3. (a.) When was contract let ? (b.) How many tenders were received ? (c.) Was the lowest tender accepted ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). Tenders for this service were invited. Two were received, one tender being for $24.96 and another, that of Mr. James McLaughlin at $29. The inspector reported the tenderer at $24.96 to be incompetent to perform the service, and accordingly the contract has been awarded to Mr. James McLaughlin, who is also postmaster at Anten Mills, at $29. The inspector has been instructed to complete the contract with Mr. McLaughlin, and the necessary contract for this purpose has been sent for execution, but the department has not been advised whether it has been executed.

INDIAN TREATY NUMBER THREE.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

1. What is the approximate amount of the claim of the Dominion against the province of Ontario, under the Indian Treaty number three (referred to in the report of the Deputy Minister of Finance for 1900, up to the 31st December, 1901 ?

2. At what dates were the claim of the Dominion and the answer of the province filed with the arbitrators ?

3. Are any steps being taken to have the matter determined ?

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

1. No claim has been filed by the Dominion made up to the date named in the honourable gentleman's question. The approximate amount of the claim of the Dominion against the province is $322,000, which, with interest up to the time of the filing of the claim by the Dominion, made then an approximate claim of $475,000.

2. Claim of the Dominion filed 18th October, 1893 ; answer of the province of Ontario filed 6th November, 1895.

3. The claim was brought before the arbitrators by the Dominion and postponed at the request of the Ontario government. Subsequently a date for hearing was fixed, but owing to the illness of one of the arbitrators the case was not proceeded with. An application will shortly be made for a further hearing.

MANITOBA LIQUOR ACT.

Mr. McCREARY asked :

Has the Manitoba branch of the Dominion Alliance, or any one acting for them or on their behalf, in the city of Winnipeg or the Province of Manitoba, remitted to the government any brief, letter or statement dealing with the unconstitutionality of the Referendum about to be taken on the Manitoba Liquor Act ? If so, what reply has been sent, or what action does the government intend taking in the matter ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Yes, copy of the petition for disallowance has, following the usual practice, been transferred to the government of Manitoba for their observations. The statute itself has not yet been transmitted to this government. When it is received, and the reply of the Manitoba government, the matter will be considered in the usual way.

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. FLINT asked :

What counties, districts or municipalities in Canada are at present under the operation of the Canada Temperance Act.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Canada Temperance Act is in force in the following electoral districts :—

Nova Scotia.	N. Brunswick	P.E. Island.	Manitoba.
Annapolis.	Albert.	King's.	Lisgar.
Cape Breton.	Carleton.	Queen's.	Marquette.
Cumberl'nd.	Charlotte.	Prince.	
Digby.	Fredericton.		
Guysboro'.	King's.		
Hants.	North'berl'd.		
Inverness.	Queen's.		
King's.	Sunbury.		
Pictou.	Westmorel'd.		
Queen's.	York.		
Shelburne.			
Yarmouth.			

IMPORTATION OF FLAX SEED.

Mr. McGOWAN—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What is the amount of flax seed, in bushels, imported into Canada from the United States since the 30th June last ?

2. What are the ports in Canada, and the quantities at each port at which it was entered?

3. What is the value of such flax seed at each port, respectively ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The quantity and value of

flax seed imported into each port in Canada, from the United States, from July 1, to March 1, 1902, were as follows :—

Port.	Quantity.	Value.
	Bush.	$
Amherstburg, Ont..	9	12
Calgary..	4	6
Goderich..	43,000	62,794
Guelph..	48,094	64,566
Halifax..	62	123
London..	549	888
Montreal..	558,332	1,227,575
St. John, N.B..	33	68
Stratford..	125,700	196,196
Vancouver..	2	5
Victoria..	571	1,080
Windsor, Ont..	63	103
Total.....	776,419	1,553,416

WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. What is the minimum depth of water on the mitre sills of the entrance locks of the Welland Canal at Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie that will be available for navigation this season ?

2. What is the number of cubic feet of water per second (or minute) granted up to the present date from the Welland Canal by lease, Order in Council, or otherwise, to the Hamilton Cataract Power Company ?

3. What is the quantity of water allowed to pass per second (or minute) from the Welland Canal into the hydraulic race of the said company ?

4. What is the quantity of water passing at present per second (or minute) northward through the guard lock of the old Welland Canal at Thorold ?

5. Why has not the Order in Council been passed granting to the corporation of St. Catharines for power purposes six thousand cubic feet of water per minute from the old Welland Canal, as petitioned for by the said corporation and Board of Trade of the said city of St. Catharines, and referred to by the Prime Minister on 18th February, 1901, as reported in 'Hansard' on page 109 of that year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. At Port Colborne, fourteen feet on the mitre sill ; at Port Dalhousie, fourteen feet on the mitre sill.

2. One hundred cubic feet per second.

3. One hundred cubic feet per second.

4. Five hundred and seventy-five cubic feet per second.

5. I have observed that the fifth answer has not been put in my hand and I will furnish it on Wednesday.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—FERRY BETWEEN MULGRAVE AND POINT TUPPER.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. What has been the cost of the improved ferry service of the Intercolonial Railway between Mulgrave and Point Tupper to date, including the cost of the new ferry boat, and of the improvements at these in connection with the ferry service ?

2. When was the ferry boat for this service delivered by the contractors at Mulgrave ?

3. Has this boat been tested, and is she of sufficient strength to confront the ice conditions in winter, referred to by the Minister of Railways in his speech in this House ?

4. How many trains or how many cars have been transferred by this boat to date ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. $419,382.48.

2. 28th September, 1901.

3. This boat has been tested and is of sufficient strength to confront the ice conditions in winter at the Strait of Canso.

4. No trains have been transferred because the bridges connecting the boat with the land are not yet ready.

COMMISSION ON WEIGHING OF BUTTER AND CHEESE.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin) asked :

When will the report of the commission on the weighing of butter and cheese be laid on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). The investigation is not yet completed. The commissioner's time has been occupied with other matters since the meeting of parliament. He has not had the opportunity of finishing up, but hopes to do so within a few days. The report will be forthcoming as soon as possible.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY—AGREEMENT WITH SIGNOR MARCONI.

Mr. MACKINNON—by Mr. Johnston (Cape Breton)—asked :

In the agreement between the government and Signor Marconi re wireless telegraphy, is there any provision respecting the extension of that system to Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). There is no special provision in the agreement with respect to Prince Edward Island, but the main purpose of the agreement was to secure, in the event of the enterprise proving successful, cheap telegraph rates from shore to shore across the Atlantic. There is a provision, however, for the use of the Marconi system for the lighthouse service of Canada and other government works, and that will apply to Prince Edward Island as well as to other parts of the Dominion. The agreement as it has been signed, will be laid before the House.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—CANADIAN CONTINGENTS.

Mr. KEMP asked :

1. Did the government arm, equip and transport by land and sea, at its own expense, the

various contingents of troops which were despatched to the seat of war in South Africa, to assist in subduing the enemies of the King ?

2. If not, what are the different conditions respecting arming, equipping and transporting the several contingents ?

3. If the government did not, at its own expense, arm, equip and transport any one or more of the contingents, what was the reason for such action ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. The government did arm, equip and transport, by land and sea at its own expense, the two contingents of troops which were despatched to the seat of war in South Africa, from Canada, in 1899 and 1900.

2. The arming, equipping and transporting of all corps were carried out at the expense of the Imperial authorities, as proposed by them.

3. The reason is that the government deemed it in the public interest to act as they did, and if the hon. member is not satisfied with that course, it is open to him to affirm by motion, the policy which, in his opinion, ought to have been adopted.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is not necessary to go very fully into the discussion of the budget after we have had a week of very full and careful discussion of that subject in which views have been presented of the most divergent character, so that, I presume, almost every opinion that can be readily advanced on the subject has already been laid before the House. There are, however, reasons why we should pay a great deal of attention to the matter of treating with proper interest the important occasion recurring annually in our affairs when we have our national balance sheet laid before us, and to a certain extent, having the confidence of the government, have some opportunity of learning in what directions, if any, the government propose to make a change of policy during the coming year. I am delighted to be in a position on this occasion to congratulate the government and the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on the fact that he has again an opportunity of bringing into the House and placing before the country a statement in which is evidenced the fact that Canada is prosperous in a very high degree indeed. The surpluses with which the hon. gentleman has been favoured since he had the honour of occupying the position of Finance Minister of Canada, have been almost annually recurring and I dare say, that, to him, they are becoming an old story. However, it is not well that either the government, or the House, or the country, should acquire the idea, or hold the opinion, that such a state of affairs as has existed in Canada since 1898 is going to continue for ever. We have unquestionably had a series of most fortunate and prosperous years, and in the year which has passed we have had the magnificent surplus of $5,648,000, which places the government of the day in such a position that they should not be short of money. Their revenue exceeds $50,000,000, reaching $52,514,000, but, I find that although they have this enormous sum of money placed in their hands by the contributions of the people of Canada, they have still found it necessary to incur a very large expenditure on capital account and in respect to this matter, I think the government are fairly open to criticism, because, I think that many items have, in the course of the past year, been charged to capital, which should, properly speaking, have been charged to consolidated revenue account, and if that course had been pursued, if all the items which could be fairly proven to be chargeable to consolidated fund account had been charged to that account, the hon. Minister of Finance would not have had nearly so large a surplus as he has. The expenditure has been very large, on consolidated fund account nearly $49,000,000, and on capital account, about $11,000,000, showing either that the demands upon the government from their supporters are enormously large, or that the government are in an exceedingly pliant humour and are endeavouring to make all their friends share in the good times which are at present prevailing throughout Canada. It is rather an extraordiary thing in the face of such a showing as we have had this year—a rather unexpected showing I believe, because I do not think the hon. Minister of Finance anticipated quite so great a success in the matter of money—to see after all the debt of Canada has increased to $268,000,000 and that during the past year it has been increased to the amount of nearly $3,000,000. It is very evident that the system under which the hon. gentleman has conducted the affairs of Canada during the past year is one in which he is going to continue for at least a year to come, for he tells us and the country that while he estimates the revenue in the year now very nearly coming to a close at $56,800,000, or, $4,300,000 more than his very great good fortune gave him this year, he expects to have an expenditure of not $49,000,000 but of $51,000,000. On capital account, the expenditure which certainly stood at an enormously high point last year when it was about $11,000,000, is to be increased to $14,250,000. Therefore, the total expenditure of Canada in

the coming year will be $62,250,000, and the debt of Canada, in such marvellously good times as we are enjoying, will be increased by $6,000,000. That is a very extraordinary showing, because at the present time we are not having any very remarkably large expenditures. There is no Intercolonial Railway to be built; there is no Canadian Pacific Railway being paid for; there is no great work in connection with the canal development of Canada; there is nothing that will occur to the ordinary citizen of the country, to account for the fact that in the face of such enormous revenues as Canada has enjoyed for the last two years, it should be necessary to increase the debt in Canada in these two years by $8,986,196. Of course, the Minister of Finance has very much better opportunities to know what is likely coming, than has an ordinary member of parliament and more particularly one who sits in the cold shades of opposition and does not receive his information so readily or perhaps so correctly as do the members supporting the government; but it does strike me that the government has shown an alacrity, a readiness, a cheerfulness in going forward with its policy of tremendous expenditure which will require more careful consideration.

There are indications that Canada has reached the highest point in this period of prosperity in which we have been living for some years past. The total trade of Canada is a very good indication of the state of affairs in the country. The total trade of Canada has for the last three or four years increased by enormous sums annually, but in the last year a different showing occurred and the total trade of this country increased by only about $5,000,000—a very significant fact which would seem to show that the great swelling tide of business which has been sending our figures up in such an extraordinary fashion has to a certain extent reached its full, and that we may expect—in view of the experiences of the past which have never failed to be uniform—we may expect that in a very short time the tide will be ebbing, and the shrinkage in our figures may perhaps be quite as rapid as was the increase. I, of course, Mr. Speaker, do not anticipate that we are going back to the lowest figures of former days; that has not been the history of the business of Canada. Although it has had periods of inflation and periods of depression, still, during the periods of depression there has been a steady upward progress—Canada was prospering, was adding to its population, was adding to its wealth, was developing its industries and was constantly increasing its volume of business. That increase we may expect to continue to some extent; but that we shall have such revenues and such trade as we have had for the past two years is too much to hope.

Now, what has probably created the extraordinary good times on which I felicitate the Laurier administration—if the premier will pardon me for introducing his name—and which good times have so far pursued the existence of this government? I think there can be no question at all that the fact which is revealed to us; the one significant fact which to my mind accounts for all that we have seen; is the fact that the production of the country has enormously increased; that its exports in consequence have reached a point they never reached before and may possibly not attain to again for some time. In reference to this matter of exports, the figures are even more significant than they are when you look at the aggregate trade of the country. We find that while the exports of Canada grew from 1899 to 1900 by $33,000,000; that between 1900 and 1901 they increased by only about $4,500,000. It seems to me there can be no question whatever that the fact that we have had these enormous exports, (showing what is generally spoken of as the balance of trade enormously in our favour); has accounted for Canada being in a position to buy so enormously as she has done from abroad, and has accounted for the people of this country being able to pour into the coffers of the Dominion treasury this enormous amount of money which they have paid in excise and in customs taxation to the credit of the present government.

The whole history of the trade of Canada shows that while Canada has always been a steadily growing and prosperous country, yet the balance of trade has stood against her during all the years since confederation, somewhere about $13,000,000 per year. That is to say, that Canada did and could purchase from abroad and pay with her resources some $13,000,000 more than the value of the exports which she sent out of the country. And while the balance of trade is now so enormously in her favour, it must be that we have accumulated, and will have to draw upon in some of the years in the immediate future, a great credit out of which the imports of the country can be maintained for some considerable time. But the fact that we see that that great source of national strength and prosperity, that enormous volume of production and enormous volume of exports is diminishing, should, I think, be sufficient warrant for the government of the day to look carefully to the future and to consider the ways and means, so that they may not be caught by a sudden depression, as we know depressions very frequently come in the most sudden fashion.

I suppose that this House is not anxious to hear many more figures, and for my part I do not intend to quote very many more. Figures may be produced, as from Holy Writ arguments may be produced, to support any cause. From one side of the House and from the other you will hear

arguments based upon figures which seem to sustain most contradictory contentions. The question as to whether or not Canada is being economically governed and governed in the interest of her people, has been endeavoured to be answered by pointing to the great prosperity of the time on the one hand; while the argument of those who believe that Canada might possibly be better governed if she had a Conservative administration in power, has been sustained largely by pointing out that the burdens which are imposed on the country at this time are very heavy; that the debt of the country is climbing upward steadily; that the expenditure of the country is very large. After all, perhaps the truest way of estimating what is the position of the country and what is the position of the individual citizen of the country upon whose shoulders rest the burden of government, is to consider what it costs him. What does the government take from that citizen every year in the shape of taxation? It is perfectly proper to argue—as our friend the Minister of Finance and our friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce did the other day—that there are certain expenditures of the government, on railways, on postal service, on the Yukon, which are recouped; that you pay out a certain sum of money and for services rendered to the country you receive a certain amount of money in return.

But there is one portion of the revenue of the government which is not given in return for any services rendered by it except of course the service of maintaining the government of the country. Now, the figures of the Year-book, supplemented for last year by the figures given by the Minister of Finance, show that although Canada may perhaps, in this period of great prosperity, be able to bear heavy taxation, without feeling the load very much or showing any distress, yet there can be no question that the taxation of the people under the present administration is steadily mounting upwards. Since 1896 the taxation of the people of Canada per head has been as follows:—

Year	Customs	Excise.	Total.
1896..	$3 87	$1 55	$5 42
1897..	3 76	1 77	5 53
1898..	4 14	1 50	5 64
1899..	4 77	1 81	6 58
1900..	5 28	1 83	7 11

And in 1901, taking the figures given by the Minister of Finance in the budget speech, and dividing them by the population as given by the latest census returns, the total taxation—I have not separated customs and excise in this case—amounts to $7.21 per head. That means an increase of 33⅓ per cent in the per capita taxation of the people of this country over that of 1896.

I do not mean for a moment to say that the country cannot bear this taxation. The country unquestionably is bearing it. But I think it might not perhaps be amiss once more—although to the government this may be an oft-told and not very welcome tale—to recall to the House and the country the fact that the hon. gentlemen now administering the affairs of Canada, under whose control the expenditure and the taxation have advanced to the figures I have quoted, are of the same party who in opposition denounced taxation and condemned every increase of the debt, and maintained that if they were returned to power they would reduce the expenditure of Canada by two, three, four or five millions of dollars per year. I do not know that the government would have acted very wisely if they had endeavoured to carry out this prediction when they came to power. Unquestionably this matter received consideration at their first council meeting, and renewed consideration at subsequent council meetings; and there can be no doubt that the collective wisdom which has ruled Canada since 1896 decided emphatically that it would not be in the best interests of the government itself, whatever might be the case with the people of Canada, to endeavour to carry out that programme which they sought to force on the Conservative administration which preceded them. On the contrary, they have entered upon a course of very rapidly increasing expenditure. There are some directions in which perhaps this increased expenditure might be justified. The country requires public works and development; let us admit that; and when is it to get these public works and this development if not at a time when the revenue is buoyant? But the fact cannot be lost sight of that the controllable, the routine expenditure of the country in every department shows an increase which is utterly unjustifiable. In those matters in respect to which a close economy would make itself felt, it is only too apparent that no economy whatever is being exercised by the government of the day.

A great many of the matters which have been touched upon in the budget speech and in the various replies to it are of a more or less routine character. There are a great many other matters which have not been touched upon in the budget speech this year which I would have liked very much to have heard something about from the administration. One great and important question which is attracting a great deal of attention in this House and throughout Canada, on which the government has not made any statement or given any information is the tariff question. But there are other matters engaging the attention of the country on which I had hoped something would have been said in the budget speech. There are the enormous and important interests which could be developed by a closer trade and perhaps closer political connection betwen the Dominion of Canada and the West Indian Islands. To my mind confederation will never be rounded or complete until that day comes when all the British possessions

on the North American continent and the islands adjacent thereto shall come under one government. Then, the question of bringing Newfoundland into the confederation is one than which I am sure nothing could be more important. But we have no mention of either of these very important matters in the budget speech. It may be that some effort is being made to develop the trade of this country with Newfoundland, and to bring that portion of the British empire, which must remain under the control of a friendly power, within our political limits. If so, there is no mention of it in the budget speech. For those who are aware of the uncomfortable and deplorable situation in which Canada finds itself with regard to the Alaskan frontier, it is easy to realize what the awful consequences would be if the control of Newfoundland, lying at the mouth of the St. Lawrence and holding the keys to Canada, should pass into the hands of a power not friendly to ourselves. It may possibly be a very difficult matter to secure the admission of Newfoundland into the confederation ; but it is a matter of such great importance that to my mind all succeeding administrations in Canada should devote to that object a large part of their attention, and should never rest without using every available means to bring it about. Then, how complete would the inclusion of the West Indies make us as a people. We have everything which a northern people might desire—enormous resources of the mine, extensive forests, great wheat fields; we can produce every product of the temperate zone in abundance ; but there are products which we cannot produce, but which the West India islands could supply us with in abundance. We would be as completely self-supporting as the United States, with all the advantages it has in possessing the southern states. The only reference in the budget speech that might indirectly be supposed to affect the question of policy regarding the West India islands is the reference to the question of a bounty on beet root sugar. The Finance Minister did not commit himself at all to any such scheme and I think in this he did well. To my mind it is far more important to devote our energies to affording the West India islands relief by accepting from them, free of duty if necessary, their sugar or by such reciprocal arrangements as would leave to them the profit of producing the sugar required in the Dominion and encourage them to look towards this country for a political alliance.

However, the great question of interest in the budget speech was the trade question. There was no doubt a great deal of anxiety in the country to know whether the government would make any changes in the tariff: And until the hon. Finance Minister finally informed the House that there would be no tariff changes this year, considerable uncertainty as to whether the government was going to change its attitude on the tariff question or not. A review of our history will satisfy any reasonable man that the tariff question has been, and is likely to continue for some time, the great question at issue in this country. If I have not read history amiss, the various changes of government which have occurred in Canada since confederation have largely turned on the tariff policy of the government. The first defeat of a Canadian administration, since confederation, occurred in 1872, over the policy of the government of Sir John Macdonald in building the Canadian Pacific Railway. But it must be borne in mind that at that time political parties in Canada had not settled down into the well-defined position in which we find them to-day. The first government after confederation was a coalition one, and many of the men who supported Sir John Macdonald and his Conservative administration were not Conservatives by tradition, history and party feeling, but men who had been dislodged from their fixed places by the coalition necessary to bring about confederation. With such supporters, the administration of Sir John Macdonald was not so strong as it would have been, if he had been supported by a phalanx of men who had been associated with him on party lines, and the cause of his defeat undoubtedly was the very large defections which took place from the ranks of his supporters—a defection for which no parallel can be found in the history of Canada, either in the central parliament or any of the provincial legislatures. This defeat of the Conservative chieftain restored the two parties to their old positions and arrayed them fairly against each other. What was the issue which then divided the two parties and on which the fate of each was decided ? The information given us the other night by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) goes to show that at the time there was a certain openness to conviction in the minds of both Liberals and Conservatives on the question of the tariff. Generally speaking, in the ranks of Mr. Mackenzie's supporters were men who would have welcomed a change in the direction of protection, and among whom considerable dissatisfaction was created when the Finance Minister announced that no tariff changes would be made. The Mackenzie government was made up almost exclusively, as far as its leading members are concerned, of men who had been actively engaged in the political contests in the upper provinces of Canada, such as the hon. member for South Oxford (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), the Hon. Edward Blake, Mr. Mackenzie, aided by that great power outside the House, Mr. Brown, who largely directed the Liberal party of that day. These gentlemen had been accustomed in the upper provinces to a certain degree of protection. They had been accustomed to a 20 per cent tariff, whereas from the lower provinces there was a band

of free traders, to whom the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) attributed that change of purpose which led Mr. Mackenzie to nail his free trade flag to the mast. In the lower provinces practically free trade prevailed. My native province of Nova Scotia knew only a 10 per cent tariff, and never, until the construction of railways was deemed necessary in that province, was such a thing as the raising of the tariff looked upon except with the greatest disfavour. We were an agricultural, fishing and mining people. We had no manufactures and were not aware that we needed any, and certainly the idea of protection might well have been expected to find a place much more readily in the minds of that array of men of ability who formed the Mackenzie cabinet, and who came from the upper provinces, than among the men who came from the lower provinces, and who composed, to a large extent, the opposition led by Sir John Macdonald at that time. The government of Mr. Mackenzie decided, in view of this free trade sentiment in the lower provinces, to stand by its so-called free trade policy. It had advanced the duties from 15 per cent to 16⅔ per cent and then to 17½ per cent, finding that the lower rate was not sufficient to furnish the revenues required for carrying on the business of the country. But that was not at all a position acceptable to the men who held that the time had come when protection was required. The tariff then in existence was held out to the country as a revenue tariff, which probably it was. It gave no encouragement to the manufacturers, and the result was that the Mackenzie government, instead of being sustained by a majority of sixty, found itself in opposition with a majority of sixty against it. The Canadian people evidently decided most positively that, in their opinion, a certain measure of protection was necessary.

Now, from 1878, when the government of Mr. Mackenzie was defeated, until 1896, when the government of Sir Charles Tupper was defeated, there was a constant keeping of that trade question to the front. Those who spoke on behalf of the Liberal party may have varied their statements, but throughout that time they constantly maintained that they were in favour of free trade. In consequence of the fact that they seemed to think they could gain advantage for their party, and, perhaps press their opponents somewhat closely by exaggerating the importance of the trade which might be done between Canada and the United States, in consequence of the extraordinary stress which they laid upon the feature of the matter, in consequence of the fact that they pressed home the view that the trade of the United States was worth a great deal more to Canada than the trade of the mother country or any other part of the world, it came about that they were led on step by step, until finally their programme was not free trade alone, but it was a policy which would give to us trade with the other part of this continent, trade that, while giving us access to the markets of the United States, would practically make us one people with the people of the United States. And that was so far pressed by these gentlemen that, in 1891, Edward Blake, who had been their leader, withdrew from them, on the ground that such a policy as was advocated and pressed upon the people of Canada by these gentlemen, if adopted, could not fail to be the precursor of political union. Now, why did these hon. gentlemen attach such enormous importance to the trade that this country might do with the United States as compared with that it might do with Great Britain or any other country under the sun? It seems to me, in the light of events as we now know them, that they were endeavouring to gain a certain advantage in the struggle they were carrying on against Sir John Macdonald. But, knowing, as they probably did then, and as they certainly do now, that any kind of fair trade arrangement with the United States was impossible of accomplishment, that no trade arrangement could be affected with that country without our surrendering our commercial and even our political liberties, they felt that Sir John Macdonald never could make an arrangement with the United States that would be acceptable to the people of Canada. Therefore, they insisted and charged home upon the government of that day that it was their fault that they did not succeed in effecting a reciprocity treaty. They attributed this failure not to the unwillingness of the American people and government but to the maladroitness of the Conservative administration because it asserted Canadian commercial independence and spoke in no submissive terms through representatives it sent to Washington. It was stated by these gentlemen that, when they came into power and sent men to Washington who would show the legislators and statesmen of the United States that there were men in Canada who were friends of that country, the United States would be ready to effect a trade arrangement that would be desirable for Canada. That is my surmise as to why the gentlemen who are now in power, and who were then in opposition laid enormous stress upon the importance and the absolute necessity of securing some reciprocal arrangement with the people of the United States. That is why they were willing—so far as man could judge—to place the fiscal affairs of Canada absolutely in the hands of the people of the United States. Because, as was well observed by Mr. Blake, there could be no question what the result would be when the representatives of Canada and the representatives of the United States sat down to frame a tariff for the two countries—it would be an American tariff and a tariff

favourable to the United States, a tariff which would give the United States the trade of Canada, while excluding the trade of the mother country. Now the time has come—and passed, I may say—when this administration has had an opportunity of showing whether or not it was right in its estimate of American public men, and whether or not those gentlemen would be ready, if approached in what the government held to be a proper spirit, to accept the overtures of Canada and give us a fair measure of trade. We know that the government sent its ablest men, including the leader of the government himself, to Washington. And these hon. gentlemen have come here and confessed absolute, complete and unqualified failure in respect of that matter, and have said, that so far as they were concerned there was no occasion to resume the sittings of that joint commission, that they expected nothing further from it and, in fact, did not desire to resume negotiations at all. Thus we have come to the point where the leader of the government, having failed to do that which he insisted the government of Sir John Macdonald could do, and being shut out from the market which he and his lieutenants for eighteen years proclaimed was the one thing necessary for Canada, now the hour has arrived when we have a right to ask of that right hon. gentleman if, being unable to secure that arrangement of the United States which he maintained he could effect, what is he going to do about the situation of affairs in this country and between this country and the United States? That state of affairs has been described on two occasions in the course of this session, as carefully and truly, and, possibly with as much completeness as could be expected of a gentleman who sat on that high commission, a gentleman who is an American by birth and whose business interests have led him to become familiar not only with the business situation in Canada, but with the business situation in the United States. And that hon. gentleman tells us that the situation to-day is intolerable for Canada. Therefore, we ask, what is the government going to do about it? We have reached the point when some decision must be come to by those who are in a position to give a decision—the government of Canada. Now, what do we see occurring not only in this House but in the country as well? We see this question which, as I have said, has been one of the great questions from the time Canada became a nation, which has been the maker and unmaker of governments in the past, we see that question pressing to the front. Now, the government of the day has not made any great or fundamental changes in the tariff and—to their great credit be it said—has continued, in the main, the tariff as it was before. As the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said of himself the other day, they have not treated the manufacturers unfairly, and are prepared, when the matter comes up for consideration, to take into account their interests and wants in a friendly way. But, that is not enough. The hour has come when the representatives of Canada in this House are of opinion that a step forward should be taken. The government that rules Canada to-day, it appears, is not a free trade government, and is not prepared to adopt that revenue tariff on which it appealed to the people in 1896. Of the quality and nature of that revenue tariff these gentlemen cannot be in doubt, because they were most explicit in defining it, declaring that they appealed to the people to support a revenue tariff such as they have in England. These gentlemen, it appears, are not prepared to give this country a revenue tariff such as they have in England, a tariff which would admit the manufactures of every country, which would lighten the burdens of the working people as much as possible, will make food cheap, will admit the wheat of every country free, and manufactures and all products of every country free, that will rely for a revenue to carry on the affairs of the country upon a tariff, imposing such duties upon such articles of general consumption as will furnish the government the money to carry on the affairs of the country while as little as possible disturbing any industry and the balance between industries.

I say if the government of Canada to-day is not prepared to live up to the programme with which they went to the people of Canada in 1896, and upon which presumably they secured a verdict, and returned to power, then I say the time has come when it is necessary that we should have such a resolution as that moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and when we should have a declared policy. So far as we on this side of the House are concerned, we are free to say that we desire a policy that shall declare and shall establish such a system of protection as will sustain and protect every industry in Canada to-day, and will, as rapidly as possible, develop within our country such industries as are likely to succeed in it; and that as soon as possible Canada shall, in the matter of manufacturing, supply all her own wants, and shall buy as little as possible from the outside world.

Now a great many speeches have been made in the course of this debate which have touched upon the question of protection, and they have done so in such a fashion as to show that almost without exception members on both sides of this House are protectionists. They are not, some of them, prepared to protect everything, but there is not one man among them who has not declared himself ready to protect every interest in which his constituents are more particularly concerned. Every one of them

is prepared to adopt the principle of protection, if I may except my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards). I do not know that I could except him; if I had an opportunity to know his business interests as well as he knows them, possibly I might find that there was even in his case a nigger in the fence. But be that as it may, there can be no question that the speeches made in this House in the course of this debate have been those that might have been made by men who believed in protection. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) said the other night, and he reiterated his statement, 'I am a protectionist.' It is true he was one of a somewhat peculiar kind, he was of that brand which, I may say, is largely to be found on the other side of the House. He was prepared to protect everything that his constituents wanted protected, but nothing more. He would stand up for protection to labour, for the exclusion of cheap labour from the country. Now that is a very high form, in one sense, of protection. But every man who has spoken on this subject except the hon. member for Russell, is in favour of some kind of protection. Possibly the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), if he had spoken, might have opposed it, I do not know what declaration he would have made. But throughout the whole of this discussion it is perfectly clear that we are all protectionists, as it was many times in a former parliament, when this question came up, and when man after man who was arrayed against the Conservative government and who was nominally a free trader, was himself ready at once to stand up for protection to those interests in which his constituents were particularly interested, as did the late member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), for a most extravagant protection to coal oil, and as did the hon. member for Queens, Sir Louis Davies, who now graces the bench of this country, and who could not for a moment think of withdrawing that protection which was necessary to the pork industry of his native province. Throughout the whole of this discussion it has become clear that we are practically all in favour of protection.

Now then why should not this government take us more fully into their confidence and inform us as to what they are going to do. They did certainly furnish us with one or two good reasons why we should delay a little to press the question at this time. They suggested that in a short time a conference would take place in London where this, and perhaps some other questions, would be discussed at great length, and it would be better that the representative of Canada should go to a certain extent with a free hand. They furthermore suggest that the results of the census might to a certain extent affect the conclusions to which they might come. But on the whole I am pleased indeed to observe that not only the supporters of the government but the members of the government themselves, so far as they have spoken, have not altogether discouraged the idea that they are going to move onward in this matter, and give to Canada a more perfect and more comprehensive system of protection than that we have to-day; although I am prepared to say this as a protectionist, that I am not altogether disposed to find much fault in the gross with the present system, which is very fair in its effects, and it has done a great deal to maintain the interests of this country.

Now the question as to what the government will do upon this matter is one of the very highest importance to us, and it is dealt with by the resolution moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. That resolution voices the fact that to a certain extent the people of Canada, as represented by the opposition in this House at least, are not altogether satisfied with the condition of affairs that we find in Canada to-day. We cannot make the assertion that Canada has no protection. Many industries have adequate protection probably; but there are some industries which have no adequate protection, there are some industries in Canada to-day which languish, there are factories which are closed, and there is no reason why such a state of things should exist. If we are going to have protection at all, then let it be such as is called for in the resolution moved by the leader of the opposition, one which, in the first place, declares protection to be the declared policy of the government, and secondly, that it shall be adequate and sufficient protection. Now in respect to free trade with the United States, it is perfectly clear from the figures given us in the course of this debate by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that we have not sufficient protection. That hon. gentleman makes the statement that no less than $22,000,000 of manufactures are coming into Canada from the United States every year, that pay no duties. If that be the case, then it seems to me that there is a large field in which the government might very well move, within which it might carry out such a system as it has in force in reference to other industries, and might secure and retain for the people of this country the privilege of manufacturing that large amount of goods which are imported.

However, so far as we have gone, I, as a protectionist, I have no great reason to be discouraged by the attitude of the government. The hon. Minister of Finance was of course non-committal, as I presume he should be; but at the same time he rather held out the hope that after certain preliminaries had been completed we should then have a revision of the tariff in which all industries, particularly all industries requiring care or assistance, should receive

that assistance at his hands. Even the Minister of Trade and Commerce who used to fulminate so loudly and so fiercely against protection, was certainly much more moderate and much milder on this occasion than he used to be. His language was not at all threatening, in fact he was apparently so au fait with the system of protection that in a most cavalier fashion he tendered his services to the leader of the opposition, and proffered his assistance, assuring him he would give him two or three lessons on the subject of protection which would enable him to produce any kind of tariff whatever that Canada might want. This is not a cause of surprise, because we have reason to know from the revelations made at one time or another, that unless we are very much mistaken and misinformed, that hon. gentleman did, upon one occasion at least, prepare and complete a protective tariff for the use of the Dominion of Canada. Now, however, while he will not go further than to tender his services to the leader of the opposition in a somewhat jocose fashion, he has not said anything at all that would give the members of the manufacturing fraternity in Canada very great concern. He has spoken to them in a very kindly fashion indeed. He says to them of course you have been very well off, and you cannot deny that. As he has said himself he has, at sometimes, been looked upon as an enemy to the manufacturers of Canada, but, he has not proved to be such a bad enemy after all. He has treated them with a fair amount of kindness, and, reading between the lines, I have every reason to hope and to believe that the government of the day is prepared, in so far as this question is concerned, to adopt a policy which will be in keeping with its conduct since it came into power, and give us a system of adequate protection which it will avow openly to be its policy.

There are one or two points to which I wish to make reference in connection with this question of protection which came up repeatedly in the course of the discussion before the House. It has been repeated that you cannot protect certain interests, that you cannot protect the farmer, the miner, or the fisherman. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) reduced that matter to an absurdity by proposing what he called a very moderate scheme of protection to the farmers which might involve an expenditure of $50,000,000. Those who have taken that line have thought that some power in Canada might have to be given to us to impose a system of protection upon the farmers, the fishermen, the miners and producing bodies. What power can be conceived of in this country that would be in a position to impose its will upon the classes I have just enumerated? There can be no question at all of the fact that power in Canada is in the hands of those very classes. If that power is not entirely in the hands of the farmers, the miners and the fishermen, if they should think, or if they should conceive that their interests, or their welfare, were in danger there can be no question whatever that without the consent of these great classes we could never have any policy of any kind. And you could certainly never have a protective policy in Canada. To make such a statement as that seems to be begging the whole question. If these great producing classes are not to be benefited by protection in the limited form in which we speak of it in this discussion, which means particularly protection to the manufacturers for the purpose of developing the manufacturing industries of the country, if you cannot secure the assent of these great producing classes to the proposition which benefits them by developing the manufacturing interests of the country, thereby adding to the welfare of these great producing classes, if you cannot succeed in doing that, then it would be hopeless and absurd to suggest any policy of protection in any country whatever. But, the view held by every one who is in favour of protection in a proper and limited sense is that while its particular advantages are directed towards the establishment of manufacturers, by the establishment of such manufacturers you add directly to the welfare and revenue of these great producing classes in the country. The system has other advantages as well. You diversify your interests you introduce a great variety of interests, a great variety of employments into the country and you develop a very much more highly organized, progressive and advanced community in that way. That, perhaps, is not a sufficiently practical argument with which to appeal to people who work for their bread, who till the farms, who net our seas, and who mine our minerals. The great argument that has always succeeded in persuading the people to accept protection in the past and it will induce them to accept it in future, if I am not mistaken, is that by developing a manufacturing population in the country they add value to every dollar's worth of the products which they gather from the bountiful hands of nature. How much would be gained by the farmers of the North-west Territories, if, instead of having to send their wheat to the British market, where it competes with wheat grown by the coolie labour of India, they could have that wheat sold in Canada in the form of bread to the men whose wages have risen, as they have in almost every country where manufacturing industries are developed, to the highest possible point? We find that in every country in which manufactures are highly developed that instead of the working classes being depressed or injured, the wage earner is the man who, in the end, has the advantage and that no matter how prices of commodities may

fluctuate in all these countries wages go upwards and upwards steadily and in the end it is the workingman who has the advantage, to whom in all cases is the residuary advantage given. If you can give us a market in Canada as the United States have now furnished, to a great extent, a market in the New England states for a large portion of the wheat produced in the western districts, if you can provide a market in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario, in which the wheat of the North-west Territories would be consumed instead of being exported, can there be any question that you would add many cents a bushel to every bushel of grain that the North-west farmer garners ? There can be no question about it. If you cannot propound such a system of protection in a democratic country like this in which every man has control of his own interests I say it would be futile to suggest such a policy of protection. Instead of the mass of the people being injured by the protective tariff retained in force until 1896, I say that they were benefited by their own act because they maintained it in power. It must be remembered that since 1878, however those other questions and subordinate interests that were presented to the electors might change from time to time, the great and important and over-ruling question in all cases, so far as the government of Sir John Macdonald and his successors was then concerned, was the question of the maintenance of the national policy intact and on that policy upon which he in successive years appealed to the people, in every successive election, until his death, he was sustained by the voice of the people, not by the votes of the cities, at all, but by the support of the agricultural counties, the fishing counties and the mining counties. He did not rely when he was returned to power, as far as the returns go to show, on the votes of the manufacturing classes, but he was returned to power by the unanimous voice of the people of Canada.

In the resolution of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), as presented to the House, it is held that there is a certain amount of contradictions. The argument has been put forward by the other side of the House that, whereas, in its first portion it appeals for a system of adequate protection of the industries of Canada and for the maintenance of the Canadian market for Canadian products, that in so far as it later on suggests a preference within the empire there is involved a contradiction. I cannot see that this is a legitimate argument. It might as well be held that during all the years in which the United States has been a highly protective country there has been an inconsistency in that policy in going to South American governments and to a certain extent of listening to the overtures of Canada in the direction of reciprocity. There is no inconsistency to my mind, in the matter at all. In fact, it would rather appear as if reciprocity were the necessary and natural incident of a protective tariff. Without a protective tariff you could practically get no reciprocity. Lord Salisbury, himself, in speaking of the position of England in dealing with this matter, said that England has nothing to offer, that England has nothing to exchange. England, which is a free trade country has given everything to the countries with which it might enter negotiations and has nothing to offer, whereas, the country which has adopted a protective tariff has something to offer. It has concessions to make. It is entirely within its power to make such a treaty of reciprocity with any other country as would involve a letting down, to a certain extent, of the barriers put up in the way of trade and as would confer a certain amount of advantage on the country with which it was negotiating. I am prepared to recognize that there are very great difficulties in the way of working out a satisfactory preference within the British empire. At the same time it would be a very foolish thing on the part of the government of Canada, or the people of Canada, or the parliament of Canada, to, for a moment admit, that such a thing cannot be accomplished. There were in operation a few years ago the Belgian and German treaties; treaties which Canada had for years asked should be denounced; treaties which were discussed at the Inter-colonial conference here ; treaties whose denunciation had been pressed upon the Imperial government, and which the Imperial government in the most formal fashion on the report of one of its leading statesmen refused to denounce. Yet, although it seemed, up to the last moment, that the denunciation of these treaties was a concession that would not be made, the time came when by pressure of circumstances it was made. These treaties are now denounced and business is readjusting itself very rapidly and it is very difficult to say that any interest in Canada has suffered in consequence thereof—except that we may perhaps suffer somewhat from the unfriendly attitude of the German government.

I maintain that in the same way, it is going to be possible for our colonial governments of Australia and Canada, and that government which we may hope to see soon established at the Cape, working in concert with the British government, to devise some method by which there may be a system of preferential trade within the empire. The simplest way in which that could be done is the way which I suppose we would not accept at all; that is, to adopt the suggestion made by one of the British statesmen and enact free trade within the empire. I do not know that his suggestion was exactly that, but it was, I think, that all the colonies should adopt free trade. Of course, in order to do that it would be necessary for

Canada to repudiate that policy which has been maintained by successive governments in this country, not only by the Conservative government but by the Liberal government which succeeded. I should think, that would be entirely out of the question. The great difficulty that lies in the way of accomplishing a preference within the empire, unquestionably must lie in the fact that Great Britain is so confirmed in her belief apparently, that free trade such as she has to-day, is that which best suits her interests; that we can scarcely expect the mother country, with her experience, with the enormous measure of prosperity she has enjoyed under free trade, to abandon that system even if it could be shown that it would very largely be in the interest of her colonies for her to do so. The men who have charge of these matters in England have always treated this question on a business principle. They have balanced the trade which they might hope to develop with the colonies, against that enormous trade which they do with the rest of the world, and so far they always seem to have made up their mind that whatever they might hope to gain from the colonies they would more than lose in some other direction. That is perhaps the proper view for a British statesman to take. I have always been disposed to think, that when we were in this country discussing protection, as we did in 1878; and when the argument was advanced that protection was not a good thing because we should follow the example of the mother country and adopt free trade under which Great Britain has achieved such enormous success; had risen to such a position among the nations of the world, outranking beyond all comparison the others, and being facile princeps in the world from a manufacturing and commercial point of view—it always seemed to me that such an argument as that was absolutely out of the question so far as we were concerned. There was little reason to doubt that a country which had commenced her manufacturing career as a protective country and had with skill, courage, boldness among her seafaring population obtained control of all the seas, had shown that capacity for commerce which was evidenced by the enormous development of her trading companies—for instance the East India Company—I say that it always seemed to me that that country had laid sure and fast the foundation of her industries during a period of protection, and that now was ready to come into the arena armed at all points with success, braced, strengthened and fortified, with capital abundant; it always seemed to me that it was naturally the most obvious thing in the world for Great Britain to invite other countries to come into the free trade arena with her, because there she was a Triton amongst the minnows, without any opponents. There was neither industry, nor experience, nor capital elsewhere in the world that could compete with her. The consequence was that the countries which did engage in this free trade dance with Great Britain did very soon find that they were paying the piper. But, the case of Great Britain is not ours; was not ours in 1878 when we adopted the protective system; is not ours to-day. Those other countries which did listen to the blandishments of Great Britain and did endeavour to compete with her under free trade conditions; where are they to-day? Have they continued the merry dance? Each one of them has had good reasons to change its opinion. Each one is now as rapidly as possible withdrawing from that position into which it was led, and as rapidly as possible placing itself in the position in which Great Britain was when she commenced her career. They are pressing Great Britain as hard as they can in the markets of the world, and are taking advantage of her adherence to her old system in her own markets, and are closing their markets absolutely against her. Under those circumstances it cannot be expected that for some time to come—although the date may not be so far distant as at this moment it seems—it cannot be expected that Great Britain should reverse or much modify her free trade system. She believes it is the best for her and very possibly it is the best for her, situated as she is. And so long as it is so, it is better in the interest of the empire; it is better in our interest (to the great extent to which we rely upon the support and protection of that great country); it is better for us all that she should maintain that course which would keep her at the zenith of her power and wealth and prestige. But, if we are to concede to the mother country that right; if we are going to justify in her the course by which she shapes her policy, by the rule that she shall do that which is best for her own people living within her own borders; then I say unquestionably, following her example, it is our duty as component parts of the empire—even looking at it as an Imperial matter—to develop our country and to follow that course of policy in this country which will give us the greatest possible gain, advantage, and development in the Canada in which we are living.

It seems perfectly clear that every component part of the empire, even regarding it from an Imperial standpoint, can best serve the interests of all, can best strengthen that great and world-wide empire which we recognize to-day, by each within its own sphere, under that policy which is best adapted to it, developing its powers, its wealth, its resources, and its population. So far we must stand firmly upon the principle that Canada must be for the Canadians, and that we cannot in respect of such a matter as the convenience of the mother country give such a preference as will imperil, or injure, or weaken,

in any respect our own industrial life. The highest and truest loyalty to the mother country and to the empire of which she is the head, requires that. And, if in the concessions we have made in this trade matter, we have made the mistake of having gone so far as to have weakened Canada's resources in any respect whatever, then it is our duty, in so far as it is possible, to correct that mistake.

I am not going to argue for a moment that it is not rather a difficult matter, that the administration having made the concessions it has made to the mother country, having made a straight cut in the duty of 33⅓ per cent, and having received a great deal of credit, and to a certain extent the warm thanks of the mother country for that act—I am not going to say that it is not difficult, while giving this 33⅓ per cent, to raise the tariff so high that the 33⅓ per cent will not be sufficient to serve the purpose of developing the trade of the mother country with us. I will not say that it is not going to be difficult to take away with one hand what you have given with the other. I am always free to believe that in this matter our government has made the mistake of being too generous, and did not in the full realize, as it now does, the consequence of it.

I presume that we must stand where we are as far as that is concerned, but not with respect to any other country in the world. If this preference, having been given is not to be withdrawn—although I would fain see it withdrawn if it has done injury to any Canadian interest—I maintain that with respect to the United States, which has profited so much by our trade, it is the duty of the Canadian administration to raise the tariff to such a point that our own people will be protected in their own markets and will not be beaten in those markets by their American competitors. I do not of course know what the intention of the government was in giving the preference to Great Britain. I presume that it was to acquire a certain amount of the gratitude of the mother country. I presume that the premier of Canada had no objection to become a persona grata to the people of the mother country ; and I dare say it has been worth all it may have cost us, to have placed ourselves in a position to ascertain—that is where I see the great value of the preference—the fact that a preferential can be given within the empire. The right hon. gentleman has established that ; and the preferential having been given, can it not be extended ? I admit that it is a matter of extreme difficulty. I admit that the adjustment of the relations between all the colonies and the mother country will involve considerations which cannot be dealt with in a hurry. But I maintain that they can be dealt with, and I maintain that it is the duty of the government of Canada to see that our tariff is so changed and modified that it will secure the Canadian markets for ourselves while at the same time giving a preference within our markets to every other part of the empire. It is too late in the day to enter upon a discussion that would be at all exhaustive as to the manner in which that object would be effected, but it seems to me that it can never be effected by giving a straight cut of one-fourth or one-third off the customs duties of the country. The industries of the country are so involved with one another, our commercial relations are so intimate, you shake so many portions of the edifice of our tariff when you touch one of them, that such a tariff as I am suggesting could only be arrived at by having an exhaustive examination of all imports, all the industries, and all those innumerable circumstances which affect the flow of commerce. Then, we should have in this country a maximum and a minimum tariff. Every item of the tariff should be dealt with separately, and should be so adjusted that we would maintain to the greatest possible extent the trade of Canada for the Canadian people, and at the same time develop in every possible way the commerce between the other colonies of the empire and ourselves, and between the mother country and ourselves. That, it seems to me, is not an impossible thing, although it involves great difficulty. But let us hope that after the premier has had the conference which he is to have with representatives of the other colonies and with the leading public men of the empire at the approaching coronation, he will be able to report to the people of Canada that if no elaborate scheme has been developed, sufficient progress has been made to justify him in announcing that the day is not far distant when such a result may be attained.

In the discussion on this budget a great deal of interest has been attached to the criticism of the census figures in which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce indulged. I was sorry that my hon. friend dealt so harshly with one of the standard publications of the government. After my hon. friend the leader of the opposition had informed the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that he placed some reliance on the official Year-book of the government, in which respect I thought the leader of the opposition was only paying a compliment which was due to hon. gentlemen opposite, he was, I presume rather discomfited by the manner in which the Minister of Trade and Commerce threw a great deal of doubt on the accuracy of the figures contained in that book, and rather discredited the publication. Having been in the habit of relying on the figures of this publication, I was somewhat astonished at finding that the government continued to publish a work which contained so many errors, and were willing to lead the members of this House and the citizens of Canada generally so far astray. I was not less sur-

prised when I came to look at the figures of the Year-book to find that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce had done scant justice, if justice at all, to the compiler of that volume. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said :—

The Year-book may be a very valuable document. I will give a few illustrations of what the Year-book was worth a little while ago. I remember that this same document—I thought that that was what my hon. friend referred to—estimated, in 1887, that the population of Canada was 4,856,226. In 1888 the Year-book's estimation of the population of Canada was 4,946,497. In 1899, it had risen to 5,075,855. They suppressed 1890 and 1891, but I will carry out the calculation. On the same line of calculation, the Year-book would have given us a population of 5,210,000 for 1890, and 5,345,000 for 1891—just ten years ahead of time. These are the 'official statistics' that the hon. gentleman relied upon for the purpose of contradicting what, as I shall show presently, was a very well-reasoned hypothesis on the part of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. Fielding's hypothesis being that Canada had increased in population as much in the last five years, from 1896 to 1901, as it had done in the preceding fifteen years. Now, I always like to do justice as far as possible ; and, where an accusation is made, especially against an unpretending volume, which has no tongue except those silent ones which are found in its pages, I like to see whether there is any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements made. Comparing the figures given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce with those of the Year-book, I have discovered some surprising discrepancies. The hon. minister says that the Year-book gives the population of Canada in 1887 as 4,856,226. But I find, on referring to the Year-book, that it gives the population of that year as 4,638,109. Then, in 1881, the hon. minister said that the year book gives the population as 4,946,497, but I find that it gives it as 4,688,147. In 1889, the hon. minister says that, according to the Year-book, the population of Canada was 5,075,855, but I find, on referring to that same book, that it gives the population as only 4,739,617.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What copy is my hon. friend quoting from ?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The edition of 1900.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend had better quote the volume that I quoted from.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Perhaps the hon. Minister will be kind enough to lay his volume on the table so that we may all see it. Then the minister went on to say that in 1890 the year-book, for some reason or other, suppressed the figures, and he supplied the figures himself. He said that the population of Canada during that year, according to the process of figuring adopted by the year-book, was 5,210,000. But I find that the year-book gives the population as 4,792,605. In 1891, the hon. gentleman represents the Year-book as giving our population at 5,345,000—ten years too soon, as he said—but I find that it gives the population as 4,846,377. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is therefore out in his count as follows :—

1887..	218,000
1888..	258,000
1889..	336,000

And in 1900, when he supplied the figures off his own bat, he is out 417,000, and in 1891, 498,623.

I think it but right to call the attention of the minister to these facts, and the only reason I can suggest for the discrepancies, is that possibly he may have discovered some edition of the year-book not issued for general use.

But my hon. friend was not satisfied with simply discrediting the year-book. He proceeded to discredit every one who had anything whatever to do with the taking of the census in 1891. He attributed motives, in the most reckless and unlimited fashion, to every one who had anything to do with it. He told us that when the census of 1891 was taken the Conservative party was in a discreditable position, and that the enumerators were presumably men in close contact with the powers at Ottawa who knew that Sir John Macdonald's government was in a desperate position and that it was necessary to place before the people census returns which would show that the national policy had been a success. Now, what possible connection could the census of 1891 have had with the election which was run by the Conservative party under Sir John Macdonald in that year. The general election took place on the 5th March, 1891, and the census enumerators were not appointed until April, 1891. And so far from Sir John Macdonald having been in a desperate position then, we find that the very first division in the House of Commons, after that general election, gave him a majority of 29, which was increased at every subsequent by election, until at the end of the term beginning 1891, the Conservative party had a majority in this House of 46.

I think my hon. friend will find it rather difficult to atone for his strictures with respect to the census of 1891. According to him Canada is not at all a desirable place for immigrants and he should not be surprised if they do not come in greater numbers. If it be correct that some 2,500 enumerators in 1891,—there were 5,000 last year, violated their solemn oath, we must conclude that perjurers are as common in this country as black flies in May. Not only have the enumerators, according to the hon. gentleman, violated their oath, but so have the commissioners and the other census officials, every one of whom was sworn to do his

duty faithfully and make no return which was not absolutely correct.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce deliberately asks the people of Canada to believe that you can find in this country, in every province, enumerators who are willing and ready to perjure themselves simply to serve the purposes of the administration of the day. I think that is the most monstrous charge that was ever made by any public man in Canada. Judging by the lengths to which the hon. gentleman had gone when in opposition in extravagant denunciation of his opponents, almost anything might have been expected of him, but this last outrage against the people is by far the worst of all, and the matter will not be allowed to rest there.

The hon. gentleman caused an investigation to be made in the province of Quebec into the taking of the census of 1891. Judging from the return which has been laid upon the Table, the government put it in the hon. gentleman's power, or the power of the commissioner who acted for him, to violate public confidence by disclosing private information given to the census enumerators in the belief that the confidential nature of this information would be respected. The evidence of this is to be seen in the documents placed upon the Table the other day. These schedules have been taken from the custody of the census officer and have been exposed to the public. I will read a paragraph from the one for the county of Bagot :—

> The stuffing in the town of Acton Vale and in the parish of St. André of Acton, is still larger, and the evidence of it is absolutely undeniable.
>
> Mr. J. E. Marcil, M.P., for Bagot, is residing in Acton Vale for the last forty years, and for thirty years he has been engaged in business, either as a clerk or as a merchant. He has consequently, opportunity of knowing every one in the locality. Mr. Marcil examined in our office the schedules of 1891, and has pointed out to us the names of those who had left the town of Acton Vale for the parish of St. Andre of Acton many years previous to the census of ten years ago.

These schedules, collected by the census officers in 1891, contained information entrusted to them by the people of Canada under the seal of confidence. But, for party purposes, they have been hawked about and exposed to the gaze of all and sundry, in order to discredit the census of 1891. It will not do for the government to leave this matter where it is. If there is to be an investigation, it will not do to have that investigation held by an officer of the government; it must be held by a commission of men whose reputation shall be beyond reproach or question. And not only the census of 1891 must be inquired into, but the census of 1901 also. And, indeed, in order to a thorough investigation, perhaps the census of 1881 and the census of 1871, if investigated, might yield valuable information. But, after the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the facts revealed by him in that speech and in the papers laid upon the Table, nothing will satisfy the people but a searching inquiry into the census of 1891 and 1901 as well. It was not necessary for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to go as far as he did. I suppose these Star Chamber inquiries might have been made, perhaps are made frequently—and if the matter had been kept quiet, if it had not been so trumpeted abroad, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce had not been given this opportunity of showing his eloquence, his bitterness, and his capacity for going beyond all reasonable length in attacking his opponents, the present position need not have been reached. But the hon. minister has brought these matters forward deliberately; and I maintain that it is incumbent upon this administration to set at rest, as far as they can, this question as to the honesty of the enumerators, as to the motives that influenced the different administrations that held these censuses as to the instructions they gave their officers, as to the good faith in which the information, given in good faith by the people of Canada in these decennial censuses, has been received and treated. Now, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, apparently to serve his own purpose for the moment, discredits the census of 1891. He maintains that the number of the people returned by that census was altogether too high. The hon. gentleman knows—no man better—that the census of 1891 was taken under precisely the same conditions, precisely the same instructions to enumerators, as was the census of 1901, which has just been taken by the government of which the hon. gentleman is a member. More than that, the hon. member must know that, if there were any error at all, it was not likely to be found by searching through the census of 1891. If he remembers the debates in which he took part in the House of Commons from 1882 to 1885, he will remember that it was admitted at the time that the census of 1881 was, probably, largely inaccurate and represented the people of Canada as having a larger population than was actually living in Canada at the time. There can be no question about that. Not the census of 1891, but the census of 1881, was the census that was exaggerated—and, probably also the census of 1871. In the discussions engaged in by Mr. Blake and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), Mr. Blake stated in most explicit language that the census of 1881 was stuffed largely with the names of people who had not been resident in Canada for ten, fifteen or twenty years. He states that most clearly in a discussion which took place in the House, in which he shows

the practice of the enumerators was to go to a house and say: 'Have you a son or daughter?' 'Are they in the States?' 'Yes.' 'How long have they been there?' 'Ten' or 'fifteen' or 'twenty years.' 'Do you expect them to return?' 'Oh, yes, I hope to see them again.' And so that name went down. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce knows that, in taking the census of 1891 that system was changed. Though the de jure system continued in force, yet in addition to the questions formerly asked by the enumerators, which might lead to a dialogue such as was suggested by Mr. Blake and the enumeration of people who had not been resident in Canada for ten, fifteen or twenty years, a new question was added to those to be put by the census enumerators. It was made the business of the enumerators to ask whether the absent members of the family had been away for over a year, and if they had they were not to be counted. Whereas, in the census of 1881, it was possible to have persons counted who has been ten, fifteen or twenty years away from the country. Under the rules of the census of 1891, no person was likely to be counted who had been away for more than twelve months. Now, as it happens, this instruction to the enumerators was adopted with the consent of the government of Sir John Macdonald. The census officer of that day suggested this, and said to Sir John Macdonald: This will make a more accurate census, but it will have the effect of reducing the population of Canada as compared with the census of 1881. And Sir John Macdonald said: What we want is an accurate census. And the government of Sir John Macdonald consented to this change in the instructions. That government contained two future premiers, representatives of the Conservative party, Sir John Abbott and Sir John Thompson, and these gentlemen consented to this method, which had for its object the learning of the truth regarding the population that the men at the head of affairs might intelligently legislate for the country they were to lead. Now, as it happens, I think it would not be difficult to bring to the recollection of the Minister of Trade and Commerce the fact that he himself was consulted upon that subject, and he agreed that it would be a rational and advisable improvement, though it would have the effect of diminishing the population of Canada as revealed by the census of 1891. In respect to another matter, in respect to the instructions issued to the enumerators as to taking persons who were not living at home, such as domestic servants and clerks in the employ of other persons, in respect to that matter as well, a change was made in the census instructions so as to secure greater accuracy by providing against duplications and counting the same individual in two different census divisions.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BELL. The chief interest in the discussion of the census arises of course from the statements made in reference thereto by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The Minister of Trade and Commerce accused the government and their subordinate officials who took the census of 1891, with having perpetrated a fraud upon the people of Canada, and he took the trouble to explain his reasons for thinking so, and the reasons which, in his opinion, induced the government and their subordinates to perpetrate this fraud. That statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the House, I see, is echoed by the press supporting the government outside the House. The Montreal 'Herald' has a leading article on census stuffing in 1891, in which, referring to the statements of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, it says that he has made out such a case as would justify and require that the government of the day should proceed to investigate the matter fully. In that opinion I agree, as I think it is in the interests of the people of Canada that that investigation should be made complete. However, I think I will be able to show the House, before I conclude my remarks, that there is no warrant, at least no sufficient warrant, for the mischevious and improper statement made in this House by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The census of 1891, as I was pointing out when the House rose at six o'clock, was taken more carefully and on a system calculated to give more accurate results than the census of 1881, although the principle on which the two censuses were taken was identical. The de jure system was adopted in both cases. But special pains were taken by the commissioner who took the census of 1891 to avoid, as far as possible, errors arising from duplication and from counting individuals who had gone off for a long time beyond the confines of Canada. I propose to quote now from the manual which was issued as a body of instructions for the use of the enumerators. The matter of duplication is dealt with in this manual under the head of domestic servants:

> Domestic servants come under three classes: 1st. Those who have homes within Canada from which they are temporarily absent; 2. Those who have no homes at all in Canada; 3rd. Those in settled employment and resident with families other than their own.

The instructions go on to describe how these are to be taken. The first class are to be taken with the families from which they are temporarily absent; then the second and third class, those who have no homes at all in Canada except where they are living and finding employment, and those who are in settled employment and resident with

families other than their own, are to be taken with those families. In order to make the matter perfectly plain and eliminate error as much as possible, the census commissioner proceeds to give instructions to the enumerators :

Family, as understood for the purposes of the census, may consist of one person living alone, or of any number of persons living together under one roof, and having their food provided together. For example: One man, say a shopkeeper, or a woman, say a seamstress, living alone in a separate house, or in a distinctly separate part of a house, would constitute a census family; but any number of persons living together in a boarding house, several of them being parents, having children and servants, would only constitute one census family, provide they have no home elsewhere.

So that by a careful description of the different classes under which the population would likely be found, and particularly of those that are liable to duplication, and by furnishing examples and instructions to the enumerators, every possible pains was taken to avoid duplication. Now what would be the results of such a course as that laid down here by the different census officials? It would be to introduce a system of taking the census which would eliminate errors which may have been committed in 1881, by which the census of 1881 may have been enlarged ; and in consequence, the system adopted by the government in 1891 was one that would reduce the number of people apparently residing in Canada, and instead of having the effect of showing a population larger than was actually here, it would come nearer to showing what the actual population of Canada was. Now, it must be borne in mind that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has made the charge, and has most deliberately made it, that a fraudulent census was taken, and in order to confirm what I said, I will quote his own words taken from his speech :

If they were capable, in a case where detection was almost certain, of perpetrating the gross and impudent frauds I have just narrated, think you, they would hesitate to add here and there a man to the members of a family where detection was almost impossible.

There can be no question about the gravamen of the charge made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. He has fortified his case with proof, or so-called proof. He said that in one case in the discussion which arose in the House of Commons in regard to the census of 1891 it had been charged that there was reason to believe that gross frauds were perpetrated in the county of King's, N.S., and that this matter was brought to the notice of the House by the member representing that county. He said : What did the government do ? They set every difficulty in the way of investigation. The fact of the case is that there was a fraud committed in the county of King's. There was sufficient evidence brought to show that one enumerator in King's had probably falsified the census and had probably done it by neglecting, or ignoring, the instructions he had received not to enumerate any individuals who had been away from the province for twelve months. The Department of Agriculture which had charge of the taking of the census, investigated that charge and was sufficiently satisfied that it was thoroughly proved that the census enumerator would have been punished if he had not gone out of the country and thereby escaped the consequences of his act of wrong-doing. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce makes the charge deliberately that the government of the day opposed an inquiry. That is not sustained by any proof advanced by the hon. minister, but, it is, to my knowledge and belief, entirely opposed to the fact. A thorough investigation was made, and it is a matter of knowledge that the only fact upon which the hon. gentleman can rest his charge is that the census officer refused to allow these returns, which had come into his hands from the enumerators and which were regarded as confidential, to be submitted to the House, a course in which I think he was absolutely justified and one I would have very much preferred to see adopted by the government of the day rather than to take these confidential communications and submit them to the inspection of unauthorized and improper persons. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce went on to have a very pleasant quarter of an hour prefacing his remarks by this statement :

As it happens we are in possession of very perfect evidence as to the means they adopted for the purpose of glorifying the national policy.

I find that in 1891 the census of that day enumerated in Antigonish county seventy carpet factories with sixty-nine operatives, and the hon. gentleman indulged in a great deal of jocosity in connection with the fact that one individual was apparently running two factories. Now, in respect to this matter the hon. gentleman practically accuses the enumerators of having, for the purpose of glorifying the national policy and of vindicating the course which had been adopted by the Conservative administration in giving to Canada a protective policy, fraudulently filled up the census return with a list of industries which were not in existence. I regret very much that a minister and a gentleman in his position should make such a charge, because it is entirely at variance with the facts. The enumerators were instructed to take all the industries they found in the country within the limit fixed for them by their instructions, and they were to be guided by the Act and by the manual from which I have read which was made an Order in Council in order to make it binding upon them. They were to take every industry which they found in the country and which had an output of $200 per annum. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, throughout his remarks,

seemd to contrast the United States census very favourably to that of Canada, and sought to give the impression to the House that the taking of such industries set down by the enumerators of Canada, carpet factories in Antigonish, knitting factories in Shelburne and basket factories in some other counties, is a practice not followed by the United States enumerators. The instructions given to the United States enumerators are precisely the same as in this country. They are instructed to take every industry they find but when they come to the matter of tabulation there is a difference. In the United States they do not tabulate any industry which has an output of less than $500, while in Canada with its comparatively less advanced development it is thought well to tabulate industries that have an annual output of $200. There is no harm in that. There is no deception in any way. It was not professed by each of these industries taken down by the enumerator represented a factory with a tall chimney, with a large number of employees and a large pay-list. The enumerators were careful to put down nothing but what was absolutely true in the enumeration of industries, and therefore, a more unwarranted use of the term fraud or fraudulent when applied to the facts collected by the enumerators of the census of 1891 was never used by any one particularly by any public man in this or any other country. I believe you will search the annals of parliamentary utterances the world over without finding a parallel for such an argument as was addressed to the House of Commons by a leading minister of the administration. But, the hon. gentleman says that this was for a purpose. The purpose was to glorify the national policy. The purpose was to grossly magnify the rate of progress made by Canada through the national policy. Well, if that hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to inform himself or had not forgotten the facts that came to his knowledge when he discussed this matter years ago, he would have recollected that the theory was put forward by him at that time and was answered and utterly exploded. Instead of magnifying the advancement made by the country, instead of exaggerating the rate of progress made by the country under the national policy, the including of these small industries has the very opposite effect, as I shall proceed to prove to the House. I have already explained that in the United States the practice is to tabulate industries down to $500 of an annual output, and in this country down to $200. Now, taking the industries—I am now quoting from that invaluable third volume of the census from which the hon. gentleman derived so much comfort. I am referring to the total which will be found in the fourth volume, although the materials for it are found in the third volume. In 1881 the number of these industries from $2,000 down, referring to their annual output, was 32,072. In 1891 the number had increased to 50,777 from which it appears that the census of 1891 was not the first in which the practice was adopted of enumerating these smaller industries. The same practice had been followed as it necessarily would be under the same instructions in the census of 1881. Therefore, the government in 1881, two years after the inauguration of the national policy, adopted this very same principle—and I believe it was in force in 1871 as well—by which all industries with an annual output of $200 or upwards would be included.

Under this heading of industries, with an output of $2,000 a year, there were in 1881, 32,072; and in 1891, 50,777; an increase of 18 per cent. The value of the produce of these factories had increased from $20,734,080 in 1881, to $32,195,192 in 1891. Of industries with an output of from $2,000 to $12,000 annually, there were 13,514 in 1881, and 19,629 in 1901; the annual output of these being $64,939,604 in 1881, and $93,260,957 in 1891.

Of industries with an output of from $12,000 to $25,000 per annum, there were 2,061 in 1881, and 2,679 in 1891. The annual output of these industries was $36,808,242 in 1881, and $47,709,005 in 1891.

Take the industries with an annual output of from $25,000 to $50,000, and there were 967 in 1881, which had increased to 1,208 in 1891. The annual output of these factories was $33,482,170 in 1881, and $42,238,542 in 1891.

Take the large class of factories; the great industries that have been established and brought into existence by the national policy; the industries with an annual output of $50,000 and upwards, and of these factories there were 1,108 in 1881, and 1,675 in 1891; the total output being $153,767,771 in 1881, and $260,795,190 in 1891.

If we take these for the purpose of comparison it will be seen at a glance that the effect of including all these small industries, which were so provocative of merriment to the Minister of Trade and Commerce; instead of showing a largely increased rate of progress and a greatly increased output; instead of glorifying the national policy, have the opposite effect. The inevitable result of that consideration is to show that there was no fraud in this matter; that it was not a new feature of the census of 1891; that it had been done in the census of 1881, and was done innocently in both cases, the census enumerators simply doing their duty according to their instructions and placing upon their schedules precisely the same information that is placed upon the schedules of the United States census, simply to show us the value of the annual work of those who may be classed as engaged in industrial occupations in Canada. In order to make the matter clearer, let us take the total increase of all the factories of all classes. In 1881, the

total output was $309,731,867, and in 1891 that had increased to $476,198,886. That includes all industries, and it includes these very industries against which the Minister of Trade and Commerce is so much opposed. That shows an increased output in Canada of $166,467,019 and a percentage of 53·74. Let us deduct all these small factories with an output of $200 annually and it will leave the production of these industries—exclusive of the smaller ones—at $288,997,787 in 1881, as against $444,003,694 in 1891, a difference in favour of the latter year of $155,005,907, or an increase of 53·63 per cent, almost identical with the increased percentage when we include the smaller factories. Deducting another class of factories and we bring down the total output to $224,058,183 in 1881 as against $350,742,737 in 1891, there is shown there an increase of $126,684,544, and a percentage increase of 56·4. But if you throw out all these small industries and take simply the great industries of the country, you will find that these factories which produced $50,000 a year and upwards, give us an increase of $107,027,419 in 1891 as compared with 1881, and that would show (for the glorification of the national policy and the justification of the administration of that day) a percentage increase in the industries of the country, not of 53 per cent, which would be secured by taking these fraudulent means charged against the government by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but a percentage of 69·60 per cent.

The result of that investigation is to show that if it were the intention of the government of that day to have committed a fraud in this matter, then the means that they adopted were such as to completely defeat their purpose. It is only fair to ask the hon. minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) to furnish us with some further and better evidence why he should ask us to make our minds that the census of 1891 was fraudulent, and also better evidence to establish his contention that there was an increase in the last five years under this government, equal to the increase which took place in Canada for the fifteen years previous.

As bearing upon that question, it happens that there are some figures which tend to show that the very opposite is the case. Instead of being apparent from any evidence that can be discovered that the increase of population was greater in Canada during the last five years, there is evidence to show that it was less; or at least, that the exodus to which the Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) attributes the loss of the population of this country, was in some respects greater in the last five years than it was during the other period. I read from a return which I think is authentic :

> The question is often asked : Is the movement of our Canadian population to the United States increasing or decreasing.

That was precisely the question that was raised. The question whether or not the exodus is less or greater, will, I assume, show whether there is any ground of justification for the boast of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the whole progress of Canada during the last twenty-five years has been within the last five years, and that for fifteen years from 1881 onward to 1896, Canada has made no progress and has remained with her population stationary.

> The state of Massachusetts takes a census on a comprehensive scale independent of the federal census. An analysis of the population statistics of the state of Massachusetts in combination with those of the Federal authorities for the same state supplies an answer to the question above asked (as to whether the exodus has increased or decreased) so far as relates to that state. The number of Canadians in Massachusetts in 1900 according to the Federal census (which is taken in the tens) was 293,169. In 1895, by the state census it was 243,732. In 1890, according to the national census, the number was 207,601, and in 1885 by the state census was 147,352. During the first five years, from 1885 to 1890, the number increased by 60,249 ; during the second period, from 1890 to 1895, by 36,131 ; and during the third period, from 1895 to 1900, by 49,437. In the first period Canadians went to the state of Massachusetts, according to the statistics of that state, at the rate of 12,050 a year ; in the second period, at the rate of 7,236 a year, and in the third period at the rate of 9,888 a year.

If these figures are right, there was a larger exodus from Canada to the state of Massachusetts in the last five years ending with 1900 than there was in the preceding five years ; and these happen to be the five years during which it is claimed by the members of the present government that there was practically no exodus, and during which Canada made greater growth than during the previous fifteen years. The result, while not conclusive, goes a long way to show to my mind that there is no foundation whatever for the statements made by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce on this subject.

The hon. gentlemen apparently rely very largely for some kind of support for their statements on the fact that we have had good times in Canada in the last five years ; and for that reason they contend that the citizens of Canada had no need to go abroad. But there have been good times in the United States also during the past five years, perhaps better than there has been in Canada. Employment has been easily secured there, wages have been high, and the inducements offered to citizens of Canada to go to the United States have been if possible greater than they were before.

There is another point bearing on this matter which should not be lost sight of. The recovery from bad times comes earlier in the United States than it does in Canada, and the difference between periods of inflation and periods of depression is more

marked there than it is in this country. Cases have come within my own knowledge of sons and daughters returning to their homes in Canada to spend the lean years with their parents on the farm, and to wait until an improved state of affairs in the United States induces them to go abroad again. The mere fact that we have had good times in Canada is not sufficient to affect the exodus. Speaking from my own experience —and I presume it will be borne out by that of nearly every person present—there has been a greater scarcity of labour, a greater difficulty in finding men, either for the farm or for railroad construction, during the past five years, than there was previously. It is well known too to almost every one that it is almost impossible to obtain a sufficient supply of domestic servants in this country. So that there is no evidence to sustain or to justify for one moment the amazing contention of the government that all the growth of population between 1880 and 1900 is to be credited to the party in power. It is a monstrous proposition for which there is no warrant whatever.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce quoted figures to show that the city of Toronto had a larger number of unoccupied houses four or five years ago than it has to-day. We all know that. But the argument borrowed from the experience of the city of Toronto is a perfectly fallacious one. There was a boom in that city some years ago, resulting in a temporary increase of population and the erection of a large number of houses. But the boom broke with the usual consequences. There was widespread loss, many men gave up buildings they had erected, losing them altogether, and a great many people who had been attracted to the city by the boom left. There can be no question that for a number of years there was a great depression in the city of Toronto. But that city is now gradually overtaking the excessive rate at which it advanced for a short time, and by a healthy natural growth the population has once more overtaken the supply of buildings, which accounts for the condition of affairs that exists there to-day.

But the Minister of Trade and Commerce is sure that there was an exodus, and he furnishes a reason which to my mind is conclusive. I believe there was a large exodus between 1881 and 1891. I do not accept many of the arguments of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but there was one which struck me as being most convincing. He said that from 1881 to 1891 he went backwards and forwards in the province of Ontario a great many times. He denounced the government of Canada, he cursed protection in all the moods and tenses. He preached to the people of Ontario that they were being ruined, bled white, that the government was in alliance with combinesters, that the whole thing was an organized conspiracy to make the poor man poorer and the rich man richer. Is it not fair to conclude that when the hon gentleman spent his time in thus proving to the people of Ontario that this was a poor country to live in, that there was scarcely any security for life, and none for property in this country, he must have had considerable influence in driving the people of Ontario across the border ? If I had time, I would like, in support of the argument I have just advanced, to furnish the House with some of the speeches delivered by Sir Richard Cartwright on the stump at that time ; but I will quote a few words which he uttered in this House in 1885 in reply to the budget, shortly after the first minister of that day had been to London and had there urged the claims of Canada for a share of the emigration from the mother country. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, standing in his place as a critic of the administration said :

> I doubt if the First Minister were well advised when he intimated that it was desirable that there should be a large immigration to Canada.

He goes on to say :

> If many had come to Canada, even to Ontario——

Which he seemed to think the best part of Canada——

> —they would have found themselves in a position where they could only be provided for by displacing the native population.

The fact that the hon. gentleman, standing here as the critic of the administration, could deliberately challenge the conduct of the First Minister in asking that immigrants of the most desirable kind should come to this country, and could warn them against coming, is sufficient to give us some idea of the kind of arguments he would address to the people on the stump, without the controlling and modifying influence of the fact that in this House men's speeches are reported, and there is a chance of their being held to account for their utterances. So that the only thing his argument that the population of this country had not increased, but that there was an exodus, proves is that he was busy in the province of Ontario, during the period from 1881 to 1891, in endeavouring to convince people that Canada was not a good place to live in and was a good place to live out of. I think I have said enough with regard to the census to show that there is not much basis for the figures and criticisms given us by the hon. minister. And if we are to be asked to believe that Canada stood still from 1881 to 1895, it will be necessary for some better arguments than have been given us by the hon. minister.

In rebuttal of the hon. minister's statements, there is a host of facts. For in-

stance, there are the voters' lists. We find that the voters' lists in Canada showed :

In 1887..	993,914	names.
1891..	1,132,201	"
1895..	1,353,735	"

In Ontario the voters' lists showed as follows :

In 1882..	406,000	names.
1887..	495,000	"
1891..	568,000	"

Then this government came into power—this government which has so enormously added to our population and increased our prosperity—this government which has increased our population at the rate of 100,000 a year. Well, you will find that the voters' lists show just the opposite. They show a decline in population since that date. In 1895 there were 650,000 names on the Ontario lists. In 1898 this number had decreased to 576,000. That was the list prepared specially for the plebiscite on prohibition. And in 1900, at the last general election, the number of voters on the Ontario lists stood at 580,000. Where then were these hundreds of thousands who were pouring into Canada in order to swell our population and add to the glory of this government ? They are conspicuous by their absence. They are not to be found in the voters' lists, and I am sure that there is no place where these hon. gentlemen would better like to have them. Because had these hundreds of thousands been brought into the country under the happy circumstances that have prevailed since the advent of this government and been growing richer every day since owing to the wonderful administration of this wonderful government, they would certainly support the regime to which they owed their good fortune, and our hon. friends opposite would have been very careful to see that their names were down on the voters' lists. But where are they ? The voters' lists say no where.

Then going back to his old love, playing again the old tune he is unable to forget, the Minister of Trade and Commerce proceeded to magnify the United States at the expense of Canada. He compared the Dakotas and Minnesota with the province of Manitoba. Again I find that the hon. gentleman's figures do not correspond, as they should, with the official returns. According to him the Dakotas gained 120,000 families from 1881 to 1891, or in all 600,000 people, allowing five to a family. But the official returns of the United States census show that the Dakotas, instead of gaining 600,000 in that period, only gained 376,000, or not very much more than one-half the figures given us by the hon. minister. The state of Minnesota he credited with a gain of 200,000 families or a million souls. But taking the figures from the United States census, I find that the actual increase of Minnesota in that period was from 780,000 to 1,301,003, or an increase of 521,103, just about half the amount given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. On the other hand, Manitoba had increased from 62,000 to 152,000, the exact increase in the ten years being 90,246, or a percentage of 144 between 1881 to 1891. I think I have said quite enough to show that we should hesitate considerably before accepting the figures given us by my hon. friend, and the conclusions based thereon. It is always possible for any of us to make mistakes, and it is quite easy to go wrong in figures, but I think that before a gentleman so prominent in the administration should venture to attack so important a document as the census of the country and openly charge thousands of his fellow citizens with deliberate fraud, perjury, connivance and conspiracy, he should endeavour to be at least accurate in his statements. I should hardly be willing to accept as conclusive the statements of an hon. gentleman, based on statistics which fail so completely to correspond with the official returns.

The hon. gentleman was rather inclined to be jocose in the course of his speech, and told a story rather at the expense of our hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He said that he once had a vision, during which he passed through the different circles of Inferno, and that when passing through the circle reserved for faithless souls, he came to an apartment in which he found a number of figures hanging up in unaccustomed and extraordinary attitudes. They proved to be the souls of farmers who had believed in protection, and being too green to burn, were hung up there to prepare them for the furnace. I wonder if the hon. minister is to be rewarded, according to Dante's conception, by being placed in that circle destined for faithless souls. If he should come into that quarter of the Inferno, he will find there a number of figures hanging up in anything but comfortable attitudes, and will find out that these are the souls of the sons and daughters of the great province of Ontario who were so green as to believe the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he told them that, if returned to power, he would destroy the microbe of protection, drive out of the country the combinsters, revise the tariff and give the people all the commodities of life at prices free from the increases caused by the iniquitous protectionist system.

I well believe that that may be his experience ; and, if so, of all the tortures the hon. minister will suffer when he finds himself in that place reserved for faithless souls, souls that have violated the trust placed in them by confiding friends, his greatest torture will be the anguish, the appealing, pitiful expression, of those poor souls, men and women from Ontario, who will look upon him with eyes of reproach and say : You brought us hither ; I am that lady of Oxford

county who gave you your tea after you had held forth and explained how you were going to do away with the duty on coal oil, how you were going to give us our glassware free—no more 30 per cent on lamp chimneys or six cents a gallon on coal oil; we trusted you and here we are in torment. That will be the worst punishment of the hon. gentleman when he finds himself in the inferno for faithless souls. And, if there is one man in that government who, more than another has broken every promise he made to the people, and betrayed every confidence reposed in him, it is the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That hon. gentleman is unfair to his country to this day. I called attention a few moments ago to the manner in which he manufactured the figures for Dakota and Minnesota to the disadvantage of our fair province of Manitoba. He compared the growth and progress of these new countries. Why did he not do it fairly? What were the states of Dakota and Minnesota? They were a territory lying at the outskirts of the union, the only place left to be filled up by the overflowing population pressing upon them from the south. On the other hand, the province of Manitoba, with which he compared them, was cut off from eastern Canada by that long, desert, rocky district which intervenes between it and the thickly settled parts of Ontario—no border settlement, no possibility of people flowing in from over-populated provinces adjacent. Nothing could be done for that province until the government of the day had succeeded, by completing the Canadian Pacific Railway, in bringing it into a position where it could be filled. And, of the enormous progress made by the province between 1881 and 1891, amounting to 144 per cent, practically the whole of that ought to be credited to the last five years of that period when, the railway being finished, it was possible for population to flow into that province. I have said enough—and more will be said by hon. gentlemen on this side who will complete the demonstration I have started—to indicate the absolute futility, folly, and inaccuracy of the statements of the hon. gentleman. It would be better, far better if both government and opposition, instead of trying, for petty party purposes, to show that our country was not progressing, or to try for similar purposes to show that it had progressed only when men of our political stripe were in office, were we to recognize the fact that in Canada we have a country so fine, opportunities so great, that nothing can keep down the growth and development of the Dominion. I cannot, for my part, conceive how advantage is to come to our country from such criticism as has been, at times, indulged in by hon. members of this House. For myself, I am glad—and this is characteristic of all hon. members on this side—I am delighted at the progress made by Canada whether under a Liberal or under a Conservative administration. That progress is admirable, it is what we all wish to see; and we should join hand in hand to make still greater the speed with which our country is advancing to the front rank among the nations of the world.

Mr. ALEXANDER JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) addressed the House a few evenings ago he likened the debate to a revival meeting, the chief business of which was a political confession of faith. The comparison was not inapt. We have had this programme continued this afternoon and evening, and it is likely that it will be continued for some days. This afternoon and evening, we have had a confession of faith from the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). There is nothing extraordinary about that confession of faith, except that it differs somewhat from a confession of faith we have heard from that hon. gentleman on some former occasions. However, it may be fashionable in those days to change opinions, and I have no doubt that the hon. member for Pictou has found that ample reason to change from his profession of faith some years ago. It is not my purpose to find fault with anything the hon. gentleman has said, because it differs from what he said on the occasions I have referred to. But, now that the hon. gentleman has concluded his observations I must confess that, for my part, I am somewhat in doubt as to whether he is a protectionist or, like myself, a revenue tariff man. The speeches that have preceded that of the hon. member for Pictou on that side have made several things abundantly plain. They struck me as being somewhat contradictory, because they went to prove different things. Some of these speeches went to prove, in the first place, that Canada is prosperous and, in the second place, that the government which hon. members on this side are supporting is in no way responsible for the prosperity Canada is now enjoying. In the third place, these speeches went to prove that this country is not prosperous; and in the fourth place they went to prove that the government is entirely responsible for the want of prosperity which characterizes the country. And, in the fifth place, some of these speeches made it abundantly clear that hon. members on the opposite side are not satisfied with the present government. It is not my intention to quarrel with hon. gentlemen opposite because of that, and I think I speak for hon. members on this side when I say that there is not much worry on this side over the matter. It is of far more importance to myself, and, I take it, of far greater importance to every hon. member on this side that the people generally are satisfied with the government. And we have had opportunities, not so long ago, of ascertaining very clearly, that the country is satisfied with the manner in which the present government has administered public affairs since 1896.

I am like my hon. friend from Pictou in recognizing that, this discussion having gone on for upwards of a week, it is very difficult to contribute anything new to the debate. It is, therefore, my purpose not to delay the House long, but to be as brief as I can. I shall try to emulate the example of my hon. friend from Pictou and not inflict upon the House any large array of figures. We have had to listen to a considerable number of figures during the past week, and it will be my aim to give as few figures as I possibly can. With regard to the prosperity of the country, I think there are some evidences that it exists. Hon. members opposite invariably open their speeches by the admission that the country is prosperous, but almost invariably they conclude their speeches, like the hon. member who has just taken his seat, by asserting that the country is not prosperous. For my part I am satisfied to take the trade returns as a proof that there is prosperity in this country. It is not denied that trade during the past five or six years has increased tremendously, and relying upon the trade returns for the proof of my statement, I should not dwell at any greater length upon it.

Our hon. friends opposite, both in the House and outside of it, have had a good deal to say during the past five or six years with regard to the expenditure of public money in this country. We hear from day to day charges made against the government that the expenditure is growing. I am going to admit, if it is any consolation to my hon. friends opposite, that the expenditure is growing ; and for my part I am satisfied that the expenditure should keep on growing, provided always that we have good results from it. I take it that a young country like our own must, if its resources are to be developed, expend a good deal of money in their development, and for my part I am prepared to support a policy of a generous expenditure of public money throughout this country.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I am glad that my hon. friends opposite are prepared to support the policy of a generous expenditure of public money. I was saying that if the resources of this country are to be developed, an expenditure of public money is necessary. We have a great country to the west, stretching to the shores of the Pacific ocean, a country of marvellous resources ; and if that country is to be developed the government must be generous in the expenditure of public money for that purpose, but without forgetting at the same time the necessities of the older provinces. In the province from which I come we are not satisfied that the time has been reached when there should be no further expenditure for the development of its resources, and I think the general opinion throughout all parts of the Dominion is that the time has not yet arrived when the expenditure of public money should be curtailed.

But while our friends opposite are profuse in their criticisms of this expenditure, they take very good care, both in the House and outside of it, not to particularize, not to single out any particular item to which they object. Now, Sir, if they expect their criticisms to have any weight it will be necessary for them to point out the particular items in the expenditure to which they object. I sat in this House during the whole of last session, and I do not now recollect that during the whole of that session our hon. friends opposite put themselves on record as opposed to any particular item in the expenditure made by this government. I say if they expect their criticisms to bear fruit and to be taken seriously by the people, they must point out the items to which they object. That is the position which hon. members on the government side of the House will take, and that is the position which people generally throughout the country will expect the opposition to take.

We have been told that the public debt of this country has been increased. I am not going to deny that it has increased. But it has not been increased to any alarming extent, and I do not think that there is anybody in this country who seriously believes that the increase in the public debt during the past five years has been an alarming feature of the present administration. I think most people, when they calmly reflect upon the question, will conclude that the increase has been a very moderate one. If hon. gentlemen will compare the increase in the debt during the last five years with the increase during the period our hon. friends opposite were in power, they will find that the increase during the last five years has been very slow compared with that during the eighteen previous years. For every dollar that the present government has added to the debt, they have added very largely to the trade of the country ; while for every dollar that the government supported by our friends opposite added to the debt, there was no corresponding increase in the trade of the country. The hon. member who has just taken his seat is not very hopeful it seems to me, of the conditions which obtain in this country. I am not disposed to agree with him that the situation in Canada to-day is without some hope. I am not disposed to agree with him that Canada has not a bright future ; or that we have any reason to expect that we should not witness a continuation of the prosperity which we are at present enjoying. For my part I would be sorry indeed to sound a note of alarm throughout the country at this particular time.

On the question of the tariff I shall have very little to say. I suppose I shall be expected to make my profession of faith on the question of the tariff, and I shall do

so by saying that I am perfectly satisfied that the present government will so adjust the tariff that it will meet with the requirements of every class in this country. It is somewhat difficult, and has been difficult ever since 1896, to ascertain just what position our hon. friends opposite take upon the tariff question. It is not very easy to locate just where they stand on the subject. We all know that when the present Minister of Finance brought down his tariff resolutions in 1897, the leader of the opposition at that time declared that the tariff then brought down was destined to bring ruin to every industry in this country. Let me trouble the House while I read the declaration which was made on that occasion by the then leader of the opposition. He said :

> The result is that this tariff goes into operation, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) knows that the industries of this country are already paralyzed in consequence. While hon. members opposite gloat over the destruction of Canadian industries, I was reading the wail, the sorrowful wail of those industries in the Montreal 'Gazette,' where one manufacturer after another declared that those industries were ruined, that their mills must close, and that they saw staring them in the face a return of the deplorable state of things that existed when the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House, was in charge of the fiscal policy of the country. I say that a deeper wrong was never inflicted upon Canada.

I need not remind the House, and it is not necessary to remind the country, upon this occasion, how far from fulfilment that prediction of the then leader of the opposition fell. How did the industries of Canada suffer ? They did not suffer. They prospered as they never prospered before, but, when it was found that the industries had not suffered as the result of the tariff which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance brought down in 1897, there was then, in the House of Commons, as there was throughout the country, a claim set up by the Conservative party that the Liberal party had taken up the tariff of the government which had preceded them and that if prosperity had prevailed in this country since 1896 it was due entirely to the fact that the government had taken up the policy and followed in the footsteps of their predecessors. I have a distinct recollection of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) addressing this House the other evening and he went on to point out that if we did have any degree of prosperity since 1896, it was owing in no small degree to the fact that the government of the day were simply travelling in the footsteps of the government which preceded them and which went out in 1896. He went on to say that if there was any difference between the policy of the present government and the policy of that which preceded them, it was slight indeed, and that the difference simply amounted to 2 per cent. He went further and said that if you take the preference into consideration the difference between the two policies is less still. On the other hand, we had the declaration from some hon. members on the other side of the House that the tariff of the present government is not satisfactory. They want a declaration of policy as to the tariff, and as I said when I commenced my observations in respect to this tariff matter, so far as I am concerned, I have some considerable difficulty in determining just exactly where our friends opposite and their followers throughout the country are on this question of the tariff.

There is one matter to which I propose addressing myself for a little while. It has become a fashionable thing during the past few years and even this session in the House of Commons to assail the expenditure of money on the Intercolonial Railway. I propose for a few minutes to point out to this House and to the country that the expenditure of money on the Intercolonial Railway since 1896 has been in every respect justifiable. Need I remind the House that the condition of the Intercolonial Railway, when this government came into power in 1896, was entirely unsatisfactory to that portion of country through which the Intercolonial Railway runs ? I need not remind the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) that he was dissatisfied with the condition of the Intercolonial Railway in 1896. I am sure that he will be the first to admit that so far as the portion of the province from which he comes is concerned, the Intercolonial Railway was not satisfactory to the people. I need not remind the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that to the constituency which he represents the Intercolonial Railway and its condition was unsatisfactory in 1896. From every constituency through which the Intercolonial Railway runs in the province of Nova Scotia there came the cry that it was not in the condition that a great railway ought to be in. The present Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) went to some trouble to ascertain the exact condition of the Intercolonial Railway and he went to some trouble to put the road in the state that we find it in to-day. We find the Intercolonial Railway to-day in a condition second to no road in Canada. Was the condition of the Intercolonial Railway in 1896 satisfactory to any person who was doing business with it ? Was the rolling stock satisfactory to the people of the country ? Was the freight service on the road satisfactory to the people ? Was the passenger service satisfactory ? I say most unhesitatingly, and, I think the opinion is universal, throughout the constituencies of this country through which the Intercolonial Railway passes, that not one of these services was satisfactory in 1896. I am glad to know that the condition which obtains to-day on the Intercolonial Railway is entirely different from that which existed in 1896. Have we the poor condition to-

day in respect to the freight service that we had in 1896 ? Have we the poor condition in respect to the passenger service that we had in 1896 ? I think not, but, on the contrary, travel where you will on this continent and you will find that the Intercolonial Railway passenger service is looked on as one of the very best passenger services you can find anywhere in the country, better, perhaps, than anything you can find in Canada, equal to anything you can find in America, and perhaps, for that matter you might go farther, and eliminating the question of speed, you might go so far as to say that in the whole world you cannot find a better passenger service than that which you have now from the city of Montreal to the city of Halifax. It is of a character that the management of the Intercolonial Railway and the Minister of Railways and Canals may well take credit to themselves for having brought about. We will be told that this has cost money.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). It is quite true, and I am not going to deny that it has cost money. But, there was no other way of bringing this condition of affairs about, but by the generous expenditure of money. That expenditure has been made and for my part, and I am speaking for the province of Nova Scotia, from which the hon. member for Pictou comes, and I speak for Nova Scotia because I have more knowledge of the situation as it affects the province, I will say that Nova Scotia is satisfied that the expenditure of money on the Intercolonial Railway since 1896 has not been an unjustifiable expenditure. It is quite true that the government is not making any money out of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway. I am freely admitting that it is so. I would prefer, and every hon. gentleman on this side of the House would prefer, that the Intercolonial Railway should be a money earner. Before I sit down I propose to point out that there are other services that are not money earners and yet we are content that they should be maintained at the expense of the people. The Intercolonial Railway, I regard as a part of the great transportation system of this country. It is an important link in the transportation system. It has a good deal to do with determining what the rate of transportation shall be. And for my part I wish to say that I give my strict adherence to the doctrine that the government should continue to hold the Intercolonial Railway. It is not only important to the sections of the country through which it runs, but I take it that it is important to every section of this Dominion that the Intercolonial Railway should be owned and operated by the government of the country.

I regard the Intercolonial Railway as a necessary part of the great transportation system of Canada, and I regard it further as a complement of our canal system. That, I do not think is an extravagant claim, and probably even the hon. gentlemen from Ontario on the other side of the House, who seem to take special delight in criticising the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, will admit that claim. Let me remind the House that while we hear a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite from the west, with respect of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway we never hear their voices raised against the expenditure of public money on the canal system of Canada. Let it not be understood for a moment that I am in any way opposed to justifiable expenditure on our canals. I am prepared to support a policy which will maintain the efficiency of our canal system, and even if it does cost money, as it does cost considerable money, and more money than it costs to operate the Intercolonial Railway, I, speaking for myself, (and I think I may safely say that I speak for other members who come from the lower provinces) will support and endorse any expenditure which is necessary to efficiently maintain our canals. I do not mean to be understood as saying that the time has arrived when the government of this country shall cease spending money on the Intercolonial Railway. On the contrary, I believe that there is yet a good deal to be done in the matter of perfecting the service which that railway owes to the people of Canada. Let me remind my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) of the fact that there has been a considerable expenditure of money on the Intercolonial Railway in his county during the past year. It will be interesting for his constituents to know; it will be interesting for this House to know, whether that hon. gentleman joins with his political friends who surround him in condemnation of this expenditure. During the past year there has been considerable expenditure in connection with the Intercolonial Railway in the town of Stellarton, and in the town of Westville, and in the town of Pictou, all in his own constituency. In these places there has been a very generous expenditure of public money during the past year. I have no doubt that the constituents of the hon. gentleman will be interested to know whether he supports the contention of those friends of his who sit behind him and around him, and who condemn the expenditure of public money in this connection. I have no doubt that some day his constituents will be curious enough to assertain from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell), whether he opposes or endorses that outlay. He did not find it convenient to make a declaration on this question during his speech, but he must know that the matter is of considerable interest to those who returned him to this House, and no doubt before the session terminates the hon. gentleman will ventilate

his views in respect to the matter. I may remark that the sum of $63,975,261.73 has been expended altogether on our government railways, and I do not think for my part that this is a very alarming figure.

I propose, just for a moment, to make a comparison between the cost of operating the Intercolonial Railway to-day, and the cost of operating it during the period which preceded the coming into power of this government. I take the five years preceding 1896, and I find that there was an average annual deficit on the Intercolonial Railway including the Windsor branch of $88,232. I am not quarrelling with that deficit; I have nothing to say with respect to it; I simply say that there was such a deficit, and that the people of this country paid for that deficit, and I will proceed to make the comparison. I take the period from 1896 when the present government came into power, down to the present day, and I find that there has been an average annual deficit on the Intercolonial Railway including the Windsor branch of $51,358.60, as compared with an average yearly deficit during the five years of the Conservative regime of $88,282.34. I do not think that these figures form a sufficient justification for the extravagant and reckless criticism that has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite with respect of the expenditure of public money on the Intercolonial Railway. There is one other feature of this question to which I shall call the attention of the House, and the comparison which I am able to make is also favourable to the administration of the present Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair). When this government came into power in 1896 it was found that the Intercolonial Railway had an earning capacity of $2,994,201.93; a very respectable amount indeed. But those of us who remember these times, and those of us who had anything to do with the Intercolonial Railway then, remember well that the resources of the railway were taxed to the utmost in order that it might earn that sum of $2,994,201 in a year. What is the condition of the Intercolonial Railway to-day? During the past year the earning capacity of the Intercolonial Railway was $5,019,497.76, or an increase of nearly 100 per cent. Now, in order to bring about this state of affairs; in order to increase the earning capacity of the Intercolonial Railway in five years by 100 per cent, my hon. friends opposite will agree with me that it was necessary there should be a generous expenditure of public money on that road. It will therefore be evident that there is nothing in these figures to justify the criticisms of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in regard to the present management of that road.

I propose to follow this matter up a little further and to point out some figures in connection with the expenditure on our canal system. I said, and I repeat, that the Intercolonial Railway is a part of the general transportation system of this country, and is a complement of our canal system. On the canals of this country there has been expended $81,404,543.98, and it has cost this country $16,985,997.66 to operate the canals. The revenue that the public treasury derived from these canals was $12,717,343, leaving a deficit of $4,268,254.65 as between the actual revenue and actual expense of operation. That is the exact position with respect to our canals. As I have said, I do not wish to be understood as finding fault in any way with this expenditure, and I repeat that I will willingly endorse any policy which has for its object the efficient maintenance of the canals. I take the five years previous to the coming into power of this government; that is from 1892 to 1896; and I find that there was an average yearly deficit of $298,841 during that period, on the operation of our canals. I take the period from 1896 down to the present time, and I find that the annual average deficit was $238,655.10. That is a record which I think the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and which hon. members supporting the ministry have no reason whatever to be ashamed of. It is a record, Sir, which the people of this country are prepared to support comparing more than favourably with the record of the gentlemen who administered our canals and our railways previous to 1896.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose passing on to another matter. The hon member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) in his address to the House a few evenings ago, made some observations respecting the county of Cape Breton, which I have the honour to represent in this House, and I propose to deal for a few minutes with that portion of the hon. member's speech. He tried to prove that the great prosperity which had come to the county of Cape Breton during recent years was due entirely to the fiscal policy of the Conservative government. On that occasion I asked the hon. gentleman this question:

> Does the hon. gentleman know what reason the president of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company gave as the chief cause that led to the establishment of the iron and steel industry in Cape Breton?

The answer given by the hon. member for West Toronto was as follows:—

> I presume the primary cause was the advantageous situation of Cape Breton to the raw material which enters into that industry and to its shiping facilities. But added to that primary cause was the bounty and the protection which was accorded to that industry by the Conservative government of Canada.

I added:

> I would like to add that that is not in accordance with the statement made by the president of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, who ought to know.

The hon. the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is reported in 'Hansard' as having said: 'Yes; it was exactly what he said.' My recollection was that it was the hon. leader of the opposition who made this statement. Of this, however, I was not sure. Until I read the report in 'Hansard,' I was under that impression.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I made no observation.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). The statement was made, then, by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. He evidently did not know very much about it. I am pleased to know that the hon. leader of the opposition, who I am sure would know better, did not make the observation. Now, if we have to-day in the county of Cape Breton a magnificent iron and steel industry, it is not due to the reason advanced by the hon. member for West Toronto in this House a few evenings ago. In order to point out the true reasons, it is necessary for me to go back a few years. In 1891, and for a year or two afterwards, the coal trade in the county of Cape Breton was not in a very flourishing condition. As a consequence there was a good deal of discontent not only in Cape Breton, but throughout the province of Nova Scotia. The output of coal in the province in 1891 reached the highest figure that had been reached up to that time, being 1,849,945 tons. The following year, 1892, showed a very marked decrease, and in the year after, 1893, a still further decrease—a decrease which alarmed the people of Cape Breton and the people of Nova Scotia generally. The output for that year had fallen to 1,485,924 tons. I have a very lively recollection of that time. The coal miners of Cape Breton were dissatisfied. For half the year they had no work. If they got work for four or five or six months, they considered themselves very fortunate indeed. A good deal of discontent prevailed everywhere throughout the country, and representations in reference to the matter were made to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), who was then leading the government of Nova Scotia. We were told by our Conservative friends previous to 1892 and 1893, and for that matter down to 1896, that the national policy was sufficient to develop the coal trade of this country. If my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, when he was approached at that time, had followed the example of the Conservative government, he would have said: 'You have the national policy, which is sufficient to develop the coal trade of the country and why should I be asked to interfere?' That is exactly what he would have said if he had followed the lines laid down by the gentlemen of the Conservative party. But he did not choose to do that. He entered into negotiations with certain gentlemen of the city of Boston and with the gentlemen who then owned and controlled the coal mines of Cape Breton. The result was the formation of the Dominion Coal Company. I may be asked why I am referring to this matter. My purpose is to point out the position taken by the Conservative party of Nova Scotia on the question, as to what has brought about the present flourishing state of affairs in Cape Breton to which the hon. member for West Toronto referred a few evenings ago. I wish to show that the Conservative party in the province of Nova Scotia opposed the formation of the Dominion Coal Company. I am not stating anything new, for it is well known that the Conservative party time and again opposed this measure in the legislative assembly at Halifax. They put themselves on record against it. They pointed out that the formation of the Dominion Coal Company would mean the abandonment of the coal fields of Nova Scotia, and particularly of Cape Breton, to American speculators. Well, Mr. Speaker, that prediction has fallen as far from fulfilment as have the predictions of the late leader of the opposition with regard to the tariff policy of this administration. The coal trade of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton did not suffer from the policy inaugurated by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. On the contrary, it has since prospered as it never did before in the history of the country. In 1893, just a year before the organization of the Dominion Coal Company, the output had fallen to 1,485,924 tons. Last year the output rose to 3,625,865 tons or more than double that of 1893. That is not a very bad record, and if the Minister of Finance were not here I would enlarge at much more considerable length on the advantages of the policy inaugurated by him. But let me simply say that it is one which will redound to his everlasting credit and which he succeeded in causing to be adopted against the most determined and strenuous opposition of the Conservative party.

I wish to refer now to the position taken by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) on this iron and steel industry. When asked what were the reasons which had brought about the establishment of this industry, he replied that no doubt it was the advantageous position of Cape Breton with regard to the raw material which enters into that industry and its shipping facilities. Let me say that during the eighteen years in which the Conservative party was in power, Cape Breton was just as near the raw material as she is to-day and the shipping facilities were just as good. There was a bounty on iron and steel for years previous to 1896. Did that bring about the establishment of the iron and steel industry in Cape Breton? It did nothing of the kind. On the contrary, the position of Sydney was not as good perhaps in 1896 as it was some years previous. The hon. member for West Toronto said that the establish-

ment of this industry was also due to the bounty policy of the government. But that bounty was not a new thing. It was in existence under the late government. All these advantages then existed. The coal was just where it is now, the iron ore was there, the shipping facilities were there, all during these eighteen years of Conservative administration, but there was no iron or steel industry established. Let us come a little nearer the reasons which were important factors in the establishment of that industry. In the month of August, 1899, the mayor and council of the town of Sydney tendered Mr. Henry M. Whitney an address in the town hall. Mr. Whitney, in reply to that address, made the following observations :

> You have referred, Sir, to my connection with the mineral resources of Cape Breton, which I take to mean my connection with the Dominion Coal Company. It is now some six years ago that I first beheld your beautiful country, and then I came in connection with this enterprise. I was little aware at that time what the future had in store for me in connection with that undertaking. It has brought me many trials, many cares and few compensations. I saw in consequence of the changing conditions of trade here and elsewhere and in the carrying out of the necessary programme by which the trade might be extended and the men receive employment the year through, it had fallen to our lot to perform many an unpleasant duty and to receive more or less your criticism, but I believe now that everybody here will agree that the policy that was adopted by us was intended for good and has been for the greatest good of the greatest number, and now it can be shown that it is owing to that policy that we are now enabled to start this great enterprise. I hope that in your minds will be full justification for things that have been done in the past which did not meet the approval of you all.

That is what Mr. Whitney, who is the president of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and also the Dominion Coal Company, said with respect to the establishment of the iron industry. And I have no doubt if the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) were in his seat, he would be glad to admit that he was mistaken in his view of the causes which brought about the establishment of this industry in the county of Cape Breton.

The organ of the Conservative party in the town of Sydney, at that time, made these comments on this address to Mr. Whitney :

> Whatever commercial greatness is in store for Cape Breton it is due to his (Mr. Whitney's) initiative. Whatever progressive changes are taking place in this staid old town are due to his high capacity and potential energy.

That is the testimony given by the organ of the Conservative party in August, 1899, in the town of Sydney, and I am prepared to rest my case there. I have pointed out to you, Sir,—and I shall conclude my observations presently—that Nova Scotia has, during the past five or six years, in common with the rest of Canada, enjoyed a very general measure of prosperity. Our coal resources, our iron resources and our agricultural resources are being developed as they never were before. And let me tell you, Sir, that the fishing industry is in better condition to-day in Cape Breton than it was in 1896, when the present government took office. I have in my possession letters from people engaged in that industry, pointing out that the regulations enacted by the present government are far more satisfactory than were those governing this industry during the preceding years. As I have said, Nova Scotia is enjoying to-day a very general measure of prosperity. In the county of Cape Breton there are public works, which were neglected before 1896, but which are now being actively prosecuted. I speak more particularly with reference to my own county of which I have personal knowledge. And I can say, without fear of being contradicted successfully that, in the county of Cape Breton there are public works that were neglected by the late government before 1896, notwithstanding that from 1878, in almost unbroken succession to that day, the county had given the government two members to support it. The government of this day has been generous in the matter of looking after the requirements of that constituency with respect to public works. It must not be supposed, however, that the list has been completed. We expect that attention to public works will continue in the future as in the past, and I have no doubt whatever that it will.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have about finished the discussion of the matters which I intended to discuss when I arose. I wished particularly to speak about the Intercolonial Railway. And, permit me to say to our hon. friends on the opposite side of the House that they should be a little more generous in their treatment of that road. While the record of the Intercolonial Railway in the matter of earning money is not as satisfactory as we could all wish to have it, for my part I am not alarmed. I think we may well have faith that the future has much better things in store for us with respect to this matter. I have no doubt that the next report of the Intercolonial Railway will show that the present year has been a far more prosperous one for the road than last year. As I have said, I want the Intercolonial Railway still further developed. In my constituency, I want a considerable amount spent on the railway to protect its terminals. The road has terminals at Sydney and at North Sydney, and we are not satisfied that those terminals should remain as they are. The importance of the harbour at Sydney and the future it has in store for it, make it necessary that the Intercolonial Railway should have more commodious terminals both at Sydney and at North Sydney than it has. And I take it that the government and the hon. Minister of Railways will regard in a

favourable light the proposal to provide the accommodation for which I ask.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) has treated the House to a somewhat lengthy dissertation upon the development of the coal mines, the iron mines, the fisheries and the Intercolonial Railway. How far these subjects might be allowed to be discussed, were you, Mr. Speaker, to give a rigid interpretation to the rule that would confine the discussion to the amendment before the House, I would not like to be obliged to say. But in your generosity, you allowed the hon. gentleman to wander far afield. I do not regret it. All the hon. gentlemen who preceded the hon. member for Pictou have modelled their addresses upon similarly Liberal lines. We had some apprehensions as to the wisdom of moving our resolution so early in the debate, for fear that we might be confined by yourself, under the rules of the House, strictly to a discussion of that amendment, and not allowed to engage in the general criticism of a budget debate. But, remembering that a custom has been followed of moving the amendment early without, in practice, interfering with the rights of members to travel over the whole domain of finance and the condition of the country, we felt that we might draw upon the patience of the House and not follow strictly the rule laid down. I trust that you will show the same liberality to me as you have shown to hon. members who have preceded me.

I shall say but little with regard to the criticism of the hon. member from Cape Breton. He said there were evidences of prosperity throughout the country generally. We on this side agree with the hon. gentleman in that. It is quite enough to be obliged to deal with subjects on which we disagree without taking up time with those in which we agree. The hon. gentleman declared that he believed in free expenditure of public money. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) will agree with him there, and so will any of his political friends. There will be no dispute on this point from the government side of the House, but there may be a large class of people in the country who will not quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the free expenditure of public money which has characterized the management of the public affairs for the last four or five years is the very best thing in the interests of the country. But I might remind the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton that when he speaks in this way he is very severe on the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) who, for eighteen years, with his stentorian voice, with his extreme adjectives and with the invective which is peculiar to himself, condemned this free expenditure of public money in the very strongest terms, moved resolutions against it—in which his party supported him. He declared that the expenditure was entirely too heavy, when it was more than $10,000,000 less than it is to-day, and said it could be cut down, two, three or even four millions a year. He told us that the country was going to the bad on account of the extravagant expenditure of public money. And, when we take exception to the present heavy expenditure the member asks us why we do not come down to particulars, name the items to which we object and move to have them struck out. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Johnston, Cape Breton) and the attention of the leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who is sitting before me, and listening to me, to the fact that, during the eighteen years when the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was in opposition, there were only about three times, if my memory is correct, when he came down to particulars and moved to have items struck out. The hon. gentleman represented that it was not the duty of an opposition to come down to particulars, but it was their business, when the expenditure was too great to condemn the expenditures generally. So, before the hon. member for Cape Breton reads lectures to this side, he had better read up the 'Hansard' reports of the past and note the lesson which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave in those days, of the duty of an opposition.

The hon. member for Cape Breton says it is difficult to locate the members of the opposition on the tariff. Is the resolution we moved not concrete enough? How can the hon. member ask for more than that? But can the hon. gentleman locate members on his own side? Where, for instance, does he put the hon. member for South Oxford, who, in that valedictory address, which sounded so sweetly because it was likely to be his last, declared that he was now as he had ever been in favour of free trade, and had never changed his principles? How is that hon. gentleman in accord with the hon. Minister of Public Works who says: I am a protectionist; I was brought up in a protectionist school and have never abandoned my principles; and who practically declares that the leaven which he has introduced into the cabinet will leaven the whole lump and that he will make them all protectionists after a while. Then I ask my hon. friend, do they come down to particulars? Is he able to locate his friends? Can he locate the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), who says he is a free trader up to the hilt? Can he locate the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) who says he is a protectionist? He is not a free trader, but he is in favour of protecting the manufacturers of our country. I can go over the whole list, and I find there are scarcely three of them who agree upon one particular. They are as

divergent one from the other as day is from night or as darkness from light. Then will my young friend from Cape Breton try and locate his friends and tell us where they stand on this question, and after that he can direct his attention to hon. members on this side of the House.

The hon. member said the Intercolonial Railway management was perfectly satisfactory to him. I have no doubt of that. He told us in the beginning of his speech that he liked a heavy expenditure, and that is what is taking place on the Intercolonial Railway, and it is a benefit to the people down there. But I thought at the time he was praising the present management of the Intercolonial Railway, and saying it was so far ahead of what it had been before, that he forgot to tell the House, or could not be aware of the fact, that only this last year we paid $488,186 for expenses of management and running that railway, over and above all it earned. Is that satisfactory to him? If it is, I tell him it is not satisfactory to the country by any means. He nods his head in assent; then I can only tell him that his views differ from those of the great majority of the people of this country, because they would like to see all these great public undertakings pay their own way if possible. I think that good management would make the Intercolonial Railway pay its own way, and the fact that it has not been paying its own way is the best evidence that it is not properly managed. Besides the $488,186 that the management is behind in running that railway, at the same time they spent $3,652,000 on capital account within the last year. Yet the hon. member says it is perfectly satisfactory to him. Well, I can tell him that there are not many people who will agree with him.

He tells us that the Conservatives opposed the Dominion Coal Company; that it was one of the best things that happened to the country, the Conservatives were the only parties that opposed it. Where was the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) who sits beside him—where was he on this question? There was not a Conservative in this House, or outside of it who opposed that more strongly than the hon. member for Hants. The hon. member's criticisms would have much greater force if they were directed towards his own friends than against any member on this side of the House. He says that the policy followed by the present government has developed the iron industry, the coal industry, the fishing industry, the agricultural industry, How have they been developed? By the policy of the present government, he says. Well, if they have, then he ought to be satisfied. But what have they done for the farmer, for the fisherman? What have they done to develop the coal industries of the country, or the iron industries, beyond putting a bounty on iron? I fail to see that they have done anything, and I think the country fails to see it. I would like the hon. gentleman, when he makes that statement again, to come down to particulars, and to tell us what they have done which has favoured the development of those mines; until he does that we will be inclined to disagree with him in his conclusions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct attention for a short time to the budget speech. The Minister of Finance, in delivering his budget speech to this House, painted a glowing picture of the prosperity of the country and the condition of the people. Now, we agree with all that. No one is better pleased than we are to find the condition of the country so satisfactory, to see the people so prosperous and happy. We have no quarrel with the Minister of Finance in that respect; but the difference of opinion comes in when we inquire into the causes that brought about that prosperity, that is where we take issue with the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance and his friends attribute that prosperity to the businesslike management of the present government; they take credit to themselves for that prosperity because of the management of the affairs of this country during the last five or six years. We say that the prosperity is due to causes over which they had little or no control. Can we verify that statement? I think we can. Now, to begin with, I ask them what they did to bring about good times? They did nothing, so far as I know, to bring about good times, except in one particular—they have made a heavy expenditure of money. What did they do for the people? They did not give the people more employment, except in so far as this heavy expenditure of money by the government gave employment. They did nothing to make wages higher, they procured no new markets for the people, they secured no better values for the products of the people. Therefore, in all these lines they can take no credit to themselves for the good times. Neither did they reduce the cost of living to the people, nor the cost of transportation of the people's products from the place of production to the place of sale, or the place of shipment, so that they might get larger profits. In none of these respects have the present government contributed in any material sense to give prosperity to the country. They did not materially improve the method of transportation—no fast Atlantic service, no better transportation facilities, no reciprocity treaty so that the people could have better markets, although they promised if they came to power they would get such a treaty. They did nothing to makes times better except to spend enormous sums of the people's money during the time they have been in power.

Now, let me ask, What makes good times? We may reasonably answer, first,

good crops. Who gave the good crops? They would like to say they did, but it was Providence gave the good crops. Providence has given us good crops for several years past, and we are reaping to-day the results of these crops. But I think the most sanguine of the supporters of the government would hardly have the audacity to stand up and say that the government were in any respect responsible for the good crops. The next thing to cause good times are good prices. The supply and demand the world over regulate prices. Owing to the hard times we had for several years before this government came to power, the large surplus of manufactured goods in the country which had accumulated from over-production was used up, and a better demand arose for our products, then values went up and better prices obtained; then the people had a larger return for their labour and consequently enjoyed good times. There was also better employment for labour, because, following a cycle of hard times, better times prevailed in the United States and in Europe, as well as in Canada, and of course we had better times. But that was not at all in consequence of the management of the present government, they had nothing to do with it, but I say, it was the natural consequence of good times following a cycle of bad times, when consumption had overtaken production, and when manufacturers were therefore prepared to go on again, and the people on their part were ready to absorb the heavy output of the mills and factories of the country. There was a better market for labcur, because there was an increased demand for labour all over the world, and that also helped to make good times. Then we have to fall back on the one single item in which, as I admit, the government may take credit for having contributed to good times, and that is by the heavy expenditure of money that they have made.

What have they done? They have expended very heavily and very liberally throughout their term of office. I take the gross receipts and expenditures of the country from the time they came into power and the statement is as follows: In 1897 they received $37,829,778, but they expended $42,972,755, very much more than they received. In 1898 they collected $40,556,510, but they expended $45,334,281, showing a very heavy expenditure. In 1899 they collected $46,743,102, but they spent $51,542,635, a very heavy expenditure. In 1900 they collected $51,031,466, but they spent that year $52,717,466. In 1901 they collected $52,516,332, but they spent $57,982,866. And in the year 1902 they will have collected $52,516,332, but they will have spent $65,250,000. I merely read these figures to let the House and the country see to what an extent they have contributed to good times. They have contributed to good times by the heavy expenditures they have made during these six years. I take the six years before they came into power and what do I find? I find that the expenditure in 1891 was $40,793,208, in 1892, $42,272,136, in 1893, $40,853,727, in 1894, $43,008,233, in 1895, $42,872,338, and in 1896, $44,096,383. The average expenditure for these six years under the Conservative administration was $42,316,000, while the average expenditure of the present government for the last six years was $52,633,334 a year, or an expenditure each year of $10,317,204 more for these six years than their predecessors expended in the previous six years when hon. gentlemen now on the other side of the House said that the expenditure was $4,000,000 too high. When we consider the $10,000,000 of an expenditure over and above the average expenditure of the predecessors of hon. gentlemen we can easily see how it has helped to some extent in creating good times and giving employment to labour. If you put that amount of money into circulation every year throughout the country, $10,000,000 more than their predecessors spent, it is bound to bring about better times. Then I say that this is the only particular in which these hon. gentlemen have assisted in bringing about better times than those which existed formerly. Although they said that the expenditure of their predecessors was $4,000,000 too high, they have expended $10,000,000 a year more than their predecessors during the last six years.

Now, the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) treats us to a lot of figures concerning the trade and commerce of the country to show that the financial transactions of the country all point to good times. We do not dispute that, so it is quite unnecessary to waste time as to that. There is no doubt about that. We agree with him and we are as much pleased as the hon. gentleman is that such a showing is able to be made at the present time. But, what we do take exception to is his manipulation of the figures and the selection of the periods which he made for his comparison with the showing which he made for his own party. The ingenuity displayed by the hon. gentleman is worthy a magician, for, if you look at it, you cannot help but be struck by the ingenuity of the hon. gentleman, although it is not what we would expect from a Minister of Finance. In making his comparison in regard to the annual increase of the debt he said that under the Conservative party which was in power for 18 years, the average increase in the debt during that time was $6,563,075 a year, while, under the Liberal party, during the six years which they have been in power, the average increase of the debt was $1,996,514 a year. He took in one instance 18 years and in the other six years. But he forgot to tell the House and the country that in those 18 years there were included five or six years of the very worst times that Canada has

experienced. In our county, on account of the drought, the people were obliged to sell their cattle at from $5 a head upwards to keep them from starving. There was no food for them. The people were bringing feed all the way from the Ottawa valley. The province of Ontario was in a most abject condition on account of the drought which prevailed that season and in addition to this there was a bad season before this one and a bad season succeeding it. During these three years the crops were destroyed, yet the hon. Minister of Finance compares these three years with three of the most prosperous years during the time that the present government has been in power and thinks that the comparison is a fair one. Then, he takes the public debt, and what is contained in that? There is included the operations of these six years. He stops at the very year when there is a small addition to the debt of $2,000,000. He tells us that before this year is out he will have to add $6,000,000 more to the debt, and he tells us as well that he has $6,000,000 of borrowed capital from the banks, for which we have to pay 3½ per cent interest, and which is due on the 1st of July. Why did he not add that to his statement of the debt? It is borrowed, it has been spent, and we must borrow money to pay it. It should have been added to the debt, and if he had done that what would have been the result? The result would have been that the average increase of the debt during this six-year period, instead of being as he says, $1,996,514, would have been $2,332,567. That is what the House and the country should have been told, because the hon. gentleman should not have undertaken to deceive the country. He knows that the money is spent, he knows that this $6,000,000 which have been borrowed to meet the expenditure will be due in a few months. We are now in March and there are only April, May and June until the year is up. When the year is up he will have to add this $6,000,000 to the debt, and he will have to provide $6,000,000 to pay the temporary loan which he has borrowed from the bank and on which he is paying 3½ per cent interest. He did not tell the House or the country that, but he tried to make the House and the country believe that he had only increased the debt to the small extent of $1,996,514 a year. He forgot to tell the people of this country that in these 18 years were included these three years during which were incurred the heavy expenditure on capital account for the Canadian Pacific Railway—1884, 1885 and 1886. We spent in 1884, $23,695,135 on capital account, nearly all of which went for the Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1885 we spent $14,245,841 on capital account, and in 1886, $26,751,414. the year in which we took back from the Canadian Pacific Railway land for which we gave them $10,195,520 of money to help tide them over the temporary embarrassment in their financial condition. He forgot to tell the people that these were included in these eighteen years to make up the average increase in the debt of the Conservative party of $6,000,000, whereas, according to the hon. gentleman, their increase is not quite $2,000,000 a year.

That was an unfair thing for the Minister of Finance to do. It was something that the people of this country and the members of this House did not expect from him. It is a most ingenious way of presenting figures, but it is an unfair way. It reminds me of an incident I once heard on the platform. A gentleman was quoting figures which were about as unfair as those quoted by the Minister of Finance in his budget speech, and this man said: I challenge any man to contradict me; these are figures and figures don't lie. The reply came: No, but liars will figure. When a man in the high position of the Finance Minister places such misleading figures before the country, he is doing a great injustice to his opponents, and he is doing less than justice to his own friends because when the electorate discover the deception they will be likely to visit their indignation on the Finance Minister and on the party he belongs to. Take the expenditure of these three years on capital account, and it will run up the public debt at an average of $3,593,000 a year for each year of the 18 years. But the Finance Minister spreads the deficit over 18 years, whereas if he had taken out these three exceptional years the increase under the Conservative government would be only $3,454,000 a year instead of $6,000,000. Does the Minister of Finance think that he has done his full duty in hiding these facts from the House? I repeat that his arrangement of these figures is very unfair, and we would have expected better from him. The Minister of Finance claims that his government since they came into power have had aggregate surpluses amounting to $19,000,000. Well, what of that? Did they put these surpluses to good use. If that aggregate surplus were applied to reducing the public debt it would have made an admirable showing for them, but the fact is that their extravagant expenditure has used up all these surpluses, and instead of reducing the public debt as they should have done, they have increased it. But the Finance Minister did not tell the country that. Not at all. It would not have suited his purpose.

The comparison which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) made with regard to our trade with Great Britain was also unfair. He wanted to show that the tariff preference his government had given to England had increased our trade with Great Britain, and had resulted in some substantial good to the mother country, but the figures which he quoted to prove this were tainted with the same defect of unfairness.

When he mentioned the figures of our trade with Great Britain, I asked the hon. gentleman if he would be good enough to give us the figures of our trade with the United States, because I knew that if he did so they would show that the proportionate increase of our trade with the United States was greater than it was with Great Britain, and therefore that his whole argument would have been destroyed. But what was the reply of the Finance Minister ? He said that I had asked him the same question exactly at the same stage of the budget speech last year, and he did not answer it then nor would he answer it now. If the Finance Minister desired to be fair why did he not reply. In that respect his argument was defective and again it was unfair. But I will supply the figures for the Finance Minister, and I think they will convince the House that his government cannot pride themselves much on the alleged benefits which the preferential tariff has conferred on Great Britain. Our import trade with Great Britain in 1898, under the preferential tariff, was $27,000,000, and with the United States it was $43,000,000. In 1899 our trade with Great Britain under the preference was $37,000,000, and with the United States it was $54,000,000. In 1900 our trade with Great Britain under the preference was $37,000,000, and with the United States it was $62,000,000. In 1901, when Great Britain was receiving the full benefit of the preferential tariff, our trade with Great Britain had dropped from $37,985,000 in 1900 to $37,270,000 in 1901, while during the same period our trade with the United States had increased from $62,000,000 in 1900 to $65,500,000 in 1901. The Finance Minister did not tell the people of the country that. The only conclusion that can be drawn from such a state of affairs is that the preference which the government have been boasting has done so much for the mother country, has done absolutely nothing at all for the mother country. On the other had, it has done a great injustice to the manufacturers of Canada, and it has helped the labouring men in Germany who are sending goods here through the ports of Great Britain to get the benefit of the preference, and to sell their goods in Canada to the detriment of our own working people. But the Finance Minister told us that we had a large revenue now. Yes, we have a large revenue and we have a large expenditure as well. While the revenue is very large on the one hand, the expenditure is very large on the other, and there is no saving on that account. The policy of this government has been that the larger the revenue they get, the greater the expenditure they make. When the people are told by this government that they have collected $10,000,000 a year more than did their predecessors, and that they have had a surplus of over $3,000,000 a year, the people will naturally expect that that surplus should be applied to reducing the national debt. But the people can ask in vain for that to be done. The surplus has not gone to reduce the national debt ; it has been wiped out by extravagant expenditure. No matter how much taxes this government collects from the people the debt runs up year after year, and there is no lessening of the burdens of taxation. If I were to ask in my county of a farmer there : What do you think of your neighbour who had good crops for the last six years, who got good prices for the products he sold, but who still increases the mortgage of $1,000 which he had on his farm. Suppose I said : This farmer has made more money by several hundred dollars a year than he ever made before, but he has been adding a hundred dollars a year to the mortgage ; it was $1,000 the first year, $1,100 the next year, $1,200 the next year, $1,300 the next year, and at the end of six years during which time he had better crops than ever before and larger returns, the mortgage was $1,600. Suppose I asked what do you think of that kind of a farmer. Surely the reply would be : That man must soon go to the poor-house, because if he cannot reduce the mortgage during good times he can never hope to do so in bad times. Well, the Finance Minister is administering the affairs of this country somewhat on a par with that improvident farmer. During all these good years when he has taken $10,000,000 a year more out of the pockets of the people, he did not reduce the mortgage, but on the contrary added to it to the extent of $3,000,000 a year. That is what a farmer would call very improvident farming, and that is the kind of thing that would compel the farmer who would do that, to lose his farm and clear out of the country. Let us apply the same principle to a merchant. During the last five years he has done a larger business, and made larger profits, but nevertheless he has not saved a cent, and his expenses have been running up all the time. The creditors of such a merchant would naturally say : Go into insolvency ; you are not fit to control a business ; your whole management proclaims that you are in no sense of the word a business man. If you cannot pay off your indebtedness during good times, it is utterly impossible for you to maintain your standing in hard times, and the result will be that sooner or later you must go into insolvency, because you are bankrupt. The same thing is true of a country, and that must be the result of the way in which the hon. the Finance Minister has managed the affairs of the country for the past five years.

He goes on to tell us that there are heavy liabilities maturing in the next few years which must be provided for. In 1903 there are liabilities falling due to the amount of $9,733,000. Suppose we have hard times and money becomes scarce and the rate of interest goes up, and the hon. gentleman goes into the money market to borrow. Our credit will not be so good as it would be if we had saved in good times. But instead of

saving the surplus which he has had from year to year and applying it on the debt, he is increasing the expenditure and adding large sums to the debt. In 1904 he says he will have to provide for $20,926,000. Is he likely to do that successfully if hard times come? What is he doing to-day to improve the credit of the country? He told us that the credit of Canada was not quite as good to-day as it was when he negotiated the last loan.

Mr. EDWARDS. He did not say that. He said that the condition of the money market was not quite as good.

Mr. SPROULE. He said it could not be expected that our securities, quoted along side of British consols, would show as well now as they did then, because the condition of the money market is not as good. What is that but saying that our credit does not stand as high? If our securities will not sell at as high a figure, our credit cannot be as good. The hon. gentleman, knowing that he must within the next two years provide for obligations amounting to $30,000,000, goes on with his extravagant expenditure, and makes no provision for these heavy obligations. If the day of adversity comes and we are likely to have bad times in the near future, because the cycle of bad times follows the cycle of good times as surely as night follows day—we shall be obliged to pay dear for it.

The hon. Minister of Finance said that the Postmaster General had made a favourable showing in his department, and was entitled to a great deal of credit. He said: 'Look what he has done, he has thrown off one-third of the postage and yet has made the Post Office Department almost self-sustaining.' The Postmaster General was in my riding in the last election, and said there that when the Liberals came to power there was a deficit of $700,000 in the Post Office Department, but he had wiped it out and made the department self-sustaining. I said at a meeting at the same place that the department was to-day over $300,000 behind, and I was flatly contradicted by a gentleman in the audience, who said that the Postmaster General would not lie. How much was the deficit last year? The Minister of Finance referred to it, but he did not tell us how much it was. It was $461,000. That is the way the Post Office Department has been made self-sustaining. How did the Postmaster General succeed in making a good showing for a year or two? He did it, to Canada's disgrace, by getting out the Jubilee stamps, which he sold for $300,000 or $400,000; and the money came out of people who got no return for it in the world.

Mr. COCHRANE. Out of his dupes.

Mr. SPROULE. Out of his dupes, as my hon. friend says; and he put the money into the treasury to wipe out the deficit, and then boasted that he had made a splendid showing by his economy and that in future the Post Office Department would be self-sustaining. My opponent and also the reform paper in my riding said the same thing. As I have shown, there was last year a deficit of $488,000 on the Intercolonial Railway and a deficit of $461,000 in the Post Office Department. That is the economy, the good management of these hon. gentlemen.

We have been told that the government have been very successful with their immigration policy. I have here the figures of the number of immigrants they have brought into Canada and what do they show? But first I will give the amounts of money spent on immigration. The Conservative government, in its last year, spent $120,000 on immigration, which hon. gentlemen opposite said was entirely too much. The year previous the Conservative government spent $127,000. Every year hon. gentlemen opposite were decrying the expenditure on immigration, declaring that it was money thrown away. But in 1896, the first year of the reform government, they spent on immigration $127,000. The next year they spent $261,000, more than double the amount; the next year they spent $355,000; the next year, $434,000; and the next year, 1901, $444,729. They declared, when the Conservative government were in power, that $120,000 was too much to spend on immigration, that it was money thrown away; and yet in six years they have run the expenditure up to nearly four times that amount. These are the men of economy. They boast of the large number of immigrants they have brought into the country—16,800 in 1896 and 49,000 in 1901; but remember that they spent four times as much money in 1901 while there are not four times as many immigrants brought in. So that they have no right to take any credit to themselves for any great good they have done to the country in this respect. An hon. gentleman draws my attention to the quality of the immigrants. As that subject has been very ably and fully dealt with already, I need do no more than remind the House and the country that in bringing in Doukhobors, Galicians, Poles and Finns, the government will not elevate the standard of civilization in this country. If there is any fusion of these people with the Anglo-Saxon race, the effect must be to lower the high standard of our people. This is not the kind of immigration that this country requires, and I was glad to hear the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) condemn it in strong language the other evening.

Every word he said with regard to it was entitled to respect in this House and the country. How did hon. gentlemen opposite run up that heavy expenditure? They ran it up largely in paying salaries. When they came into office, we had in Great Britain, Ireland, on the continent and

in the United States agents and we paid out in salaries $15,000. How many did we have in that year, when these hon. gentlemen took office? We had eleven, and we paid them salaries amounting to $15,000. The next year they had forty-three, and paid them in salaries $36,497. The year following the number was thirty-nine, and the salaries $35,728. The year after that they had thirty agents, and paid them $36,294. Then the next year, the number was raised to forty-three, and the salaries increased to $40,570. So that from $15,000, which was the amount paid in the last year of the late government, the expenditure was increased to $40,500. And that only represents the amount paid to the salaried agents. Over and above those, there are 250 agents in the United States who are working on commission. These hon. gentlemen boast about the results they have accomplished in immigration, but taking into account the additional number of agents they employ and the vast increase in the expenditure and the quality of the immigrants they have brought in, the country will be inclined to give them blame rather than credit for the policy they have pursued.

Towards the close of his budget speech, the hon. Minister of Finance let us into a little secret. He told us that he had decided not to touch the tariff. Some people, he said, were complaining, but on the whole the tariff was doing justice to all. And he told us this, knowing well that by his preferential tariff with England the woollen men were being forced to the wall, the operators forced out of employment, their mills kept on short time, some working on less than half time, and their output largely reduced. Deputations had waited on the minister and made to him the strongest representations; but in the hardness of his heart he decided to do nothing. Neither will he do anything for the lumbermen, who pleaded to have the tariff raised in their interests. Nor will he do anything for the agriculturalists, although he told them how much he intended doing for them when in power. And he will give nothing to the implement manufacturers, notwithstanding the fact that last year nearly $2,000,000 of machines were imported from the United States, thus displacing our own to that extent, to the advantage of the American agriculturalists, to whom the labourers employed in these American implement factories furnish a home market. Nor will he do anything for the beet-root sugar men, notwithstanding the importance of that industry. He has allowed them to bring in their machinery free of duty for one year, but refuses to do anything more. He will neither give them a bounty nor raise the duty on imported sugar, and if that industry cannot succeed with the advantages it has, it may die. He is determined not to give it any bounty to keep it alive. I ask why not do for the beet-root sugar men what he has done for the iron and steel men? Is the farmer not as important as the iron men? If a bounty were paid on the manufacture of beet-root sugar, the farmers would get 60 cents of every dollar invested in that industry. But the hon. gentleman stiffens his neck and hardens his heart, when the agricultural industry is in question, and says he will do nothing.

Then we had a valedictory address from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We had heard threatening and mutterings of thunder for some days previous. When the hon. the Minister of Public Works was giving out his views as a protectionist, we tried to draw out the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and did succeed in drawing him out, to this extent, that he told us the time would come when he should pronounce himself with no uncertain sound. That day came and with it came his valedictory address, for we are told that that was the last time we should hear his melodious voice in this House on the tariff. These hon. gentlemen opposite kept his mouth closed the last six years, and if they thought they were going to the country very shortly, they would have muzzled him again. The hon. gentleman has been obliged to be silent all these years and content himself with simply drawing his salary in a position, which he himself declared was an utterly useless one. He told us that he was a free trader on principle, that he had never changed his views, and that those who had changed theirs were going on a very unsound principle. Then he proceeded to give us some information about Conservative scandals, and even brought poor old Thomas McGreevy out of his grave. If anything could show how uncomfortable the hon. gentleman must be in his present position it was this seeking to revive again a dead issue in the person of Thomas McGreevy, who has long ago gone to answer for whatever sins he may have committed. The hon. gentleman gave us an epitaph appropriate to McGreevy, but I think it would have been more appropriate had he given the House an epitaph that would have suited his own career and demise. I think that when the hon. gentleman does leave the political stage, his country would be disposed to put on his tomb stone the epitaph which a Cornishman placed over his departed wife, only changing the name:

> My wife is dead, here she lies,
> Nobody laughs, and nobody cries,
> Where she has gone and how she fares,
> Nobody knows and nobody cares.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce went on to discuss the census and to revamp his old favourite argument about the census of 1891. But in telling us how disappointing it was, he forget to say anything about the cost. What did the census of 1891 cost? It cost $532,000 all told. And

the Minister of Finance told us the other day that on the present census we have already spent $948,510, and there is a lot more in the estimates. I am told that the expenditure will amount to over one and a quarter million dollars before we are through with it, so that while the census of 1891 only cost the country half a million dollars, the present census will cost over a million and a quarter. The hon. gentleman was careful to say nothing about that. He said that the last census taken was a better one. Well, so it ought to be, for it cost so much more. Why, there are twice as many enumerators, and the expenditure is still going on.

The hon. gentleman next took up the exodus. He said that the census was most dishonestly taken in 1891. He gave no evidence whatever, but simply made this gratuitous statement, insulting these 350 people who were sworn to do their duty, and who, I believe, did honestly do their duty. Many of these men were just as honest, I am sure, as he was, just as desirous of doing right and of acting conscientiously as the hon. gentleman ever was. He insulted them, declared publicly before the world, in effect, that they were dishonest, that they were untruthful, that they were perjurers, in that they had fraudulently and dishonestly packed the census. And what have they done this for, according to the hon. gentleman? To make a good showing for the Conservative party and to prove that the national policy had done a great deal for the industries of this country. The hon. member for Pictou reminded him that this could not be the case, because the election of 1891 was over before the taking of the census began. The hon. gentleman went on to dilate upon the exodus. What brought about the exodus? he asks. When he told us that the exodus was great during the time when the Conservatives were in power, my mind followed the same train of thought as that of the hon. member for Pictou. I thought it was not hard to find out what was the cause of that exodus. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) himself told us that he had travelled five times the length of Canada and had talked to hundreds of thousands of people dilating on the curse of the national policy and of advantage of free trade, and trying to educate the people up to the belief that Canada was a most undesirable place, that the Elysian fields lay to the south, and that the worst thing for Canada was the national policy. Was it a wonder that the people took the hon. gentleman at his word? Was it a wonder that they came to the conclusion that Canada was not a good place to live in, and so left for the United States in hundreds and thousands? But he did not content himself with lecturing and speaking to the people who came to hear him in different parts of the country. He made known his views to the people abroad. I have here 'The Economist,' of the 13th of Februray, 1892, with an article signed Richard J. Cartwright. Here are the opinions of the hon. gentleman given over his own name. The hon. gentleman was blaming the Conservative party for not bringing in immigrants. Now, this article was going to the very place whence we desire to draw immigrants, and this is what the article says:

> But it is not equally well known on your side of the Atlantic that it has become painfully apparent for some time back, to every one who has been at the pains to examine the evidence which has accumulated on the subject, that, even in that comparatively short space of time, this most ill-advised policy——

This refers to the national policy——

> —has resulted in a tremendous exodus of the very choicest portion of the population of Canada, and in a very grave depreciation in the selling value of farm lands and of town and village property throughout all the older sections of the Dominion, including Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward.

The hon. gentleman says that there is an exodus, but he had been for years before telling the people that Canada was not a desirable country to live in, because people were ground down with taxes:

> This has been accompanied, as is usual in such cases by an immense increase in the aggregate indebtedness of the Dominion in the shape of large additions to its federal, provincial and municipal debts, and also to the mortgage debts incurred by private individuals, and liabilities incurred for the construction of railroads—by far the greater part of all which obligations are held abroad.
>
> Briefly, in these thirteen years, there has been a great displacement of wealth, caused mainly by artificial legislation but (as regards the older provinces) absolutely no increase at all of the collective wealth of the community. Two or three cities and perhaps a score of towns, have increased considerably, and a few hundred individuals (who have been privileged to tax their fellows for their private advantages) have grown rich by this system of legalized robbery; but the great mass of the population and notably the agriculture class are distinctly poorer and less prosperous than they were twelve years ago.

We had been inviting the English farmers to come out and settle in our country, but the hon. gentleman steps in and says: Consider the condition of the country you are asked to go to. Were they likely to come after what the hon. gentleman said? This article was copied in the newspapers all over England, and it was copied in the newspapers of the continent of Europe, the very places where we were looking for immigrants.

> Take the returns of the recent census, New Brunswick, with an area of 30,000 square miles inhabited by about 60,000 families has added just sixty-one souls to her population from 1881 to 1891.

Then he goes on to speak of Nova Scotia. I do not wish to go over the whole argu-

ment. It is interesting, but largely in the same line. He goes on to say:

As to the amount of taxation, the agriculture class has been simply bled white.

Over and above the taxes actually paid into the Dominion treasury to be expended for so called federal purposes, they have been mulcted during all these years under the protective system of at least an equal amount, which is either totally wasted or goes into the pockets of a very small number of protected manufacturers.

The exact amount levied, or, to speak more accurately, pilaged, in this way can hardly be estimated; but it is known not to be less than a sum fully equal to the entire amount credited to the treasury, and probably much exceeds it. In fact, the Canadian tariff (which has been, in the most literal manner dictated by the protected manufacturers) is so constructed that there are innumerable cases in which for each single dollar paid into the treasury, three, four, five, and even ten dollars are taken out of the pockets of the consumer; nay, in many instances the tax is made absolutely prohibitive, so that the public are heavily taxed without any benefit to the revenue.

Then he goes on to speak of the duty on sugar, and proceeds:

Taken altogether, it is well within the mark to say that while the present nominal amount of the taxation of the Dominion is about thirty-one millions of dollars, the genuine actual taxation, i.e., the sum taken out of the pockets of the people for the benefit of the manufacturers in addition to that paid into the treasury is certainly not less and is probably a good deal more than sixty millions.

That is over and above the amount actually taken for revenue purposes. Is it any wonder that we did not get immigrants or that the people left the country? The hon. gentleman goes on:

It would be well if this were all, but, unfortunately, the economic results of the protective system adopted by Canada in 1879, grievous as they are, fade almost into insignificance compared with the moral and political pollution it has brought in its train.

Then he says:

One thing, I think, ought to be clear to all intelligent Englishmen, and that is, that it is utterly impossible that Canada can prosper under her present condition—isolated and in danger of being still more completely isolated from the trade and commerce with the entire continent to which she belongs geographically, losing her population at the rate of one million and a half in ten years (if the official statements of the present government are to be relied upon) and subject, at the same time, to a system of taxation and of organized political corruption such as you have happily been strangers to since the days of Walpole or Charles II.

Then he goes on to say:

The Liberal party of Canada, and, indeed, the great bulk of the people of the Dominion wish well to the mother country, and it is very far from their desire to do anything which in the long run can injure her interests, but their duty in the premises is plain.

As Canadians, they must consult the advantage of Canada first, and if it be,—as it appears to them it is beyond all possible controversy—for the best moral and material interests of Canada to form a commercial treaty which will ensure perfect free trade with the United States, you on your side must be content to allow them to try the experiment. It is, and always has been, my own very strong desire that this measure should be so conducted that it might ultimately result in removing all possible causes of conflict between the two great divisions of the British race, and end in bringing them together in a firm and durable alliance.

That is, the Americans and us. Mr. Blake said it would bring them together in a firm manner, because if they ever succeeded in getting it, it must ultimately result not only in commercial union but in political union. He goes on to say:

I see every reason to hope that that end may be accomplished; but, whether or no, I see still more clearly that some very radical change in the position of affairs in Canada must be brought about, and that very speedily, or else that the Canadian confederation must perish, rotten before it has had time to become even half ripe, as the result of the vice and folly with which its affairs have been administered.

This is the information he gives the people in England. Then he goes on to say:

But in truth the question between the two Canadian parties is in reality an economic one, and in the long run resolves itself into this—shall Canada be governed for the benefit of the people of Canada, or for the profit of a few hundred protected manufacturers, backed by a subsidized press and a purchased majority in the legislature? To talk of loyalty in such a connection is little short of political blasphemy, and I can only express my surprise that such a shallow subterfuge should have obtained even a momentary credence in the mind of any Englishman of even average intelligence.

I have the honour to remain,
Your obedient servant,
RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

That is the hon. gentleman who, as I say, for 18 years went up and down this country declaring that a protective policy was ruining it, was bleeding the farmers white, was taking $60,000,000 out of the pockets of the people for every $30,000,000 that was gathered in revenue, and that the only solution was commercial union with the people of the United States. And yet we are told that he sat on that Joint High Commission, and if the information we have is correct, when he was offered unrestricted commercial union with the people of the United States, he had not the hardihood to accept it. When we get these papers we will no doubt find that to be the case. But, as I say, the policy which he declared Canada required, and which he preached for years to the people of Canada and to the people of the mother country, that very policy, when it was offered to him, he dare not accept. Then what will the people of Canada think of his integrity, think of his intelligence, think of his consistency? I am afraid they will not give him much credit for either. Then I take up the 'Economist,' and it comments upon that article:

The Liberal party which Sir Richard thinks is not sufficiently understood in this country, partly as the result of deliberate misrepresentation. That policy he states 'lies in introducing a system of perfect continental free trade, or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States.'

The 'Economist' goes on to say :

Such a commercial union with the States as he proposes would not ultimately be prejudicial to Great Britain. Even if it were otherwise, however, 'as Canadians they must consult the advantage of Canada first, and if it be—as it appears to them it is beyond all possible controversey—for the best moral and material interests of Canada' to effect such a union, we on our side must be content to let them try the experiment.

Such in brief are the commercial policy Sir Richard Cartwright advocates and the reasons he urges for its adoption. That it is a wise policy we cannot however admit.

Now then I read that for the purpose of letting the people of Canada see why we did not get immigrants. The fact is that the Minister of Trade and Commerce and his friends, during all those years, were educating the people of Canada to believe that Canada was not a fit place to live in, and the result was that in many constituencies their electors believed them and left the country in such large numbers that when the election came around in 1891 they were defeated, defeated as I believe in consequence of the education which had been given the people by the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself when he was travelling up and down the country, as he told us the other night he had travelled from one end of Canada to the other. Is it to be wondered at that the people left the country, that we did not get immigrants from England or Ireland, or Scotland, or the continent ? Why, this letter was reproduced in different parts of the United States to show the inferior conditions prevailing in Canada, and I am told the Yankees had the photograph of the hon. minister on the top of the letter, showing that the United States was the most desirable country for immigrants to go to, and that Canada was the last place in the world for them to go to. That is the work of the hon. member for South Oxford, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who gave us his valedictory address the other night.

Well, we are told by these hon. gentleman that it is impossible to do anything to protect the farmer, because, they say, if the farmer has more than he can use he must send the surplus abroad, and as long as he has a surplus you cannot protect him. I heard the hon. member for Russell say the same the other night, and I heard another hon. member from the west say the same thing. I ask the attention of the House for a moment to the result of the duty that was put on pork in 1890. I looked at the quantity of pork brought into the country in 1887, 1888 and 1889. I find that during those three years before the duty was put on, 72,480,606 pounds of pork and pork products were brought into Canada. After putting on a duty of 2 cents a pound on cured meats and 3 cents on fresh meats, what was the result ? During the three years subsequent, instead of 72,000,000 pounds being brought in, only 25,000,000 pounds were brought in, about one-third of what it was before. Then can you not protect the farmer ? Can you not do him some good ? Pork is one of the lines which the farmer depends on in this country, one of the lines out of which he makes his money ; and while this immense quantity of pork was being brought into this country to feed the labouring men, the lumbermen and the fishermen, the Canadian farmer was obliged to find a market for his pork in Britain and to deduct the cost of transport from the profits he would have received if he could have sold his pork at home. We find to-day that only a few thousand pounds are coming into this country instead of the millions of pounds that were coming in before. I find that in 1878, years before that duty was put on, the amount brought in was 17,717,628 pounds. Take 1895, a year or two after it was put on, and only 4,259,697 pounds was brought in. Now the conditions were much the same, and the amount of imports would doubtless have increased every year had it not been for the duty. In face of these facts will any one say that the farmers of Canada cannot be protected ? If hon. gentlemen opposite believe that, why don't they take the duty off pork to-day ? They dare not do it ; yet they have the hardihood to tell the farmers that they cannot be protected, that you cannot increase the value of his product by putting on a duty, because, as long as he has a surplus to export, the home market is no better for him than a foreign market.

I said at the beginning of my speech that there was no agreement between hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to what trade policy this country should adopt. The Minister of Finance has one policy, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has another policy, the Minister of Public Works has a totally different one. One wants free trade, another protection and another a revenue tariff. The hon. gentleman who spoke last said he was in favour of a revenue tariff. What is a revenue tariff ? It was a protective tariff under the old government, but it is called a revenue tariff under the present government. Yet, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce denounced that for years as legalized robbery. Then, if we take some of the members of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, we find, as for instance the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd), that they are in favour of protection. Each one is in favour of protecting a line of industry in which he, himself, is interested. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) is in favour of the protection of labour, in favour of keeping out Chinamen and Japanese. He is in

favour of protecting the labourers in so far as keeping out that servile labour that comes into competition with our own labourers is concerned, and he is in favour of protection to labour so far as keeping out the products of servile, or convict, labour is concerned. But, he will not go any further. He is only in favour of protection for the line in which he is most interested. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) was a member of a deputation that came to Ottawa to ask that a duty be put on lumber, yet he is not in favour of protection. He is only in favour of protection on lumber. There is no settled or definite policy with hon. gentlemen opposite. Their ministry have no agreement. We have always been told that cabinet ministers ought to be agreed upon the same thing, that there should not be any diversity of opinion amongst them, because if they disagree with each other they ought to resign. Why does not the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) resign. He is one of the most out-and-out protectionists in Canada to-day. If this policy prevails, why does not the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce resign, because his policy is the antipodes of it? They have all agreed to hang together but they have no definite policy except to hold on to office and divide the spoils. They will hold on to office as long as they can and as long as there are any spoils to divide. They say that they have a transportation policy. We have heard of that for six years. It is as indefinite to-day as ever it was. They were going to build up Montreal, going to make a fine harbour there, going to build elevators, and they were going to do wonderful things, but they are living in the future, and that policy is indefinite to-day. At that time they were going to extend the work on the Welland canal, they were going to improve Port Colborne, the Rideau canal, the St. Lawrence canal, they were going to improve the French river and the harbours of the Georgian bay, but they have no definite or fixed policy and there is no agreement between them as to what their policy is to be. They have no national pride. If they have they have never shown it. They have no national aspiration. If they have they have not shown it and they do not give the people any evidence of it. National aspiration and ambition have no attraction for them. There is no union amongst them. They proclaim themselves as loyal, yet, they are afraid to say that they are in favour of Great Britain. The right hon. Prime Minister, tells us that he is going home to the coronation ceremony. He told the House a few days ago that he has been invited to go to England, and while there to consider the question of Imperial defence, but, he says he does not want to do it and he refuses to do it. Yet he will go over there and tell them about his loyalty, and he will be put in the front rank of the celebration as he was at the jubilee. He is right in the band wagon as representing the first colony in the empire, yet, he tells us that he will not go home and discuss Imperial defence.

Mr. DAVIS. He won't go home till morning.

Mr. SPROULE. I am inclined to think that with this situation and what the people think of it he will be inclined to stay out all night and think it over till morning. The opposition have a definite policy. They have a policy that is embodied in the resolution now before the House. Will any one say that they are not agreed on that policy? Hon. members will see when the vote comes that we are all agreed upon it. Has there been one dissenting voice in this House raised in objection to that policy? Is it not concrete enough? I think it will suit the most fastidious. Put it alongside of the various and diversified policies that hon. gentlemen opposite have had.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What duty will you put on coal oil?

Mr. SPROULE. Our policy is a protective policy in the interests of the people of the country. What did the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) do? He told the people that when he was brought to power he would take the duty off coal oil. There is a duty on coal oil to-day. The hon. gentleman did not keep his word. He was either dishonest then or he is untruthful now, because he told the people that he would take the duty off coal oil and he has not done it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What duty are you going to put on?

Mr. SPROULE. The policy that we have submitted to this House and to the country aims at keeping Canada for the Canadians.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How much duty on coal oil?

Mr. SPROULE. It aims at building up and developing Canada on broad national lines, not upon sectional lines as does the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. It aims at keeping the market of Canada for Canada's own people and not giving it to the people of the United States, or the people of Germany or to the people even of England. Our first duty is to look after the interests of our own people. It aims at protecting the labour of the country, it aims at protecting the manufacturers of the country and not allowing this country to be made a slaughter market for the surplus products of foreign countries. It aims at protecting the mechanics of the country, at developing the mining industries of the country and lastly it aims at protecting the most important class of all, the farmers of the country on the lines I have indicated. This is our policy. I claim that it is a

definite policy and one that in my judgment will commend itself to the respect of the people of Canada. Put that beside the vaccilating policy that the government have carried out for the last six years and it will compare favourably in any part of the country. We have no reason to be afraid or ashamed of it. We are prepared to stand up in favour of it in any part of the country and to tell the people that this is the policy that Canada requires and that the statesmen found among the opposition in this House will be prepared to carry it out just as soon as they are returned to power.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who has just taken his seat treated us to a lot of figures. The hon. gentleman has a great aptitude for figures, but, I remember in reading in one of Dickens's novels of a party who figured out that he was worth £10,000, but when he came to look at his pocket he did not have enough to pay for his breakfast. There was only one other gentleman who had as great an aptitude for figures as the hon. member for East Grey, and that was the hon. gentleman who at one time occupied the position of Finance Minister in this House (Mr. Foster). I remember, on one occasion when the immigrants that we had got into the North-west, were leaving in thousands on account of the hard times, that hon. gentleman came up to that country and travelled through the country holding meetings. He had a great deal of trouble by figures to convince the people that they were well off, because as a matter of fact they had hardly enough to take them out of the country.

The hon. member for East Grey has alluded to two or three things that I wish to refer to in passing.

In making his comparisons as to the expenditure, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) was very unfair. He said that the average expenditure under the Conservative regime was $44,000,000 a year as against $52,000,000 since the Liberals came into power, but the hon. gentleman forgot to turn to the other side of the ledger, and he never told us how much money was taken in. Let me give him the figures. When the Conservatives were spending $44,000,000 a year they were taking in about $36,000,000, but if the Liberals have been spending $52,000,000 a year they are taking in more than that sum. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) also knows that this government has to provide for services like the Yukon, which the Conservative government had not to provide for, and that if the money is going out on the one hand it is coming in on the other. The trade of the country under Liberal rule has been increasing by $30,000,000 a year as against about $3,500,000 when the Conservatives were running the machinery of the country, and surely the hon. member does not expect us to do such a vastly increased business without an extra outlay. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) told us that the Postmaster General stated in his constituency that he found the deficit in the Post Office Department to be $700,000 a year when he came into office, and that he had wiped out all that deficit. Well, we know the Postmaster General too well to believe that he would make a statement of that kind. It is true that he found a deficit of $700,000 a year when he came into office, and although he did not wipe it out entirely he reduced it to something like $43,000 a year. But the Postmaster General gave the people of this country the benefit of the penny postage not only in Canada but within all the empire. I remember when the proposal for penny postage was first made, the Hon. Geo. E. Foster then stated in the House, that it would result in a deficit of from $800,000 to $1,000,000 a year. Well, that prophecy of Mr. Foster has fallen very far from being verified, and notwithstanding that the Hon. Mr. Mulock has given us penny postage within the empire, the deficit is not $1,000,000 a year, but only $400,000 a year as against $700,000 a year when the Conservatives were in power and when we had no penny postage. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) following his leader, said that the Ministers of this Cabinet could not agree amongst themselves as to a policy. Let me remind these gentlemen that last election a trio composed of Sir Charles Tupper, Mr. Geo. E. Foster and a certain Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, campaigned through Ontario, and let us see how these gentlemen agreed as to their policy. Let me interject the remark that these three gentlemen were left at home at the general elections. Well, while Mr. Foster was promising an increase of duty on agricultural implements, Mr. Hugh John Macdonald who was slated as being the Minister of the Interior in the new Cabinet was declaring in favour of free agricultural implements.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They are going to have both now.

Mr. DAVIS. I suppose they will have both, but it will be a long time before they have a chance of interfering with the tariff in any way. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) told us that the Conservatives were not able to get settlers in the North-west and Manitoba because of the speeches made by Sir Richard Cartwright. If the hon. gentleman looks at the record he will find that there was immigration to a certain extent when the Conservatives were in power, but when the census of 1891 was taken it was found that these people had evaporated, and the reason was, not because of the speeches of Sir Richard Cartwright, but because they were starved out under the Conservative policy and had to leave the country. The hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Bell) tried to dispute the

statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that the census of 1891 had been padded, and he took up the voters' lists of Ontario to prove this. But the hon. gentleman forgot that in the meantime that beautiful franchise Act under which the Conservatives got votes from the graveyards and from the United States had been done away with, and that the names of the Indians had been taken off the lists, which would account for the decrease in numbers in 1901 as compared with 1891. And now as to the tariff. How remarkable is the change of front these hon. gentlemen have made with regard to the tariff ? When the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) brought down the tariff in 1897, Sir Charles Tupper, then leader of the Conservative party declared that it would ruin the industries of Canada although there was then only a 12½ per cent preference. All his lieutenants backed him up in this declaration. Next session these gentlemen raked up the old stock arguments about hard times and soup kitchens, but when they found that their prophesies did not turn out, then the next session they declared that we had adopted their national policy, had stolen their clothes, and the Hon. Geo. E. Foster declared that the Liberal government had only reduced the Conservative tariff to the extent of one sixteenth hundredth of one per cent. Others of these gentlemen opposite said that we had given no preference but that what we did was to put up the tariff and then to reduce it by the preference to the level of the Conservative tariff. Again this year these gentlemen have a new cry and they say that some of our manufacturing industries are going to be ruined, and we have the leader of the opposition moving a new resolution in favour of what he calls 'adequate protection.' Coming as I do from the west where we are perhaps more interested in the tariff than in any other part of the Dominion, I would like to have a statement from the hon. gentleman as to what he means by 'adequate protection.' For my part I think we have 'adequate protection' now. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) who represents the woollen industries in this House no doubt thinks that 50 per cent would be 'adequate protection' on woollens, whereas some of his farmer friends behind him might think that 15 per cent might be adequate enough. I would like the leader of the opposition to come down off his perch and tell us exactly what he means. Does he mean to repeal the preference that is given to Great Britain ? He has not said anything at all about that, although he has skated all around the water-hole, and spoken of a number of industries that are in danger of being ruined. I would like him to tell us also whether he advocates increasing the duties on agricultural implements or on the other necessaries of life if he had the opportunity of doing so ? The hon. leader of the opposition says nothing about his intentions in these matters. I would like to know what he means by adequate protection ? That might mean a great deal or it might mean nothing at all ; it is beautifully indefinite. What the people of the North-west Territories would like to have from the leader of the opposition is a definite statement of exactly what he means. He reminds me of a Yankee pedlar who had only one suit of clothes in his pack. If he called at a house where there was a big man, he said it would suit the man, and if he called at a house where there was only a boy, he said it would fit the boy. This policy of the leader of the opposition is something like that suit of clothes; it is big enough for any man and small enough for any boy; but that is not what the people of the North-west want.

Mr. Speaker, as it is rather late, and as I want to make a somewhat lengthy address, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the House adjourns, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance, who is leading the House at this time, a communication which I observe in 'La Patrie' of this evening. As that paper has somewhat the character of an official organ, I attached more weight to this communication than I would to one in some other newspapers. The communication, which I will translate, is as follows :

> I have nothing official, but I am under the impression that if the pending negotiations between Kitchener and the Boers are not successful, a new contingent will be recruited in Canada at the expense of the War Office. It is even said that in case of peace this contingent will serve as police, and will replace troops whom it is desired to retire from active service.

I wish to inquire of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance whether there have been any negotiations or whether any circumstances have taken place to lend any warrant to this communication in 'La Patrie' ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would be obviously inconvenient for us to be held answerable for everything that appears in the newspapers, even in so excellent a paper as 'La Patrie.' I would not like to discuss the matter on the basis of a newspaper report, and I think my hon. friend will see that that is a wise and proper course.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 25, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—Mr. Malouin.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I have a word or two of personal explanation to make. Yesterday an hon. member of this House was pleased to state in his place, that I had been guilty of making certain statements equivalent to falsifying the record, and had quoted figures from a certain document which he named, which I could not produce or verify. Sir, that is a peculiarly odious kind of charge, and I may add a peculiarly silly one; for I do not suppose that many members of this House are less likely to make statements and quote figures from a document such as the Statstical Year-book without being able to verify them, than myself. I sent word to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) who is the party in question just now, that I was going to bring this matter up, and I am sorry he is not here. I did not expose the matter yesterday afternoon, because I wanted to see how far stupidity and party spite would drive these gentlemen ; and I also wanted to see that they should be so committed that there could be no possible quibbling and no possible wriggling out of the position in which they had placed themselves. I will proceed briefly to give the House the authority on which I made the statements I did with respect to what appears in the Statistical Year-book for the year 1889. The House will recollect that I gave certain estimates of the population of Canada in the course of my remarks on the budget, and I stated that those had been derived from the Statistical Year-book of the year 1889. The House will also recollect that yesterday it was stated in this House, that these figures were not to be found in the Statistical Year-book, that other figures were given, and a long deduction was made therefrom. Sir, I have here the Statistical Year-book for 1889, printed for the Department of Agriculture by 'Mr. Brown Chamberlain, printer to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty in the year of Grace 1890.' On page 116, of this valuable and veracious document will be found the following statement: In the fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1887, the estimated population of Canada is given at 4,875,005 souls. Immediately thereafter, for the fiscal year 1888, the population is given at 4,972,101, and for 1889, the population is given at 5,075,555. I call the special attention of the hon. leader of the opposition to these facts, as he appeared to be under the impression that his colleague from Pictou had been making a correct statement when he disputed the authenticity of my remarks. Sir, that is enough in itself, but there is more also. I stated besides, that these hon. gentlemen—at least, the predecessors of these hon. gentlemen—had carried out the calculation, at any rate as regards one year, and that they had produced the results of showing that in 1890 or thereabouts, the population estimated by them for Canada would exceed 5,200,000. I have here, Sir, the Trade and Navigation tables for the Dominion of Canada for the year 1890, countersigned by Sir Mackenzie Bowell, then Minister of Customs, under date of the 29th December, 1890. On page X, the total duty collected from customs is put down at $24,014,908. On the opposite page, you will find the amount of customs duties paid per head of the population put down at $4.60. You will further find at the bottom of the page this statement :

> The calculations in this column are based on the estimated population of the Dominion in each year as published by the Department of Agriculture and statistics in the statistical Year book. See Pages 116 and 180 of that book for 1889, the figures this year having been corrected to correspond with those in the said statistical Year-book.

Now, I suppose it is possible for these two. hon. gentlemen to go through the profound arithmetical calculation of dividing $24,014,-908 by $4.60, and if they do, they will find by the quotient that the estimated population of Canada, according to the customs returns and the Statistical Year-book, amounted to 5,220,632. Sir, I leave the House to say who has falsified the statements in the Year-book.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I did not hear the first part of the remarks of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and furthermore that I am compelled to leave the city on the first outgoing train, and therefore have not time just now to reply adequately to what the hon. minister says. I regret that I am called away by circumstances over which I have no control, the death of a near relative, to go out of the city immediately; but on my return I will deal with this matter, and I trust that the question may be settled satisfactorily to the House and the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that I stated to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that I quoted from the Year-book of 1889. It does not appear from what the hon. gentleman himself says that he has any fault to find with the Year-book of last year or that of the previous year, which were the Year-books I referred to. The statistics of these

Year-books are set out in the returns which have been laid on the Table of the House by members of the government in the past two years, and they were the very statistics to which I had reference. I therefore insist that the figures which I quoted and on which I relied, are figures furnished by this government to the country and paid for by this government out of the country's money, and figures which any member desiring to address the House has a perfectly legitimate right to rely upon. If I had told the hon. gentleman that I was quoting from the Year-book of 1889, the observations which he has made might have some relevance; but as he knows that that was not the Year-book to which I referred——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I had nothing to say to the hon. gentleman. I referred to his friend from Pictou.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the hon. gentleman did in the course of his speech refer to my having relied on figures on which he said I should not rely at all. He turned with a great wave of his arm to his followers, and said 'I thought so,' because I used figures which he and his colleagues printed and paid for out of the public moneys of this country, and because I placed some slight reliance upon them. Perhaps I should not have done so, considering the record of hon. gentlemen opposite in the past. Possibly I should apologize to the House and the country for having placed the slightest reliance on any figures which these hon. gentlemen furnish to the House and the country. But in my simplicity and ignorance as a young man in public life, I thought that when the hon. gentleman and his colleagues placed these figures before the House, we might place some reliance upon them. The hon. gentleman with great force and eloquence has pointed out that I had no possible right or reason to do so, and I accept his word with regard to that. If there is any consolation in all this to my hon. friend for having administered the reproof which he did to myself and the hon. member for Pictou, I am sure that as far as our side of the House is concerned, he is entirely and perfectly welcome to it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I beg to state to the hon. gentleman that his friend from Pictou deliberately charged me with falsifying the record. That is what I called attention to, and, if he possessed any sense of honour, he would withdraw the charge.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I draw attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman is falsifying the record which his own colleagues presented to the country.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding):

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last night, I was alluding to the resolution which the hon. leader of the opposition has placed in your hands, in which he professes to outline the policy of the Conservative party on the question of the tariff. I said that as far as I was concerned, I might be very dense, but I would like a little more information from the hon. gentleman as to what he meant by adequate protection to the industries of this country. I pointed out that adequate protection might mean almost anything—that while the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), who represents the woollen industries in this House, might consider 50 per cent adequate protection to the woollen industry, the farmers who sit on the opposition side of the House might think 15 per cent adequate protection. The people in the North-west are as much if not more interested in the tariff question than the people of any other section of this country, and what we would like is a definite statement from the leader of the opposition as to what he would do if his party got into power. We would like to know whether he would repeal the preferential tariff. That is one thing we in the west are interested in. It has enabled us to get woollen goods at a much lower price than before on account of the 33⅓ per cent preference, which has been a great relief so far. I would like to know also from the hon. leader of the opposition whether he proposes to increase the duty on agricultural implements, on which this government materially reduced the duty. We would be glad to know what the hon. gentleman would do in regard to these and a number of other prime necessaries of life? The hon. gentleman's followers would then be in a position to go round and tell the people exactly what the hon. gentleman's resolution meant. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that if the duty were increased on certain commodities, the result would be to build up certain manufacturing industries, which would be a benefit to the agriculturists in the older provinces, inasmuch as they would provide a home market for their products. But we in the west have to export everything we produce beyond what we consume ourselves, and find a market for it outside of the shores of this Dominion. We have to send our wheat, our butter, our cattle, and everything else to the English market; whereas we have to pay a duty on everything we consume, whether under a

protective tariff or under a revenue tariff. We have a revenue tariff to-day, and we do not complain of that, because we know that we have obligations to the nation and we have to bear our share of the taxation. We are willing to do that, and do it cheerfully; but we think the line should be drawn somewhere. When the present tariff was brought down in 1897, a great many of our people in the west were a little dissatisfied, because they thought it should have gone a little further in the direction of tariff reform; but when the matter was pointed out to them, and they realized the advantage they got from the preference, our people were satisfied with the tariff as a revenue tariff. But we are told that there are rumours in the air that there is likely to be an increase in the tariff in the near future. I have heard nothing that would lead me to believe that there will be anything of the kind. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), in addressing the House a few nights ago, read from the speech of the Minister of Finance a passage which led him to believe that the government did intend in the near future to increase the duties on certain commodities. Here is what the Finance Minister said, and I do not see anything in it to cause any alarm lest he should raise the tariff :

> We do not propose to make any changes in the tariff this session. I do not for a moment claim that the tariff is perfect. I think, that, on the whole, it has proved a very good tariff. Indeed, when we recall the circumstances, under which our tariff revision took place, when we remember the very complicated and difficult problem with which we had to deal, we may well congratulate ourselves upon our success in devising a tariff so well adapted to the requirements of the country, a tariff under which Canada has prospered in a greater degree than in any period in her history. I have occasionally pointed out the desirability of a reasonable measure of tariff stability. Nothing would be more likely to unsettle business than a practice of introducing frequent tariff changes. Hence, we have resisted applications for many small changes and we think it well to do so to-day. But I would not have it understood that this view can always be held.

I suppose that last phrase is what agitated my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) : 'I would not have it understood that this view can always be held.' Then the Finance Minister proceeded to say :

> As time passes, conditions change in our own country and it will be well for us to take note of this, so that we may adjust the tariff accordingly. Nor is that the only reason that might require some change. Conditions arise in other countries of which we are obliged to take account. We do not propose that we shall stand still and that this tariff shall remain unchanged, but we think the time is not opportune for making changes at present.

That is all the Finance Minister said with regard to the revision of the tariff. And there are no doubt many things in the tariff that could be improved. For instance, some of our manufacturers are paying thirty-five per cent on their raw material while they are only getting twenty-five per cent protection on their manufactured products. Such a case is a very fit subject for revision. Take again the article of oatmeal. The raw material is taxed more than the manufactured product. This year, owing to Providence having given us a great harvest, our people do not require to buy any oats, but sometimes we have to buy them from the United States, and under our tariff our millers are practically prevented from making the manufactured article. A revision is therefore necessary in the item of oats. A revision of the tariff might be made, which would not increase the amount of taxation on the people in any part of the country. Take the article of coal oil. We are paying at present something like five cents a gallon on all the coal oil consumed in this country. As this subject has already been warmly discussed, I do not propose to go into it at any great length now, but when we consider that in order to benefit some 10,000 people, who are directly and indirectly living out of the coal oil industry, the balance of the population of this country, or 5,300,000 people, is taxed at the rate of five cents a gallon, it is evident that there is need here for revision. It is evident that the knife might be applied to this item, and that the taxation taken off coal oil might be added to some other article in order to protect some other industry, requiring more assistance. So long as you do not increase the general amount of taxation which the people have to pay, there is no objection to you re-adjusting the tariff. We do not care if you take the duty off some commodity which our agriculturists and labourers have to use, and add it on to those consumed by the wealthy. If, for instance, you leave the duty as it is on the coarser grades of woollen manufactures made in this country, which are the only ones that our people can manufacture at a profit, and raise the duties on the finer qualities worn by the rich, there would be no objection on the part of the west. But we do not want the duties raised on the ordinary classes of goods we have to use. We are paying our share of taxation and strongly object to paying anything more.

I listened a few nights ago to the speech made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He made two speeches in this House, as he found one was not sufficient to explain why he had gone back on the faith of his fathers and the faith he had professed during the last fifteen years. I remember in days gone by, before I was in active politics, I used to read the speeches of my hon. friend with pleasure. I used to lie in bed reading them ; I was so proud of them I used to repeat his stories too, they were such good stories. When he was discussing the balance of trade the other night and trying to convince the House that it would be a good thing to cut off our nose

to spite our face—or, in other words, because the Americans have a high tariff we should raise our tariff against them in order to get even—I was reminded of a story which he used formerly to tell illustrating that very point. He told us about a farmer, in the old days, when we were selling barley to the United States, who started out with a carload of barley for the American market. At the boundary line he met a gentleman with a lot of gold braid around his hat who asked him where he was going. I am going, replied the farmer, across the line with a carload of barley. You cannot cross with that barley, said the officer, before you give one third of your load as duty. The Canadian farmer protested, but in vain, he had to hand over the one-third and was not very well pleased. He crossed the line and sold the balance which remained to him in the American market, and with the proceeds he bought some nice American buggies with which he started home. When he came to the line again, he was very pleased to see his own native soil, and the first man he met was a Canadian customs officer, with the badge of office around his hat. The Canadian told this customs officer what awful robbers the Yankees were, how they had mulcted him of one third of his load, and the Canadian officer gave him every sympathy. He said: Yes, that is perfectly ture, these Yankees are villains, but we will get even with them. I will take half your buggies from you, and in that way we will get square. That is the story which our hon. friend from North Norfolk used to tell with great gusto, but he has lately seen new light. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all interested in the balance of trade as the hon. gentleman puts it. To my mind when people have something to sell, they should sell it in the best market they can find, and when they have something to buy they should buy it where they can get it the cheapest. If they can sell their grain in England at a better price than in Germany, they should do so; and if they can buy in the United States cheaper than somewhere else, they should give the American market the preference. Surely the hon. member for North Norfolk will not maintain that when we have to get certain raw material from the United States, we ought to impose a duty on that raw material coming into this country, and for the reason forsooth that the Americans charge a high tariff on other commodities which they require from us.

Now, if the hon. gentleman should go before a British audience and discuss this balance of trade question in this way, what would he find? He would find that the people there would not listen to a doctrine of that kind; for every person knows that the people of England have to buy raw material from the United States, and, to put on a duty with the idea of getting even with the people of the United States would be merely to work against their own interest. I was going to say that, though we from the west do not take up a great deal of time in discussing questions in this House, yet I notice that whatever question is discussed, nearly every gentleman who rises to take part in the debate speaks of the great west and of the great future of the west. The west has a great future. When you consider that we have there only four hundred thousand people all told, including the people in the cities and towns and people in every line in business, and that these four hundred thousand people have produced in one year one hundred million bushels of grain and a vast amount of wealth in the shape of cattle, dairy produce and so on, making a total of over $60,000,000, I think, hon. members of this House will agree that we have become a factor in the affairs of this country, and one that must be considered whatever question may be taken up. And, when it comes to the question of taxation, the voice of the west will have to be heard. As I have said, we do not expect anything unreasonable; we expect to pay our portion of the taxation necessary to meet expenses of the country. We are practically satisfied with the tariff as it is now. But, if it comes to anything like an increase, I am afraid there is apt to be some grumbling in the country west of Lake Superior. I think I could show by figures, if time would permit, that the tariff is a reasonable one and one under which our industries may prosper. But, when the manufacturers, the woollen men, or the leather men, or the machine men, come asking for an increase of duties, they must remember that the people do not feel called upon to submit to taxation for their benefit. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), the other night closed his remarks with a great flourish about wanting a policy of Canada for the Canadians. I agree with the hon. gentleman. The only difference between the leader of the opposition and myself is that he wants a policy for the minority of Canadians, and I want a policy for the majority of Canadians.

This tariff was accepted by the people of the west as a revenue tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite have changed their position on this tariff question so often, that it is pretty hard to put your finger on them. When the tariff was first brought down they raised a howl and declared that we were going to ruin all the industries of the country. Though we then gave a preference of only 12½ per cent to Great Britain, they predicted that the country would go to the dogs under the new tariff. But when, after a year, they found the country prosperous to a degree it had never attained before, when they found that the mills, instead of being closed were running day and night, and the working people, instead of being out of employment, were earning 20 per cent more wages than when the Conservative govern-

ment were in power, they changed their ground and said: Oh, this is the national policy; you have only continued the old tariff; you have done nothing to help the country, but have simply continued our policy. I have already pointed out that Mr. Foster, the Finance Minister of the late government, and the man who, while he sat in this House, spoke for the Conservative party on fiscal matters, tried to prove, not only in this House but through the press that we had only reduced the tariff by the one sixteen-hundredth part of one per cent, and that the preference was a sham because we had first increased the tariff and then taken off a slice—in fact he tried to show that it was the same national policy. But when they found in the election of 1900, that the country took no stock in their cry of stolen clothes, we find them changing their position again, and now the leader of the opposition comes down with a policy of adequate protection to the labour, agriculture products, manufactures and industries of this country. I have already shown that a resolution like that means anything or nothing, as you choose to take it.

As showing how the country has prospered, I think it would be easy to point out in what way practical relief has been given to the people—speaking particularly for the people of the west—under this tariff, thereby causing a prosperity such as has never been known in this country before. This tariff, brought down in 1897, and in operation ever since, has been the means of reducing the taxation upon the people to the extent of $10,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the expenditure, and say that we are spending an awful lot of money. So we are spending an awful lot of money. But if we did not get the money in we could not spend it. In order to make a fair and reasonable comparison between this government and the late government on this point, you must consider not merely the expenditure, but also the revenue in the two regimes. Under this tariff, as I have said, over $10,000,000 have been saved to the people within the last five years. That means that this government, by taking the shackles off trade and allowing goods to come into the country more freely than before, have not merely reduced the taxation of the people by $10,000,000 but have been the means of placing over $50,000,000 a year in the treasury, as against $36,000,000 which was the amount when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. If you take the importations of last year, you find that a saving of nearly $4,000,000 was made by the people as compared with what they would have paid under the old tariff. Exclusive of coin and bullion and of Indian corn, which was simply imported and exported, the duty on the total importations last year made an average rate of 16·90 per cent, as against a rate in 1896, which was the last year of Conservative administration, of 19·19 per cent. That is a reduction of 2·29 per cent in the rate of duty which is equivalent to a reduction, in proportion to the existing rate, of 12 per cent. There is one reduction of duty which, while it was not made for the benefit of the west particularly, has been taken advantage of by the people of the west to a considerable extent. That is, the placing of Indian corn on the free list. I think this is one of the best pieces of legislation proposed by this government. Properly considered, the farmer is a manufacturer. He must finish his cattle if he is to export them to the British market, and, in order to do that, he must be in a position to get his feed at as cheap a rate as does his competitor across the line, who sends his commodity to the same market. Without this, our farmer is not in a position to compete. Our people asked to have barbed wire to be put on the free list, and that was done, and the people have taken advantage of it. Of course, for a year or two after this commodity was placed on the free list, an increase in the price of the raw material had the effect of keeping up the price of the manufactured article so that the people did not see the benefit of the reduction of duty at the time if the duty had not been taken off they would have had to pay 12½ per cent more.

But it has come down again, and people in the west at least realize that benefit was conferred on them when cream separators were placed on the free list. Now $500,000 have been saved to the farmers on these four commodities alone, on binder twine, Indian corn, barbed wire and cream separators. The duties have been reduced on a lot of other articles besides. I know our friends in the west belonging to the Conservative party assert that the government did not do anything in the way of reducing the duty on agricultural implements. As far as a few lines are concerned, such as binders and mowers, that is perfectly true. But there is another large list of agricultural implements that people have to buy, and that perhaps are not so well known as binders and mowing machines, on which the government did reduce the duty. I present this table to the House:

	Per cent.	Per cent.
Implements, farm road or steel rollers	35	25
Forks, pronged	35	25
Hay tedders	35	25
Hoes	35	25
Knives, hay or straw	35	25
Knives, edging	35	25
Potato diggers	35	25
Rakes	35	25
Scythes and snaths, sickles or reaping hooks	35	25
Spades and shovels	38	35
Butts and hinges	32½	30
Wind mills	30	25

	Per cent.	Per cent.
Grain crushers	35	25
Farming mills	35	25
Threshers and separators	30	25
Wire nails	1 c. p. lb	⅝ c. p. lb.
Nails and spikes	¾ c. p. lb.	½ c. p. lb.
Carriage hardware	32½	30
Table cutlery	32½	30
Axes	35	25
Saws	32½	30
Rakes, of wood	35	25

33⅓ per cent off general tariff on all articles.

Now, the item of threshers and separators to which I call particular attention, there is a difference of duty of between 30 and 25 per cent. That does not look very much like a reduction; but when you take into consideration the fact that a threshing machine cost about $2,000, and you figure 5 per cent on that sum, it amounts to a snug amount of money that every man saves who has to buy a threshing mill and separator in the west. Now the manufacturers have nothing to complain of, because, while these reductions were made in the interests of the farmers, there was a certain reduction made on the raw material that entered into the manufacture of agricultural implements in this country, and which enabled the manufacturer to make them a little cheaper than he did before. I do not object to that, but as to reducing the duty any below the present rate, I would object to that.

Now, the duty on coal has been reduced, and the duty on iron and steel. Let me show the average rate or duty under the old tariff and the average rate under the present tariff, on the following articles:

Bituminous coal reduced from 60 cents to 53 cents per ton.

Pig iron reduced from $4 to $2.50 per ton.

Puddled bars, ingots, billets and slabs from $5 to $2 per ton.

Bar iron or steel from $10 to $7 per ton.

Steel shafting from 35 per cent to 30 per cent.

Rolled iron or steel from $10 to $7 per ton.

The rates on these articles are also subject to a further reduction of 32⅓ when the articles are imported from Great Britain.

The outstanding feature of the Liberal policy was the preferential tariff. No step which was ever taken by the government of the country was more popular or has redounded more to the credit of the country. It was the best advertisement Canada ever received and has been productive of the most beneficial results alike to Canada and the empire. The effects of it may be summarized as follows:

It effected a large reduction in duties paid by the Canadian consumer as compared with the duties paid by him under the Conservative tariff. This is illustrated by the following figures:

Articles.	Average rate of duty under the Conservative Tariff, on importations of 1896.	Average rate of duty on importations under the Preferential Tariff, 1901.
Iron or steel manufactures.	25·65	11·56
Woollen goods	31·71	23·00
Cottons	28·53	20·43
Earthenware, chinaware	30·20	20·02
Manufactures of flax, hemp and jute	22·25	18·00
Glass and manufactures of	25·60	17·11
Hats, caps and bonnets	30·00	20·00
Gloves and mitts	35·00	25·55
Leather and manufactures of	20·11	10·70

When we take into consideration the 23 per cent that the woollen manufacturers have in favour of their commodities, I say that is a fair amount of incidental protection, and they ought to be satisfied with it. We find on going over the list that there is a substantial amount of incidental protection on all the manufacturing industries of this country. Now, under the operation of the old Conservative tariff importations from Great Britain dwindled from $52,000,000 in 1883 to $29,000,000 in 1897, which was the last year prior to the coming into force of the preferential tariff. As to the British preference, although our friends opposite say it has not done the English people any good, still under that preference we find that importations from Great Britain have gone up from $29,000,000 in 1897 to $43,000,000 last year. Now it may be that the preferential tariff has not greatly stimulated importations from Great Britain, still I believe that it has been a great benefit to our own people. It has already been pointed out in this House that it would benefit the consumers in this country if we did not import a thousand dollars worth of stuff under the preferential tariff. The very fact of the tariff being in existence, the fact that the wholesale men and others importing goods can import from Great Britain at a certain rate of duty and can lay down the goods at a certain rate at their warehouses, establishes the price, not only of all American goods sold in this market, but it also establishes the price at which the manufacturer in this country has to sell his goods. If that were not so, why would these woollen men be squealing? The very fact of woollen goods coming to this country from Great Britain reduces the price at which they are obliged to sell, and the consumer in this country reaps the benefit to that extent.

I think also that we have done very well in our exports to Great Britain, and there is no doubt that our granting that preference to Great Britain has led the English people to buy more of our stuff. The hon.

gentlemen opposite have time and again challenged the government to show what they have done to improve Canada's exports, what they have done to bring about this measure of prosperity that we enjoy to-day. I say they have done a great deal to bring about this measure of prosperity for the very reason that they have adopted up-to-date methods in running the affairs of this country. They have done as any business man would do in his business, they have made our capabilities known, they have advertised our wares, they have advertised our produce in the English market and other markets, and in that way they have been able to find new markets and to enlarge the old ones for the producers of this country. That is one of the reasons why our export trade has swollen to its present enormous proportions. Let me show you how our exports have grown :

Exports—Canadian Produce to Great Britain.	
1897	$69,533,852
1898	93,065,019
1899	85,114,555
1900	96,562,875
1901	92,857,525

In 1897 the exports of animals and their produce and agricultural products the produce of Canada, were $47,000,000. In 1901 they amounted to $66,000,000. Canadian butter to the amount of 10,413,131 pounds was sent to Great Britain in 1897, whereas in 1901 we sent 15,602,445 pounds. For the year 1900 we sent 24,317,436 pounds. Cheese in 1897, 163,942,649 pounds, in 1901, 195,-125,317 pounds. Eggs in 1897, 6,939,496 dozen, in 1901, 11,273,452 dozen. Bacon in 1897, 59,552,464 pounds, in 1901, 102,709,560 pounds. Beef in 1897, 363,533 pounds, in 1901, 8,819,213 pounds.

Now as regards foreign trade, I present a summary statement showing the progress and prosperity of the country under Liberal rule indicating the wisdom of the Liberal fiscal policy.

Statement showing the foreign trade of Canada by five-year periods :—that is to say, the five years from 1897 to 1901, inclusive, being the last five years of the Conservative administration :

Aggregate foreign trade, 1897-01	$1,651,726,204
Aggregate foreign trade, 1892-96	1,193,453,797
Increase in 5 yrs., Liberal rule	$ 458,272,407
Imports for consumption, 1897-01	$758,085,924
Imports for consumption, 1892-96	567,617,947
Increase in 5 yrs., Liberal rule	$190,467,977
Exports produce of Canada, 1897-01	$756,090,015
Exports produce of Canada, 1892-96	522,299,289
Increase in 5 yrs., Liberal rule	$233,790,726
Exports produce of Canada to Great Britain, 1897-01	$437,133,826
Exports produce of Canada to Great Britain, 1892-96	294,859,222
Increase in 5 yrs., Liberal rule	$142,274,604

Exports produce of Canada to United States, 1897-01	$252,103,818
Exports produce of Canada to United States, 1892-96	179,306,963
Increase in 5 yrs., Liberal rule	$ 72,796,855
Exports Canadian mine to all countries, 1897-01	$104,078,270
Exports Canadian mine to all countries, 1892-96	32,080,247
Increase under Liberal rule	$ 71,998,023
Exports Canadian fisheries to all countries, 1897-01	$ 52,955,091
Exports Canadian fisheries to all countries, 1892-96	51,291,152
Increase in 5 yrs., Liberal rule	$ 1,663,929
Exports Canadian forests to all countries, 1897-01	$145,465,322
Exports Canadian forests to all countries, 1892-96	126,063,954
Increase in 5 yrs., Liberal rule	$ 19,401,368
Exports Canadian animals and their produce, and agricultural products, the produce of Canada, 1897-01	$368,230,911
Exports Canadian animals and their produce, and agricultural products, the produce of Canada, 1892-96	254,751,545
Increase in 5 yrs., Liberal rule	$113,479,266
Exports Canadian manufactures, 1897-1901	$ 62,143,520
Exports Canadian manufactures, 1892 1896	39,561,961
Increase in 5 yrs., Liberal rule	$ 22,561,371

STATEMENT showing the increase in foreign trade from 1896 to 1901 under Liberal rule, as compared with the increase from 1878 to 1896 under Conservative rule :—

Aggregate foreign trade, 1896	$239,025,360
Aggregate foreign trade, 1901	386,903,157
Increase under Liberal rule, 5 yrs.	$147,877,797
Average increase per annum	$ 29,575,559
Aggregate foreign trade, 1896	$239,025,360
Aggregate foreign trade, 1878	172,405,454
Increase under Conservative rule, 18 years	$ 66,619,906
Average increase per annum	$ 3,701,106
Imports for consumption, 1896	$110,587,480
Imports for consumption, 1891	181,237,988
Increase under Liberal rule, 5 yrs.	$ 70,650,503
Average increase per annum	$ 14,130,101
Imports for consumption, 1896	$110,587,480
Imports for consumption, 1878	91,199,577
Increase under Conservatives, 18 years	$ 19,387,903
Average increase per annum	$ 1,077,106
Exports produce of Canada, 1896	$109,915,337
Exports produce of Canada, 1901	177,431,386
Increase under Liberal rule, 5 yrs.	$ 67,516,049
Average increase per annum	$ 13,503,209

Exports produce of Canada, 1896.. ..	$109,915,337
Exports produce of Canada, 1878.. ..	67,989,800
Increase under Conservatives, 18 years	$ 41,925,537
Average increase per annum.. ..	$ 2,329,197

I think that all goes to show that this country has been progressing fairly under the rule of my hon. friends who now occupy the treasury benches, and I think, that, while it may be that hon. gentlemen opposite are not satisfied with the government of the day, it has been shown that whenever an opportunity has been given the electorate to pronounce upon the policy of the government, they have intimated that they are entirely satisfied with the manner in which the affairs of the country are being conducted at the present time. There is no doubt that there are hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are not satisfied. They are in the cold shades of opposition and they cannot be expected to enthuse over the immense trade of this country as they might have done if their leaders in the past had adopted the astute methods of the present administration and had thereby brought about a similar condition of prosperity, because, by reason of advertising our goods in foreign markets and adopting a proper trade policy the government has, in large measure, brought about this state of prosperity. I do not say that the government of the day causes the rain to fall or the sun to shine. No government can do that, although hon. gentlemen opposite used to make the claim in the days of the old national policy that the Conservative party made the hens lay big eggs. This may be ancient history, but in the days of poor old Alex. Mackenzie, when the times were hard and there was a great depression in the United States and all over the world, these hon. gentlemen did not make any allowance for this condition of affairs, but they told the people that through Mr. Mackenzie's bungling and stupidity this state of affairs had been brought about and they said if you put us in we have a panacea for all the ills that man is heir to in the national policy. We do not claim, as I have said before, that the government can make the rain to fall or the sun to shine, thus causing the crops to grow, but the government can do a great deal by assisting to open up the country, by improving the transportation facilities, by giving the people lower freight rates and in various other ways, and a great deal has been done in these directions by the present government.

A good deal has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to the expenditure of the country. I do not want to take up the time of the House in discussing this question which has been threshed out very thoroughly already, but, I may say that we are quite willing to compare the record of this government with the record of its predecessor in the matter of expenditure. How do we make that comparison? The only proper way to get at that is to find the difference between the expenditure and the revenue. The receipts of this country have increased from $38,000,000, in round numbers, in 1895, to over $52,000,000, which we expect to get during the present year. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: Yes, that is very true, but you are taxing the people more. The census has shown that the increase of population does not warrant that increase in expenditure. I have already shown that we are taxing the people less than hon. gentlemen opposite did because we have taken $10,000,000 out of the people less than would have been taken if the old tariff had been in operation. But, neither this government nor any other government ever taxes the people. The government never goes to each man's door and collects the taxes from him. The very fact that the revenue was increased from $38,000,000 to $52,000,000 is the strongest possible proof of the value to the country of the policy of the present government. It goes to show that the government has brought prosperity to the country and for that reason money is flowing into the public treasury. But, if the government were to raise the rate of duty 5 per cent, instead of the money going into the treasury to be spent in the interests of the people in proper public improvements, it would divert it into the pockets of a few manufacturers for the benefit of a few individuals. The policy at present in operation has brought about the present satisfactory state of affairs. Why are we getting this $52,000,000? We do not send tax collectors round to the people's doors to collect the taxes. We are getting this revenue because the people are taxing themselves, because the people are able to tax themselves, because, under the policy of this government, the people have been able to buy luxuries for their families that they were not able to buy under the national policy, because, they are able to dress their families as they never dressed them before, because they are able to buy articles that under the national policy they never were able to buy. If a man is now able to buy two binders, where before under the national policy, he had to cut his crop with a cradle or a scythe and these binders are imported he pays more taxes. If he buys two ploughs with which to cultivate his land, if these ploughs are imported he pays more taxes. If he buys two dresses for his wife, where he had hard work to buy one when the Conservatives were in power and if the goods out of which these dresses are made are imported he is paying more taxes. If hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were able to show that the money has not been properly expended, then, it would be a fair proposition, but, the proper time, as has been pointed out here before, to do that is when the esti-

mates are under discussion. If any item in the estimates which are brought down here, does not meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, they are in a position to move to have that item struck out. I have sat here for five or six years and I have never heard them ask to have very much struck out. On the other hand, they are always asking for more money, and when they are tired badgering the Minister of Public Works to make greater expenditures, then they come down at the end of the session with a resolution in favour of retrenchment and economy, trying to hoodwink the people of this country. I will read a few items showing the difference between the expenditure and the revenue during several years for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite. First I will take the years when the Conservatives were in power. In the year 1884 the difference between expenditure and revenue was $23,695,135.80. Just think of that, $23,000,000. Why, there was as much difference between the revenue and expenditure that year as the whole revenue of the country practically amounted to then. In 1885 the difference between the revenue and expenditure was $14,245,841; in 1886 it was $26,751,414; in 1887 it was $4,500,000, and the last year the Conservatives were in power it was about $6,000,000. Now, let us look at what has been the case since the Liberal government came into power. The first year the difference between the revenue and expenditure amounted to $3,041,164; the next year it was $2,417,802, and the next year it was $2,317,047. These gentlemen opposite now argue that we should keep only one set of books and put down on one side all our expenditure and on the other side all we take in, no matter from what source we receive it. Well, if that is the proper system, the Conservatives were in power for eighteen years, and why did not they adopt it? We never heard a word about it until they got into the cold shades of opposition, and then they commenced to talk. I took a little pains to go through the debates of last session in order to get extracts from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite to show the applications they have made to the Minister of Public Works for further public expenditures. These statements, I think, will show how sincere these gentlemen are when they talk about economy. You will notice that their cry is always money, more money. The first on the list is a gentleman named Mr. Blain, and he wants improvements in the Brampton armoury. Next, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Wilson said:

I would call the attention of the minister to the Napanee public building. It requires some pointing, and some outside painting.

Then a gentleman named Mr. Bennett, who is very prominent on the other side of the House, said:

The hon. minister will remember that there was a dock built there last year. Perhaps it would be better to have the dredging done to get at the dock.

He wanted money spent on dredging. Then we come to a gentleman by the name of Mr. Kemp, who represents the large city of Toronto. There is no city in the world that is looking for more expenditure than the city of Toronto. There are more delegations here from the city of Toronto than from any other city in the Dominion. They are here all the time badgering the Minister of Public Works for more money. But, at the end of the session when the leader of the opposition brings in a general resolution in favour of economy, all the members for Toronto vote for it. Here is what Mr. Kemp said:

During the time of the administration of the government which was in office previous to the present government, vessels of the capacity of the St. Lawrence canals in those days were able to come into the harbour of Toronto, but since last fall vessels of 14 feet capacity have been able to pass through the St. Lawrence canals, but they are not able to get into the harbour of Toronto. Now, we contend that a harbour of such importance as that of Toronto should receive the consideration of the government, and that it should be dredged to the depth of the capacity of the St. Lawrence canals.

This gentleman, who is an apostle of economy, wanted the whole harbour of Toronto dredged to a depth of fourteen feet, and I suppose it would cost some millions of dollars, but at the end of the session he was voting for a resolution declaring for economy. Then Mr. Bennett crops up again with another request for public expenditure and he said:

I would ask the Minister of Militia and Defence to consider the claims of the town of Orillia for an armoury. In the county of Simcoe there is an armoury at Barrie which serves the purposes of the town companies, and if my memory serves me right, there is also one a few miles out in a neighbouring township. In the town of Orillia there are two companies, and right across the bay, in the county of Ontario, there is a company in the Rama reserve.

Then we have Mr. Clarke, who represents an important division in the city of Toronto, and he wants more money spent too. He said:

The minister must not forget the great point in connection with the necessity for deepening the harbour of Toronto. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) has pointed out that Toronto is the largest distributing point, possibly, in the Dominion of Canada, and if we are going to get the advantage which the hon. gentleman hopes, and which we all hope will result from the completion of these transportation routes, it is absolutely necessary that during the period of navigation we should have at Toronto facilities sufficient to enable vessels which can navigate the canal system to its fullest extent, to take cargoes from Toronto to Quebec and the lower provinces and to bring return cargoes back again.

Then Mr. Maclean, the apostle of government ownership, wanted more money expended, and he said:

Then why not give us $50,000.

Then Mr. Clarke is not satisfied with asking that the whole harbour of Toronto should be dredged to fourteen feet, but he asks further :

Before this item is passed, is it any use to ask the Minister of Public Works if there are to be further supplementary estimates to provide for needed accommodation at the Toronto drill shed ?

He was looking ahead to the supplementaries even, to see if he could get a rake-off there to provide for the Toronto drill shed. Then there is a gentleman named Taylor on the other side, who is another apostle of economy, and when he wanted more money expended by the government, he said :

I do not see any item here for improvements about the two public buildings—post office and custom-house in Gananoque. A drain was put down from the post office, and a granolithic pavement over it, but it has dipped so that it now has become dangerous.

Mr. Fowler wanted more money expended, and he said :

You are taking a vote of $1,000 for repairs to Dalhousie wharf. My information is that it is simply wasting money to be dribbling it out in this way, that is instead of making these repairs the department should make repairs of a permanent character. I do not know any thing personally about it ; I am only giving the information I have respecting it. I am told that $2,500 or $3,000 would make permanent repairs.

This gentleman by the name of Bennett crops up again, and he said :

In order that the minister may not over look it, I would ask him to consider the claim of the town of Orillia, which is the headquarters of two large companies, and which is a town of about 6,500.

Mr. Hughes (Victoria) wanted more money expended, and this is the way he put it :

One of the oldest, if not the oldest, portions of Canada, the site of the old Huguenot French-landing is at the north of the River St. John, and is in a dilapidated condition. Inasmuch as it concerns the race to which the hon. gentleman belongs, and the early history of the country, I would suggest that the government should expropriate that for and preserve it as a public work.

Then, there is a gentleman here who takes a very prominent part in the debates on the other side of the House, named Mr. Osler, and he was asking for something. He said :

With the permission of the committee, I would revert to the Kingston vote, for the purpose of asking a question. I have heard that there was a great want in the college of proper accommodation for the cadets in winter. I am told that there is no skating rink and only a very inferior gymnasium. In fact, there is no place where they can amuse themselves unless they go into town.

Here is a gentleman who is always talking economy, but he was not satisfied with expenditure on ordinary public works, but he wanted the government to spend money on gymnasiums and skating rinks. If he had asked the government to build a wharf on some river or harbour, or to do some work in the interests of the agriculturists of this country, I would not raise any objection; but he wanted them to build a skating rink or a gymnasium at Kingston at the public expense. Another gentleman, who takes a very prominent part in the discussions in this House, Mr. Clancy, said :

There is another matter which the hon. minister seems to have forgotten — Little Bear Creek. I think the locality had the honour of a visit from him at one time. I do not know how far he was impressed, but I have a very strong belief that he was not impressed favourably, because the vote which formerly appeared has disappeared from the estimates.

The Minister of Public Works said he was not impressed with Little Bear Creek, and then the hon. gentleman said : 'Well, I suppose I may as well subside.' I have only broken the crust; I could go on all night reading speeches of gentlemen on the other side of the House asking for more money to be spent. And yet they go out on the platform and talk of the enormous expenditures and the extravagance of this government. When these estimates appear before the House, if the hon. gentlemen are not satisfied with any of the items, they can oppose them and move that they be struck out; but after they agree to all the items, and also get up time and again and ask for the expenditure of more money, it does not look very well for them at the end of the session to trump a bogus resolution in favour of economy. There are certain gentlemen on the other side of the House who have been advocating a vast expenditure of public money for the purpose of building the Georgian Bay canal. A very prominent member on the other side moved a resolution in favour of the country spending something like $65,000,000 on that canal. If the money that comes into the treasury and the money that we have to borrow for the purpose of making necessary improvements is properly spent, I think there will be no kick against it in the country. When hon. gentlemen opposite are criticising the expenditure they should remember that they are living in glass houses. If I wanted to take up the time of the House to go over the expenditures of the eighteen years during which they were in power, I could show up certain expenditures, like that on the St. Charles Branch Railway, which would not warrant the country in giving them a return of its confidence. When we show that they increased the debt by $100,000,000, they answer, see what we have got for it—that magnificent steel band which traverses the continent, the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is a great work, and of great advantage to the country; but I do not see how these gentlemen can call it an asset when it belongs to somebody else. If you went over their whole record, you would find such expenditures as those on

the Tay canal, the St. Charles Branch, the Langevin block and the Curran bridge; but I need not go over all these cases, because the House knows all about them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have taken up enough of the time of this House. I have spoken at greater length than I intended. In conclusion, I want to refer to what I consider the proper policy for this country to pursue. Instead of manufacturers coming down here and asking the government for more protection, we should turn our attention to the opening up and developing of the vast heritage which we possess beyond the great lakes, and I am glad to see the government doing this to a large extent. In that way we would be furnishing a market for our manufacturers at our own doors. At the present time people in the west are consumers of the greater part of the things which are made in eastern Canada. Your travellers and agents are going all over that country buzzing like flies around a honey pot. They find that $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 of cold cash which our people get for their produce is worth looking after. Therefore, I say that the judicious expenditure of more money on immigration and on improving the transportation facilities to open up that country, is the proper policy to adopt. If the gentlemen who are hunting for a little more protection would work as hard to make a success of their business as the farmers have to do, they would not be coming down here harassing the government for more protection. The farmers have to work day and night to make their farms pay. They do not come down to Ottawa harassing the government for more protection; but these gentlemen, if their machinery gets a little antiquated, or if they get a little old themselves, do not buy new machinery, but come for more protection. I remember a little story, of a gentleman who came down here on a delegation that wanted more protection for woollen goods. A gentleman said to him: 'You get 23 per cent protection against English goods, and you have besides the freight between Great Britain and Canada, which is equivalent to 3 or 4 per cent more; why are you not satisfied?' He said: 'We cannot compete with the manufacturers in the old country.' 'Why?' 'Because our machinery is not as good.' He was asked: 'Why not put in new machinery?' He said: 'I am too old.' It was easier to come down here and ask for more protection than to put in new machinery. The true policy in the interest of this country is to open up and develop our North-west Territories, and in that way provide an enlarged market for our manufacturers. We are getting producers into that country at the rate of 50,000 a year. I am quite satisfied that this year we will get 75,000 if not 100,000 people in there, and these people are bringing in large amounts of money. They are not poor people who are coming from the United States, but are well-to-do people. If we spend $500,000 to bring in 75,000 people, and they bring into the country $10,000,000 of money and goods, they are increasing the wealth of this country to that extent. If we spent $1,000,000 on immigration, and brought in 150,000 people, and they brought in with them $20,000,000, that would be a good policy for this country.

Hon. gentlemen on the other side say that we are not getting in the proper class of immigrants. Well, I am in a position to know more than do these hon. gentlemen who talk so flippantly. I have personal knowledge of the fact that we are bringing in the proper class of immigrants. These immigrants are producing millions of bushels of wheat. Why, there is a little town in my riding, which five years ago was a wilderness, and in that town there are five large elevators this year, and the export of wheat from it was something like a million bushels. That is the kind of people which my hon. friends opposite are so fond of abusing—Doukhobors, Galicians, Germans and other foreigners. What we want is men willing to take off their coats and go to work. We do not want gentlemen with eye glasses. They may be very desirable in the clubs, but in our country we want men who will tear up the prairie and produce wealth, who will take off their coats and apply their muscles to the plough. And that is the class of men we are getting, and the money spent on immigration is the best expenditure that we are making in the interests of the country. and if we were to increase that expenditure, we would be adopting a wise policy.

Then take our transportation facilities, we must have some other method of getting our stuff out of the country. The other day I was taken to task by the Minister of Public Works because I said that the canal system had outlived its usefulness. Well, that system may be all right to relieve the congestion of traffic, but it is not to be compared with railways. We are told that our canals are valuable because were it not for them, our railway rates would be much higher. We are told that the railway rates are regulated by the rates on the canals. It is a sad admission that we should have spent some $90,000,000 on canals for the purpose of regulating our railway rates. It seems to me that we ought to have devised some system of regulating these rates without having had to spend $100,000,000 for that purpose. What we want is a continuous line of railway which can be operated twelve months in the year and double tracked if necessary. Last year four hundred thousand people in the west produced 100,000,000 bushels of grain. We are going to get people in there at the rate of 100,000 per year, and in eight or ten years the production in that country will be increased to 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 bushels, which will have to be carried

to the seaboard, and that cannot be done over our canals when they are frozen up six months in the year. What we want is to be able to put our wheat on the car and run it through to the seaboard. There has been too much money spent trying to compete against nature. We have been spending millions of dollars in Montreal trying to create an artificial port—trying to make an ocean port out of something that was never intended to be so by nature. If half that money had been spent on the port of Quebec in providing proper facilities there, where we have a port that can float the largest ship that will be built in the next twenty years, and if we had a railway running from the centre of the territories right into that port, from which our produce could be shipped twelve months in the year, you would not hear anything about the car shortage that we hear so much about at present.

Then we have to take into account the depreciation in the value of wheat and the charges for interest and insurance, when it has to be stored over during the winter, which must amount to at least 6 cents a bushel. There is also this further point to be considered. If we have to depend wholly on our canals, we will have to store an immense quantity of wheat in the elevators at the head of Lake Superior, and when navigation opens in the spring and we throw that on the markets of the world, down goes the price, so that the farmers will be out, not only the loss in storage and insurance, but also the depreciation in value on account of such an immense quantity being thrown on the market.

What we want is a continuous line of railway from the west to some ocean port, and Quebec is the proper place. This would enable us to send our commodities to a port which could be kept open twelve months in the year, and in this way we would stimulate the production of grain and other products in the North-west, and thus not only increase the trade of that part of the country but the trade and wealth of the whole Dominion. This government has still a large domain of public lands at its disposal, notwithstanding the 70,000,000 acres which our hon. friends opposite gave away to railways. Notwithstanding their extravagance in this respect, we have still left millions of acres of fertile land, the property of the people of this country, and by providing proper transportation facilities, by opening up and developing the country, by getting immigrants in there, we will increase the value of our own public domain to such an extent that we will have sufficient in ten years to pay the whole public debt of the country. That is if we keep these lands ourselves and do not give them away to railway corporations. What we want is to get settlers into that country, and if we are not spending enough money at present on immigration, we should spend more. If five and a half million people in round figures are paying now $52,000,000 or $53,000,000 into the public treasury, and 5,000,000 more west of the lakes, and you will double the revenue and thus furnish the means to pay the interest on any amount of money to be spent in developing this country.

I wish to say a word or two on railway subsidies. I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite condemn the system of railway subsidies and advocate government ownership of railways. That policy of government ownership is a new fad put before the people of the west, but I submit that we need only turn our attention to the government railway which we are now operating to show that such a policy is not practicable. If the railways of a country could be run by the government outside of politics, no doubt that would be a good thing, but with our present experience of an expenditure of over $50,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway, without ever getting back a cent of interest besides being obliged to operate the road at a loss, I do not think it would be wise on our part to extend that experience. Even if it were shown that the people along the line of that railway are getting the benefit in the shape of cheaper rates, that would be some compensation, but that is not shown. It is not proved that our government railway is carrying freights or passengers at cheaper rates than other lines. And yet still the country has to face a heavy deficit in the operating of that line besides not getting any interest on the capital investment. These hon. gentlemen who advocate government ownership point to Australia. Well, I do not know much about Australia, having never been there, but I find that the per capita expenditure of that country is $38 per head as against $10 in Canada. How comes it that these people have to pay $38 per head.

Hon Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Because they own the railways.

Mr. DAVIS. Then we do not want to own any railways, if such ownership is going to entail a rate of taxation amounting to $38 per head. But there is such a thing as regulating the railways without government ownership. I do not think that it is advisable for a government to run railways, but it is high time that the government had control over them and forced them to treat the people as they should. In every state of the American union there is a railway commission which controls the railways, and there is besides the Interstate Commission which settles all disputes between the states. But on this side of the line, although our exports are greater per head than on the other side, we are still without any means of controlling our railways, and I hope the government will take action for the appointment of a railway commission. We are told that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council attends to this matter. No doubt, Mr.

Speaker, that has been a very efficient body during the last five years.

Take for instance the railway rates on coal oil. In that case the committee did their duty to the people. I know that in other cases they have proven themselves to be an efficient court. But this country is growing, new transportation companies are being started, we are going ahead by leaps and bounds; and the time has come when we must have somebody, as they have in England and in other countries, to regulate the traffic on the railroads of this country. I pointed out in this House last session, that, west of Lake Superior we were paying double what they were paying in the east as a local rate. We do not expect, in a country like that where there is little local traffic, to get a rate as cheap as in this part of the country. But we do expect fair treatment, and I believe that we cannot get that fair treatment until we get that railway commission. There are a hundred and one things for that commission to deal with. The cattle-guards question for instance, should be under their control. Such a commission should take means to find out the kinds of cattle-guards in use in the United States and other parts of the world, learn which is the best form of cattle-guard and make a recommendation to the government accordingly. This done, the government would be in a position to legislate intelligently upon this important question. Then there is the question of shortage of cars. There is an evil which we have felt very keenly in the west this year. For, after all, the grain bill has nothing to do with it. I do not blame the railroads for the shortage of cars altogether. We raised two crops in one year in that country, and it was not to be expected that any railroad could take that out of the country in a month or two. But what I do complain of is that the railroads discriminate against the farmer and small dealers in favour of the elevator man and the man who was in a position to ship large quantities of grain. But the railroad people say that they did this in the interest of the country, because cars in the hands of big shippers were loaded more quickly and so there was less delay and, on the whole, more grain was shipped out than could have been shipped out if the cars had been given to the farmer. It may be that there is something in that argument. But I have known cases where the railroad has refused point blank to give a man a car. These things need to be inquired into and regulated. And the sooner the government take steps to appoint a commission to control the transportation companies, the better it will be for all concerned. Another thing that the commission should do is to see to it that a uniform system of book-keeping is adopted by the transportation companies, so that the public may know exactly how much capital these companies have invested in their enterprises. Nobody wants capitalists to put money into railroads without getting a fair return. But we want to know how much they have put in, so that we may know what is a fair return. They may say that they have, for instance, $65,000,000 worth of stock, but we may know that that is half water, and still they are paying five per cent on the whole, and, in order to do that, charging rates which, we contend are too high. The commission should be empowered to examine the books of every transportation company, to ascertain how much money has been invested, and allow them to charge such rates as will give a fair return.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken up more time than I intended to. I hope and believe that, in the season now opening, we are to have a great influx of population into the western part of this country. I hope that, in dealing with all the questions I have spoken about, the government of the day will recognize the fact that we are 'getting a big boy now' in the west, and that, when it comes to questions of taxation and other things of that kind, our interests must be consulted. When delegations of manufacturers come for increased duty, or delegations of promoters come for subsidies for Georgian Bay canals and other works, the government must take into consideration that their friends, and not their friends only but the people, the great producing people of the west, are interested in these questions and that the position and interests of those people must have consideration at the hands of the government of this country.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, considering the marked ability with which this debate has been conducted by hon. gentlemen on both sides, it would be presumptious in me to think that I could add any interest to it by any remarks of mine at this stage. At the same time, I feel that I should not be doing justice to myself if I did not express my views on certain public questions which have been before the House for the last few days. We are trying in this country to solve various problems according to the light that is thrown upon them, considering the whole field of our trade and commerce and our fiscal arrangements, and also the field of foreign trade and commerce. My hon. friend (Mr. Davis) who has just resumed his seat has charged the leader of the opposition with not stating what changes he would make in the tariff. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) himself has ventured to state, in respect of certain items, just what, in his opinion, the tariff should be. It seems to me that the way to frame a tariff is to take evidence from various quarters, and, after carefully weighing it, and considering it from every point of view, to decide what each tariff item should be. We are a great confederation, and I hope that this confederation of ours is bound together by bonds as strong as those which unite the various

states of the United States of America. And I hope that the policy which will guide us in the future in determining these various questions regarding our trade policy, will be one which will result in benefit to the people taken as a whole. In dealing with this question we must take into our earnest consideration our geographical position, our national position and our sentimental position. Sentimentally, I take it, we are pretty well agreed that the country will remain British and that we need not go into any discussion as to that. Geographically, however, I have no hesitation in saying, if there were no sentiment in the question, that, after a few years, we would become a part of the United States. I do not think there is any intermediate line—either we are to be British or we are to be American, and I believe we are to remain British. But we have to ask ourselves the question : Are we in a position to grant to our people, through legislation, as much as possible, those material blessings with which the people to the south of us are favoured. I say we are. Unfortunately, however, for a long term of years we have been witnessing conditions which have been very distasteful to us, which have grated upon our finer feelings. Our pride has risen in us, and we have as it were set our teeth, when we have witnessed what has been going on in this country for the last fifty years. I refer to the exodus which has been talked of in this House under the administration of various governments. We have not faced the question as we should have faced it. We have been living alongside this agressive people to the south of us who have studied our trade conditions and have decided what will be in their best interests, and have proceeded to put upon their statute-book laws which were very much against our interests and very much in favour of their own. It seems to me that, in considering this matter, we have not taken advantage of our opportunities. When we discuss this question in this House, we would not like every observation we make to reach the ears of our friends to the south of us.

We are sorry to have to face the present situation, I very much regret for myself that I have to admit that this country has been a breeding ground for the United States for many years past. We are a young country with great natural resources, and with a people eminently fitted to develop these resources. We have hitherto occupied in this country a position similar to the position which the thickly populated nations of Europe have occupied, for Canada, as well as they, has had to witness great numbers of her population going into the United States. In the European countries, however, population has been overcrowded, and there has been reason for the large immigration to the United States, a reason which does not exist in Canada. There is room enough here for every one of our sons born in this country, and in view of the heavy losses we have sustained by immigration I think the time has come when we should make a determined effort to prevent that drain upon our population. We educate our young men in this country, and as soon as they come to years of maturity they flit away to the United States. Our universities, I am sorry to say, contribute to the same result by the high class education which it gives them. As soon as our young men go to the United States they immediately are sought for to fill the highest and most important positions in that country. It is evident that young Canadians are of more value to the United States than the men who come to that country from Europe. I say that we are becoming weary of witnessing this kind of thing. There is no doubt that our young men who go to the United States are more highly prized than the men from any other nation in the world, owing, I presume, to their home training, and to the surroundings in the midst of which they were brought up in Canada.

Now, the United States seem to know, as shown by their legislation, what is in the best interest of the American people ; but we cannot say that of our own legislation hitherto. I think, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we should set ourselves to the task of looking after our own interests, and of retaining our population at home. I admit that the task is a very serious one, and requires careful study, but I think that it is quite possible to improve our condition. In discussing this question we must consider it on broad national grounds. I have no sympathy whatever with those petty and sectional considerations which are sometimes imported into the discussion of our public questions. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a feeling of friendliness existing throughout this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, among all sections of our population. We are a great confederation, and we are bound together by bonds which will not and cannot grow any less in the future. The business men in the industrial centres of Quebec, such as Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, St. Hyacinthe and Sherbrooke, are found extending their operations from one end of this Dominion to the other, trading with business men in the far west, and with business men of Ontario and the maritime provinces. In fact the commercial interests of the people in all sections of this country are intermingling and becoming mutually more dependent on each other. We all desire to develop the great North-west of which my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has spoken with such marked ability this afternoon. We are bound to develop the North-west, and we must ask our friends from the North-west to assist us in developing the east. I am sure that their loyalty to our common country will lead them in the future as it has in the past, to see that it is only by a common policy that our common interests can be subserved and the whole country developed.

During the budget speech the hon. Minister of Finance gave us the usual statistics regarding our foreign trade and the figures of receipts and expenditure. These figures were very interesting. I was somewhat astonished at the liberty which the Minister of Finance took in some of his statements. It seems to me he was taking great liberty with an over ruling providence in failing sufficiently to attribute our prosperity to the productiveness of the soil, and the development of our natural resources during the last few years. The first matter to which I shall refer in reference to the budget speech is the manner of bookkeeping as applied to our public accounts. A great deal has been said about surpluses. I understand a surplus from a business standpoint, the same as a business man would understand it. I do not think people in general understand what the Minister of Finance was trying to make out when he spoke of the question of surpluses ; but I notice that the press of this country who support the government have tried to make a great deal of credit for the government out of this question of surpluses. In discussing this question I do not propose to deal with consolidated revenue, capital account, or matters of that kind ; I am simply going to draw attention to what our income and receipts have been during the last six years, and to compare them with the income and receipts during the last six years of Conservative administration. I propose to take these figures, because they comprise all the moneys which we have received and that have already been used. Now, as comparisons are in order, I would like to direct the attention of the House to these figures :

Total income or receipts, 6 years.

1891	$38,579,310
1892	36,921,871
1893	38,208,608
1894	36,374,883
1895	33,978,129
1896	36,618,590
	$220,681,394
Average, 6 years	$36,780,232

Total income or receipts, 6 years.

1897	$37,829,778
1898	40,556,510
1899	46,743,102
1900	51,031,466
1901	52,516,332
1902 (estimate)	56,800,000
	$285,477,190
Average six years	47,579,531

The average during the last six years of the Conservative administration per annum was $36,780,232 and the average during the past six years of the present administration was $47,579,531. That is to say that the present administration, during the term they have been in office, have taken from the people $64,795,796 in excess of what the Conservative administration took from the people in the last six years of their regime. But Sir, with this great increase in the expenditure which we see, has the debt decreased ? Has the debt stood still ? The debt, to-day, is $15,982,570 in excess of what it was in 1896. The public debt at the end of the present fiscal year adding the increase according to estimate of the Minister of Finance of $6,000,000 will stand $274,480,003. Therefore, we have here all the money that has been received and we have a tremendous increase in the debt also. Therefore, I submit under all these circumstances there is no real surplus. The expenditure in 1896, taking out the North Shore Railway subsidy charged in that year was $41,702,383. In 1901 it had risen to $57,982,866, and in 1902, we are informed by the hon. Finance Minister, that the government, proposes to expend $65,000,000. Now, Sir, I submit that this is an alarming condition of affairs, because we remember that in the time when hon. gentlemen who are now holding the reins of power were in opposition, and when the expenditure was $38,000,000 per annum, said to the people of the country that if they would put them in power they would reduce this expenditure by $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 per annum. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question arises : Were these hon. gentlemen sincere ? As far as I am concerned I do not want to say that they were insincere in respect to their promises to the people in those days. They went up and down the country and they did appeal to the people and tried to frighten them at the enormous expenditure of that day. They alarmed the people and they were pictured in those days as going about the country with tears in their eyes bewailing this tremendous expenditure. But, I venture to say, while I do not accuse them of insincerity, that the tears which were pictured as steaming down their countenances were all crocodile tears. I believe, in view of what has happened since they came into office, that there is reason to justify that belief. The debt per capita has increased from $8.22 in 1896 to about $12 per capita at the present time. Notwithstanding that I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that during the Conservative regime a tremendous amount of money had to be expended on public works which the present government have not had to expend since they came into power. During the Conservative regime from 1878 to 1896 they spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway $65,000,000, while the Liberal government have only had to expend $33,000. On canals the Conservative government had to expend $36,000,000 while the Liberal government have only had to expend $14,250,000. On account of the debt of the provinces the Conservative government had to expend $10,300,000 as against $267,000 expended by the Liberal government. and on the Intercolonial Railway the Conservative government had to expend $20,500,000, instead of

$8,250,000 expended by the Liberal government.

Now, I admit that the tariff is specially arranged for revenue purposes. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) has stated that the tariff is so arranged as to bring in a revenue. His theory is that the first and most important object to be sought is framing a tariff is to so frame it as to raise a revenue regardless of any other consideration, and we have had it from the lips of the right hon. Prime Minister that :

> Our first consideration in imposing duties, is to produce revenue, and if, as an incident, the manufacturers derive advantage, they are welcome to it. But, gentlemen on the other side impose duties, not with a view of levying a revenue and putting money into the treasury, but of putting money in the pockets of private individuals.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce also pointed out in respect to that question :—

> Would it surprise him——

Referring to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax)——

> ——to know that it would be equally easy to double, treble and to quadruple the actual taxation of the people of the country and at the same time to reduce their nominal taxation to one-half or one-third of what it now is ? Would it surprise him to know that ?

I submit to hon. gentlemen opposite right here, when they say the tariff is a revenue tariff that it is a tariff which is calculated to take large sums of money out of the pockets of the people and they do not consider that the chief object is one for the promotion of our industries, but that the chief object is to raise revenue, that, on the other hand, we differ, and we say that the chief object should be to protect the industries of this country, to pursue such a policy as will give employment to our people, in order that we may be able to keep them in this country. I say that it would be in the interests of the people of this country, in the interest of public economy, and it would be good policy at the present time to have less money flowing into the treasury. It would be a good thing if the government were occasionally hard up and had very little money to spend. I think we would carry on the affairs of the country much more economically if that were the case. In reference to the pledges of the party which is now in power, I do not intend to say very much. I have no doubt that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce feels very keenly on this subject and we listened with a very great deal of interest to what he had to say a few days ago. It was said in some quarters owing to the peculiar character of the speech which he made, that it was his valedictory, and that perhaps he would be translated to a higher position in the eyes of the government where he could be of greater use to the country during the coming years. He was reminiscent in what he said and I felt some degree of sympathy for the hon. ministers who surrounded him, when he made the statement :

> That even the best government that ever existed, even a government like that of the late Alexander Mackenzie, could not have averted the disaster which overspread the whole world, although it might have greatly modified it.

It seems a peculiar thing that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce should have taken this opportunity to bring the attention of the House to the fact that the Mackenzie administration was the best government that ever existed, and, therefore, I say that perhaps the hon. gentleman may be translated to a higher position. But, before he is translated and before he leaves this House, I hope he will tell us what he thinks of this $65,250,000 of an expenditure, or nearly double what it was in the years when he advocated economy in the way in which he did. Regarding our trade a good deal has been said in respect to it being on a satisfactory footing. I contend that there are signs that it is not altogether on a satisfactory footing. The balance of trade is against us at the present time and it is made up as follows : Our exports in 1900, deducting gold bearing quartz, silver concentrates, coin and bullion, amounted to $167,735,057, and our imports, deducting the same things, amounted to $186,878,231, leaving a balance against us of $19,234,994. The United States exports were in excess of their imports during the year 1901 by $664,592,826. In so far as we have in this country to export very many of the same commodities which the United States have, and if our industries were developed to the extent to which I think they will be, and to which I think they ought to be, there is no reason why we should continue to have this balance of trade against us. We look at the United States exports to Great Britain and we find that in 1901 they increased by $93,272,475, while the exports of Canada decreased by $2,407,412. That is not a picture which is very satisfactory and I do not think that the government can take much comfort out of it. Indeed I am surprised that the Minister of Finance dwelt upon these matters to the extent to which he did.

Then as regards our trade with the United States it is not in a satisfactory condition. Our exports to the United States, deducting gold bearing quartz, silver concentrates, coin and bullion, in 1900 amounted to $44,477,451, and in 1901 our exports to the United States amounted to $43,795,001; a decrease of $682,150, while during the same period our imports from the United States had increased by $6,762,733. I think the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is responsible for the following figures. We export to the United States farm products to the

value of $8,096,092, which is 10 cents a head of the population of the United States, while we are taking of such farm products from the United States $19,147,732, or $3.48 per head of our population. My object in giving these figures is to draw attention to the fact that our present trade conditions must be considered if we are to develop this country in the way in which we hope to. In this connection I would like to draw attention to the industrial development in the United States. At the National Reciprocity Convention held at Washington last year, it was pointed out that the manufactured products of the United States amounted to $13,000,000,000, and that they exported of that $412,000,000 or from 3 to 4 per cent. In 1890, ten years previous, the manufactured products of the United States amounted to $9,000,000,000, and they thus had increased in the ten years 45 per cent. If the industries of the United States go on increasing in that ratio which is quite probable, then in another ten years instead of having a total production of thirteen billions they will produce nineteen and a half billions. It therefore becomes an interesting question for us as to what is to become of their surplus output. Our geographical position towards the United States would lead one to suppose that if they have a surplus which they are bound to get rid of, Canada is the easiest and most likely place in which they will try to find a market. I do not need to-day to give illustrations of what we mean when we refer to this question of slaughtering American products in Canada. I have only to refer to the illustration which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) gave to this House in reference to the article of shears, which any gentlemen by referring to 'Hansard' can see for themselves. I need not take up the time of the House discussing this question, because it already has been dealt with, but I will emphasize the fact that we must consider this question very seriously, and we have come to a time, when, I believe we must take prompt action in order to protect our own industries and our own people from the over production of the United States. We do not fear United States competition under equal conditions. We want Americans to come and locate their industries in Canada, but we do not want them to carry on operations against Canada from across the border, where they are not liable to the laws of this country, and where they do not contribute to the revenue of this country and do not help in any way to make of Canada a great and strong nation. Before disposing of this question in reference to trade, I would like to refer to certain words contained in the first presidential message of Mr. Roosevelt in reference to the attitude of the United States so far as they are concerned, in protecting their home market. He said :

Mr. KEMP.

It is most important that we should maintain the high level of our present prosperity. We have now reached the point in the development of our interests where we are not only able to supply our own markets, but to produce a constantly growing surplus for which we must find markets abroad. To secure these markets we can utilize existing duties in any case where they are no longer needed for the purpose of protection, or in any case where the article is not produced here and the duty is no longer necessary for revenue, as giving us something to offer in exchange for what we ask. The cordial relations with other nations which are so desirable will naturally be promoted by the course thus required by our own interests.

I need not repeat what was said by the late President McKinley in his remarkable speech at Buffalo, and which was referred to by the hon. leader of the opposition, but I would like to read an extract which is a characteristic one so far as the Americans are concerned, and which appeared in the 'Implement Age,' August 15, 1901, published in Philadelphia :

It is safe to assume that, under the present condition of affairs in Canada, some tariff agreement which would make the road into Canada easier for our manufacturers would be greatly to the advantage of this country, as we could not only hold our ground but invade Canada with our manufactures. In proof of this claim it may be stated that for the nine months ending with March, 1901, we sold implements and machinery to British North America to the value of $1,368,000, while Canadian manufacturers sold nothing in such lines in this country. If the tariff should be reduced our manufacturers would no doubt increase their sales in Canada while Canadian manufacturers would be unable to meet the American manufacturers in the United States markets under any kind of tariff.

In reference to the question of protection in our own country, we have heard from the Minister of Finance that the policy that we should pursue was the policy of teaching Canadians to use Canadian goods. That is a very nice theory indeed, but it is a very impracticable one. I have heard it often spoken of before, but when I consider the great competition there is between merchants, how anxious every merchant is to get something a little different from his neighbour and to buy a little cheaper; when I realize how little attention the merchant pays to mere sentiment in his dealings, and how he proceeds to supply himself with these articles which are most suitable to his trade regardless of where they are produced; when I think of this, I am not inclined to put much faith in the policy outlined for us by the Minister of Finance. I believe that in the whole consumption of this Dominion of Canada there would not be $50,000 worth a year of goods sold on account of a sentiment of that kind. Therefore, so far as that peculiar sentiment is concerned, we need not pay much attention to it, although no doubt the recommendation of the Minister of Finance is a very loyal utterance, and one which I would be

glad the people of this country would adopt. I do not think, however, that there is any reason to hope that our people will buy Canadian goods simply because they are Canadian goods.

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is also responsible for this statement, that we could produce, of our imports from the United States, about $65,000,000 worth of manufactured products. Now, I am not sure but what that is a little larger sum than we could hope to produce. I think perhaps that of the imports of the manufactured goods into this country from the United States, we might reasonably produce upwards of $40,000,000 worth, and if we produce $40,000,000 worth of manufactured goods in this country more than we are producing now, I submit that it would give employment to a great many more people, and to that extent there would be fewer people to emigrate to the United States and find homes there.

I have also heard the statement made by an authority on this subject, that if that amount of goods were produced in this country affording employment to the extra number of people required to produce them, there would be a consumption of farm products in Canada to the extent of $11,000,000 worth more than at present.

I regret that I cannot believe that the exodus to the United States has been stopped or indeed diminished to any great degree. From information which I have had from various parts of the country, I am told that the exodus is still going on, and those whom I know in the United States and who formerly lived here, tell me that the exodus is continuing.

The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) was very anxious to know what the government are going to do with regard to the tariff. He was trying to find some proof that the tariff was not going to be raised. I do not see any reason why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) should be alarmed. He has the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) with a policy on this question, and on the other hand he has the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) with an entirely different policy from his other two colleagues. But as there are two ministers against one, they ought be able to win the day, and leave the mind of the hon. member (Mr. Davis) at peace as to the tariff. We will not deal with the other members of the cabinet as to their attitude on this question, because we have not been able to get from them a definite announcement of their opinion. But, Sir, the time has come when we should have a cabinet which would have but one opinion as to our fiscal policy. The time has come when different members of the cabinet should not advocate different policies in different parts of the country. The crisis is too serious for that. We have alongside of us a nation which is trying to get hold of the business of this country; a nation which pays no attention to the economic theories which were discussed by the hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan. The Americans disregard such theories, but they aim at practical results; an example which I hope this country will follow in reference to our fiscal legislation in the future. Let me refer to an observation which was made by the Prime Minister—an observation which was made by him recently on more than one occasion—namely, that we have turned our face from Washington. It seems to me that is a very remarkable statement for the Prime Minister to have made in view of his past record. At the same time I was glad to hear him say it, because it will be better for this country if we do to some extent turn our face from Washington. At the same time I am prepared to believe that there are certain questions of difference between this country and the United States, which it should be the duty of our statesmen to have settled. I remember in years gone by, before hon. gentlemen who are now in power occupying the treasury benches, that they were never tired of telling the people of this country that if they came into power they would settle all these questions. I have here a copy of the Liberal platform of 1893, which has been given to me by a good Liberal. He has been studying it and reading it all these years, and it is almost worn out; but I think I can make out from it what was said in those days by hon. gentlemen opposite, who were then in opposition, about the government going to Washington :

> That no sincere effort has been made by them to obtain a treaty, but that on the contrary it is manifest that the present government, controlled as they are by monopolies and combines, are not desirous of securing such a treaty ;
>
> That the first step towards obtaining the end in view is to place a party in power who are sincerely desirous of promoting a treaty on terms honourable to both countries.

While I have this remarkable document in my hand, I would like to refer to another statement in it, in regard to economy and expenditure :

> We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

Now, with regard to having turned our faces away from Washington, we have been told only within the last few months that this is the policy of the present government. Therefore we may take it for granted that the various questions still in dispute between this country and the United States

are not going to be settled, and that no attempt is going to be made to settle them. The 'Globe' of August 19, 1898, said:

It is ten years since the last international conference was held on this side of the Atlantic and on that occasion, although Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Bayard and the other conferees laboured faithfully to settle the Atlantic fisheries difficulties, the settlement was contemptuously tossed aside by the Senate of the United States. The present conference assembles under happier auspices than the Fisheries Commission, because the relations between the United States and Canada are distinctly cordial instead of being dangerously strained as they were in 1888.

The Anglo-American entente also is an element that can scarcely be left out of the calculation in estimating the probable result of the gathering.

Now, we have the fact before us that the conditions were peculiarly favourable to the present government for procuring a settlement of the various questions pending between the two countries. What were those questions? They were the following:

1. The Behring Sea difficulty—fur seal fishery.
2. Reciprocity in trade.
3. The Atlantic and Pacific coast fisheries.
4. The Alaskan boundary.
5. The bonding privileges.
6. The preservation of fish in contiguous waters.
7. The maintenance of naval vessels on the great lakes.
8. The alien labour law.
9. The wrecking laws.
10. Transit of merchandise.
11. Mining rights.
12. Definition of marking of frontiers.
13. Conveyance of persons in custody.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the government take the ground that none of these questions are capable of solution, I submit that we must question very much their ability as negotiators. I hope, however, that the government, if they cannot solve all of these questions, will at least take up some of them and dispose of them during the term of their administration.

As we have turned our faces away from Washington, I think we should at the present time turn them towards Germany, which is discriminating against this country in trade matters. During the last day or two I noticed a press despatch saying:

A special to the 'Herald' from Washington says:—Secretary Wilson is preparing to enforce retaliatory measures against Germany. He is formulating regulations for the exclusion of any products of that and any other countries which are preserved or in which boracic acid has been used.

This is the direct result of the decree issued by Emperor William prohibiting the importation of American meats upon which boracic acid has been employed as a preservative. The Department of Agriculture holds that boracic acid is not injurious, and it is satisfied that German action is due to the pressure of the Agrarian party. As the secretary pointed out in his memorandum to the Department of State, there are many articles of German exportation which this government can exclude for clear sanitary reasons. These include German wines and German malt liquors.

Thus, you see that the moment Germany or any other nation in the world, attempts to discriminate against the people of the United States, the United States government proceeds to act. But Germany has been discriminating against this country for the last three or four years, and all that this government have been doing apparently is taking the matter into their consideration. We ought to be in a position to do something to bring Germany to time. She is discriminating against our wheat as compared with that of the United States to the extent of 50 per cent, against our rye 40 per cent, against out oats 50 per cent, and against our peas 40 per cent. Our exports of wheat and other products to Great Britain show a decline. Why should we not be able to take advantage of the German market upon the same terms as the United States where we would find a market for those products which in volume are declining in the British market? Why does the government not make some effort to have Germany remove this discrimination? I contend that in this matter we occupy a very humiliating position, and I hope that the government will take steps to place Canada in a right attitude towards Germany or any other nation that attempts to discriminate against our trade.

A good deal of discussion has taken place in reference of the preferential tariff in favour of Great Britain. I would like to show the House exactly what benefit this preferential tariff has been to Great Britain. In 1901 our total imports from Great Britain, dutiable and free, amounted to $43,164,297, of which there came in under the preferential tariff $25,905,721. Now, if there had been no preference it is safe to estimate that we would have brought from Great Britain at least two-thirds of that amount, or $17,270,481, in any case, which leaves as the extra amount which we bring in because of the preference, $8,635,240. If we deduct from that amount those goods which are not British, but which are manufactures of Germany, Belgium and other European countries, and into which a moderate or 'substantial portion' of British labour has entered, estimated at $3,635,240, we have left only $5,000,000, the product of British labour, which we actually bring in from Great Britain as a result of the preferential tariff. The government in their wisdom saw fit to change somewhat the conditions under which British goods under the preferential tariff would come in, and I contend that the Order in Council of June 13, 1898, is of such a loose character that it enables the goods of various European countries to come into this country under the preferential tariff.

Mr. WRIGHT. How does the hon. gentleman ascertain the amount of goods imported from England that have been partially made in Germany ?

Mr. KEMP. I am making an estimate, which I think is a safe one. I believe that if there were no preference, we would import two-thirds of what we now bring in, which would be $17,270,481 as compared with $25,905,721. It is impossible for any one to calculate what the hon. gentleman asks, but I think that the estimate I have made is a safe one.

I do not think there can be any doubt that our woollen people have suffered under the preferential tariff, and that some relief should have been given before this. The United States import about $14.000,000 worth of woollen goods annually. This Canada of ours imports about $10,000,000 annually. The American people therefore import to the extent of about twenty cents per capita while in Canada we import to the extent of $2 per capita, or ten times as much. There is no reason why these goods cannot be produced here, and it seems to me that if we are truly loyal to the British empire and to this country we will strengthen our own industries and in so doing strengthen the whole empire, for it can be no benefit to Great Britain that we should destroy an industry in this country when in so doing we do not appreciably affect any interest in Great Britain.

But hon. gentlemen opposite want to know if we mean to do away with this tariff. Well, my policy would be to make every thing we possibly can in this country, to give to Great Britain a substantial preference over her competitors in such things as we do not produce, and allow no foreign goods whatever to come in under the preferential tariff. I do not believe that what the Minister of Interior told us last year meets with the approval of this country. He said :

> When we give a preference, if it is to be at any one's expense, it is at the expense of the manufacturer and workingmen of Canada. We go a little further, and say that it is the policy of the Liberal party of Canada to reduce the duties and to remove to some extent the burden of the excessive tariff which was imposed on imported goods by the late Conservative government.

What have we gained by this preferential tariff ? We have gained the discrimination of Germany against us. We have thrown our workingmen out of employment to some extent. True, we have got the clauses in the German and Belgian treaties denounced, but up to the present of what advantage has that denunciation been to us ? It may be in the future, but so far it has been of no benefit to this country whatever. I would advocate a reciprocal preference in trade matters between the different parts of this empire on entirely broader lines than those which exist at present.

Let me draw attention to a press despatch which appeared coming from London to the ' New York Post ' a day or two ago :

> So far as concerns the preferential tariff proposals now coming from Canada and Australia, designed to make the empire more or less a trade unit, in view of the coronation conference in June, it is understood that the cabinet is inclined to agree to submit the whole question to a Royal Commission, upon which the colonies shall be represented.

I wish to point out that the idea of a royal commission is one which unanimously gained the approval of the chambers of commerce that met in London in 1900, and the British government has been strongly pressed to appoint this commission. If the right hon. the Prime Minister can accomplish nothing further, when he attends the intercolonial council in Great Britain, I hope he will at least advocate the appointment of a royal commission, composed of home and colonial delegates, to consider this question of preferential trade. I think that we ought to join hands with Australia in trying to work out reciprocal trade giving preference to the products of the empire. I believe that in the future Britain's trade policy will be considered upon the true basis of expediency. I believe that she will have to do something, and what we want to do is to make ourselves more independent of other countries, as an empire, in trade matters. We should place ourselves in closer touch with the 400,000,000 people of this British empire. We should stand shoulder to shoulder in matters of trade as well as in matters of war, and make it our object to keep British capital and labour within the empire.

In discussing this preferential tariff we always come to the question of the debt of gratitude which we owe Great Britain and how we should repay it, and hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that this preference was given Great Britain because of the support she has given us by her army and navy, and in every other respect. That brings me to the question of the colonial conference, and it seems to me that the attitude of the government in that respect is a very peculiar one. I have here a copy of the cablegram sent on the 23rd January to His Excellency the Governor General by the Colonial Secretary, in which the Colonial Secretary asked that certain questions be discussed at this colonial conference. The cablegram reads as follows :

> It is proposed by His Majesty's government to take advantage of the presence of the premiers at the coronation to discuss with them the questions of political relations between the mother country and the colonies, Imperial defence, commercial relations of the empire, and other matters of general interest.

These are the questions which the Colonial secretary was desirous of having discussed. The Governor General's reply was :

> Referring to the several questions mentioned in your despatch of 23rd January, the only one

which, in the opinion of my ministers gives promise of useful discussion is that of the commercial relations between the various sections of the empire.

The British people must have been greatly disappointed when they found that this government will not even discuss the question of defence. The government state very clearly that that is a question which they do not intend to discuss. I would like to ask the right hon. the First Minister how it is possible for him to consider the question of preferential trade within the empire or of getting a preference for our products in Great Britain, if he is not prepared to discuss the question of defence, and if he takes the position that Canada will do nothing for herself in that respect? Not only must the British people be disappointed, but our own people feel humiliated at this attitude of the government. We know that Cape Colony and Australia have been assisting in Imperial defence. I do not say that we should follow the example of any of these colonies. I do not say that we should tax our people for the purpose of the British navy. I do not say that we should bind ourselves to do whatever the British parliament might tell us to do. But I contend that we have come to that period in our history, as a nation, when we should be willing to assume some of the burdens which other nations have to assume with regard to their own defence. How can we, with the population which we have to-day, expect to escape the responsibilities which other nations have to assume? Do we expect to enjoy all the advantages of being a part of the British Empire and share none of the burdens? Do we expect the British navy to continue to protect our shores while we simply do nothing to help ourselves? I think this is a question which we should face in a manly way, which we should be willing to discuss openly in this House in order to come to some conclusion. This country is practically, in the matter of defence, in the same position as the most helpless, recently acquired colony of Great Britain. We are not doing anything in the direction of coast defence or of building up a navy of our own, and I submit that the figures I have shown with respect to the operation of the preferential tariff are not a sufficient return to Great Britain for the advantages she is giving us. We find Great Britain overwhelmed with responsibilities and taxation, and I believe that if we had been obliged to go through a similar experience to that which the people of South Africa have been undergoing, if this country had been attacked by a foe, Great Britain would have done as much for us, and more than she has done in South Africa. The time, I consider, has come, when we should consider our relations with respect to this question. We are a part of the British Empire, and the question to my mind is this: Are we going to remain a part of the empire or to become absorbed by the United States? There is no medium course. And I think that the consensus of opinion in this country is that we shall remain British. I believe that the people of this country from one end of it to the other, unanimously are in favour of British connection, so strongly in favour of it, that they will not listen to any other course. I do not wish to take up the time of this House in discussing this question at any great length at this time. But I think that the Premier should tell us, before he goes to this colonial conference, what his ideas are with respect to this question of defence. In looking up 'Hansard,' I find that the Prime Minister, in 1892, stated in this House:

> I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspirations is the independence of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation in due course of time.

I would be the last one to accuse the Prime Minister of harbouring any such sentiments at this day. I do not think that it is possible for any public man in Canada to hold such sentiments. But, in view of our peculiar trade relations and of the attitude of the United States with regard to us, in view of the fact that the question of defence has been suggested by the Colonial Secretary for discussion, we should have a pronouncement by the Prime Minister before he goes to London, upon the question of our political relations to the mother country, and upon that of defence. Yesterday I asked a question with regard to the contingents which had been sent to South Africa, with the object of finding out which contingent we had assumed the cost of transporting, arming and equipping and which we had not. I will read the question and the answer in order that the House may understand my object in referring to them now:

> Mr. KEMP asked:
>
> 1. Did the government arm, equip and transport by land and sea, at its own expense, the various contingents of troops which were despatched to the seat of war in South Africa, to assist in subduing the enemies of the King?
>
> 2. If not, what are the different conditions respecting arming, equipping and transporting the several contingents?
>
> 3. If the government did not, at its own expense, arm, equip and transport any one or more of the contingents, what was the reason for such action?
>
> The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier):
>
> 1. The government did arm, equip and transport, by land and sea at its own expense, the two contingents of troops which were despatched to the seat of war in South Africa, from Canada, in 1899 and 1900.
>
> 2. The arming, equipping and transporting of all other corps were carried out at the expense of the Imperial authorities, as proposed by them.
>
> 3. The reason is that the government deemed it in the public interest to act as they did, and if the hon. member is not satisfied with

that course, it is open to him to affirm by motion, the policy which, in his opinion, ought to have been adopted.

I am a comparatively new member of this House, and may not know as well as the right hon. gentleman the rules of debate. But, I knew it was open to me to proceed to take such a course as the Prime Minister pointed out. But, without having before me the particulars which he has given, it would have been a rash thing for me to bring about a discussion of the subject in this House. Therefore, I asked the question in order to ascertain the facts so that I might judge what my course should be. My opinion is that it is quite clear that, in respect to this matter, we have done very little and that we should have done very much more. I think it was a reflection upon our soldiers who were sent to South Africa to put them absolutely in the position of mercenaries. These men would never have gone to South Africa to fight for any other flag except that under which we live. They went there to assist in protecting the flag and in subduing the enemies to the King. The government put them in the position of mercenaries, and that, I say is a reflection upon them which they did not deserve. I hope that when the cheque comes out paying the government for the transportation of these men from the inland parts of Canada to the seaboard and equipping them, that the cheque will be returned, and that we shall assume our fair share of responsibility. Consider what New Zealand has done. The little colony of New Zealand has sent to South Africa more troops than we have sent. It is proposed to send to Great Britain, with our premier when he goes, a body guard of nine hundred soldiers. When those soldiers go through the streets of London, it is not unlikely that the people will draw a comparison and say : The British government, of course, are not paying for these troops, but they are paying for the troops that the Canadians have sent to South Africa. It is unfortunate to find that we can send to London such a body guard of our soldiers—and I am glad that our representatives will have such a noble body guard, and that we should refuse to pay the petty amount, the paltry amount required for the last contingent sent to South Africa. What is the position of Australia ? It might be interesting to the House to hear the expression of the Prime Minister of Australia with regard to the relations between Australia and the empire. Speaking at a recent gathering at Melbourne, Premier Barton voiced the opinion of Australia on the subject of British unity. He said :

> It was not true that this country would not remain a part of the British Empire, or would not be so loyal a part of it if it advanced in its democracy. The tendency of the British Empire was clearly toward the advancement of individual liberty. In taking up arms for the empire, the states had acted with alacrity and brilliance. Did it mean a subservient adherence to old forms and traditions inconsistent with British liberty ? Not a bit of it. Did it mean that we were becoming an independent country not only in thought, but in action and would forget those from whom we sprang ? No. It meant neither a grovelling subserviency on the one hand nor an ill-considered, unthinking resort to a separate republicanism on the other. The truth was that the Australian character laid down its own lines of demarcation, and Britain's attitude to her colonies since the one great mistake at the end of the eighteenth century was to help them to realize their aspirations for freedom.

Now, while I am prepared to say that we should not give away any of our liberties, and while I am as strong a believer as anyone in retaining the rights we have under the British North America Act, and while I would not leave it to the British parliament to say when and where and how we should serve, the time has come when we should consider to what extent we are going to help to defend ourselves and to defend our own commerce. We should take a strong, a manly stand, upon that question. Australia has a navy. She is now spending $20,000,000 upon new ships and $5,000,000 annually on maintenance. Cape Colony has done something along the same line, as well as Natal. The people of Great Britain spend no less a sum—not in war time, but before the South African war broke out—than $5.40 per capita on the army and navy. The people of the United States spend about the same amount, or about $5.50 per head. If we spent in proportion to the amount spent by Great Britain or the United States, we should have an expenditure of about $30,000,000 for defence. We actually spend about 40 cents or 50 cents per head. Every civilized nation in the world spends from $2 to $5 on arms and defence. On the basis of our export trade, as compared with Great Britain, if we spent at their rate, we should spend about $25,000,000 annually on defence. We need not go into any such extraordinary expenditure, and I am not giving these figures for the purpose of showing that we should. I do say, however, that we should to some extent start the nucleus of a fund for the purpose of building up a navy of our own, and taking such steps as may in some degree protect ourselves and protect our commerce, that we may occupy a more manly position within the empire than we do at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to occupy the time of the House any longer; but before resuming my seat I would like to refer to one more matter. The Prime Minister said in Toronto that there was nothing to reform; he has also said that there were no burning questions in this country. Now, I would like to submit for the consideration of the government some burning questions which I think the government might well take into their consideration, with the view

of developing the country and acquitting themselves of their responsibilities. There is the question of the exodus; there is the question of defence; there is the question of purity in elections; there is the question of purchasing supplies and doing public works by tender; there is the question of strictest economy in the administration of the affairs of the country; there is the question of reduction in freight rates on farm and other products; there is the question of building up our foreign trade in the ratio of that of the United States; there is the question of improving our transportation facilities so that our produce may go out via Canadian instead of United States ports; there is the question of inducing Germany to stop discriminating against our farm products; there is the question of framing our trade policy so as to give more employment to our own people and thus keep them in this country; we require a definite and aggressive trade policy based upon the necessities of the country; and we should endeavour to frame such a policy within the British Empire, based upon reciprocal trade preferences which will bring us into closer touch with its 400,000,000 inhabitants, and render us more independent in trade matters than we are at the present time. We should also endeavour to settle the various questions in dispute between Canada and the United States. Sir, I submit these are matters that may be considered as burning questions, and I hope the government will consider them as such. It is not necessary for me to say that I shall support heartily the amendment submitted by the hon. leader of the opposition ; and I do not see why such an amendment as that should not commend itself to many hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND (North Essex). Mr. Speaker, while thus far I have not burdened the House at any considerable length, I, nevertheless, like the last speaker (Mr. Kemp), have some little hesitation after so much ground has been covered and so many very excellent speeches have been made in attempting for the first time to participate in a budget debate here. I believe it is the duty of all new members of this House for a time, at all events, to endeavour to watch the operations and business of the House, in order to attempt to get well acquainted with the duties that a representative of the people should be acquainted with in order to properly discharge the service which he should render to the country. During last session and this, there are two things which I have been attempting to do as well as I was able.

One was to observe the conduct, the capacity and the operations of the members of the government behind which I sit in order to ascertain, how, in my humble judgment, they were discharging their duties which would be properly discharged by them, and another was to ascertain just what was the nature, the character of the criticism which leading members on the opposite side of the House evinced from time to time. If I were to judge from the criticisms I have heard from the other side of the House I would have commenced by this time to believe that this government was not the government that I had supposed it to be. I well recollect in 1896 that when the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was called upon to select a government, with what joy, with what satisfaction and confidence the Liberal party throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and also, I believe a great many of the independent Conservatives throughout the country, looked over the personnel of that government. They expected from their record, from their business capacity and ability, from their integrity and honesty that the government would take hold of the affairs of this country with a good grip, with an honest desire to serve the country and with a great deal of business capacity. After watching them for four or five years from outside this House and at long range, and during the past year from inside of this House at close range, the only opinion that I have been able to form in connection with the matter is, that the government has answered the expectations that the Liberals of this country had in 1896 when it entered upon its career, and I believe, also, has lived up to the expectations that many Conservatives formed of that government at that time. On the other hand, if I were to express the opinion which I had formed from an observation of the criticisms of the leading members on the other side of the House during last session and this, it would be to the effect that they seem rather more to confine their attention to matters of small moment, to items of small detail, than to dealing with the large questions that the members of the government deal with from time to time. For example, just within this session, on a certain evening, an item was up for consideration amounting to $5,000, and we were shortly engaged in a debate upon that item. The minister in charge gave his word, in view of the criticism of the item, that not one dollar of the $5,000 would be expended until he had an opportunity of looking into the matter and deciding whether it was an expenditure that should be made. While that was his representation to the House, hours were taken up after he had made that statement in a continuance of the debate upon the question of that particular item, although items of very large concern were passed without any comment at all.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, is this quite in order ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland, Essex) is referring to a previous debate which is contrary to the rule.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). Possibly I may be doing so in going into the details of that matter, but, as a matter of general comment, that has been the opinion I have formed from observing the criticisms of hon. gentlemen opposite during the past session and during this session. Now, while I have tried, as I think, to examine and follow the record of the government as carefully as possible, I have also sought in the best way I could to examine the amendment which the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) moved some few days ago. Although, gentlemen who have participated in this debate from this side of the House, almost without a single exception, have asked speakers on the other side of the House to come down to details, and to something definite in regard to what their leader meant and to what they meant, not one of them up to this time has acceeded to that request. We are told in this amendment that the present tariff is unsatisfactory, but I do not know in what respect hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House consider it unsatisfactory. Not one of them has come down to details upon the matter at all. We are told also that the trade of the country needs for its development a policy of adequate protection, but what are the items of protection, what are the particular commodities upon which this duty is required, are unknown up to this moment. It does seem to me that the legal ingenuity and political sagacity of the hon. leader of the opposition have been used for the purpose of framing an amendment which is almost unintelligible and which would leave him all sorts of scope in the future, and in so far as its being a declared policy of a definite character is concerned, it is quite the reverse, and one which does not lay down any definite policy at all. It has been stated from time to time in this House and in the country that this is a country of wonderfully different classes; that we have a great agricultural class in one part of the country, a great mining industry in another part of the country, a great fishing industry in another part of the country and the needs of these industries and of the people from one end of the country to the other are diverse. It does seem to me that no policy can have any great force, or be of any great benefit to the country, that does not recognize that the first principle which should characterize that policy must be one of moderation, one of general application rather than one by which a particular interest, or a particular class, would be benefited to the disadvantage and detriment of other great classes in the community. It seems to me that if there is one thing that characterizes the policy of the present government more than another, it is that mark of moderation and regard for the interests of all classes. If I were asked what was the character of the industries of this country, I would naturally say that they are, agricultural, manufacturing, mining, lumbering and fishing. There is another great interest, that of the labouring classes, and I shall show in a few moments that this government has not been at all slow to recognize the duty it owes to the great labouring interests, and that from time to time it has done many things which are for the particular benefit and in the interests of that great class. If we look for a few moments over these various great industries to which I have adverted, we will ascertain the condition of our commerce as represented by the exports from this country in 1896 and again in 1901. If we look at the exports of animals and their produce we find that they amounted to $37,000,000 in 1896, while in 1901 they have increased to $56,000,000. If we look at agricultural products we find that in 1896 the exports were $17,000,000, and in 1901 $38,000,000. If we look at manufactures we find that in 1896 the exports were $10,000,000, and in 1901 $17,000,000. If we look to the exports in connection with the mining industry we find that in 1896 they were $8.000,000, and in 1901 $40,000,000. The only industry which, in a comparison between these two particular years, 1896 and 1901, does not show a marked increase, but rather a slight diminution, is the fishing industry, the exports of which in 1896 amounted to $11,000,000, and in 1901 to $10,000,000. But we all know that that industry is marked by great fluctuations. We know that, for example, in British Columbia for several years there has been great falling off in the catch of salmon, but we know also that the largest catch of salmon the country has ever seen will be that of the year we are in. What I want to try to make out is, that this policy is a general policy working for the interest and advantage of all classes as shown by the fact that each and every of the great industries of the country during these past five or six years, has shown a steady, a gradual and a very large increase. So that, instead of this policy being one for one particular class, it is a policy in the interests of all classes. There is another point which is very akin to this. One would expect for five or six years, in order to ascertain whether this policy was a general policy, a moderate policy and one in the interest of all classes, that if you apply these tests which are ordinarily applied to ascertain whether a country is prospering or not, whether the policy that is in vogue has worked in the interest of the country; that if you apply these tests, some at all events of the tests

will show that the country was or was not prospering under that policy.

The first of these tests is as to a general and steady increase of trade. If we apply that test, then unquestionably the policy inaugurated in 1896 and continued to the present has been satisfactory and useful to the country. If we apply the second test: That of an increasing population, I do not think that any one that listened to the speech delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) during this debate, can come to any other conclusion but that for the last five or six years while this government has been in power and while its policy has been in force, the depopulation of the country which was occurring during the Conservative regime has been gradually ceasing, and that a great change for the better has come over the country in that respect.

Again let us apply the test as to whether the value of lands has been increased. I doubt if there is a single member of this House who has had any practical knowledge, who cannot say that in his vicinity the fact is patent that land values are steadily going up for the last five years, while prior to that they were practically at a standstill. Again, if we look at the savings of the people as evidenced by their deposits in the savings banks, has it not been made apparent time and again that the people of Canada are rapidly becoming wealthy and are putting by far more of their earnings as savings, than they ever did before. Again, I have no doubt that many of the hon. gentlemen in this House can testify, as I can myself, that the liabilities which existed upon the property of the Canadian people are largely being reduced under the present condition of things. If I were to speak from my own knowledge I could name many cases in the county from which I came where farmers have during this year come in and paid off as much as $1,000 or $1,200 of the mortgage which was upon their lands for many years. that is evidence that the agricultural classes are now prosperous as never before and that the result of that prosperity is enabling them to wipe out the mortgage incumbrances which had been upon their lands for many years. Again, take the business failures of this country. Any one who studies the records of these failures in Canada for the past five years will see that the number of failures and the amounts involved in 1896, were far greater than they are at the present day. That tells in favour of this government as do all these other tests of prosperity which I have applied. Therefore, as I say, applying to this general moderate policy which the government inaugurated in 1896 and has persisted in, up to this day—with such slight changes as were rendered necessary from time to time—applying any or applying all of the tests which are ordinarily applied to show whether the policy of a government which has been in operation for a reasonable number of years, has been successful or not; then undoubtedly the policy of this government has proven to be eminently successful. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) in the course of his speech asked the question: What has this government done to promote the prosperity of this country? I shall endeavour to tell him. There is one thing that the prosperity of a country depends upon as does the prosperity of an individual, and that is reputation and credit. These are qualities which stand as high and are as useful to a country in its operations, as they are to a private individual in his business. Reputation and credit are necessary to the private individual in the conduct of his business, and they are also necessary to a government which frames measures for the welfare of a country. We cannot perhaps answer this question, free from any partisan bias, but we may go across the sea and ask, what was the credit and what was the reputation of Canada when the Conservative government went out of power in 1896. We know that in 1896 that great newspaper, the London 'Times,' said:—

> Here in the mother country, there is only a feeling of deep regret for the wrong done to the fair fame of the oldest of her daughters.

And the London 'Chronicle' said in 1896:—

> It is no longer possible to doubt that corruption in its worst form is rampant in a large portion of the Canadian civil service.

Now, after six years, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, can it be said with the slightest degree of truth that that is the reputation of the Liberal party, of this government, or of Canada in the year 1902. I have given you definite and positive evidence that outside of this country and among our kin across the water, that was the reputation which Canada unfortunately had in 1896.

I submit that if this government had done nothing more than to wipe out that stigma which rested upon the people of this country, they have done very much to secure our thanks, and they have done much also to promote our prosperity.

What has this government done for the country? I think that the speech made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce served a very wise and very useful purpose in showing what this government has done for the good of Canada. In periods of prosperity like this, and when we are swimming along in a very happy and progressive way, we sometimes are prone to forget what were the conditions which existed in other days; and when the Minister of Trade and Commerce pointed out, that prior to 1896 there was an era of deficits which has been replaced by an era of surpluses; that there was an era of stagnation in trade which has been replaced by a period of enterprising progress; that there is more

work for the working men now than there was in those days ; that wages are higher now than they were then ; that the great agricultural industry and other business was at a low ebb then as compared with now ; I say that in pointing out those things and drawing a contrast between the conditions that exist now and the conditions that existed then, the Minister of Trade and Commerce served a very good purpose. But there is another thing which the people of a country are apt to forget and which it is well perhaps for public men to advert to from time to time. We are too apt to forget the services this government has rendered to the country ; the practical legislation which it has introduced and the various other beneficial administrative acts which the government has performed during the past five or six years. With the permission of the House I shall for a moment call attention to these. In considering whether the government has served the people wisely and well, and whether it merits the criticism that has been levelled against it by its opponents, it is well that we should look to its record and see whether the ministers of the Crown have lived up to the ideal we had of them in 1896, as a cabinet of business men who would govern the country on business principles. Here are some of the things which this government has applied itself to, and which in my judgment it is entitled to a good deal of credit for. There was the settlement of the Manitoba school question ; There was the reform of the tariff and the reduction in taxation ; there was the preferential tariff introduced ; there was the development of transportation facilities ; there was the abolition of Canadian quarantine on cattle exported to the United States ; there was the development of cold storage facilities ; there was the fostering of agricultural interests ; there was the adopting of a vigorous immigration policy ; there was the reduction in the postage rate ; there was the inauguration of increased postal facilities ; there was the reduction of the post office department deficit ; there was the government loan secured in the British market on most favourable terms ; there was the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties ; there was the fact that Canadian government securities were listed in Great Britain ; there was the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal ; there was the development of the iron and steel industries in Canada ; there was the establishment of creameries in the North-west Territories ; there was the establishment of the assay office in Vancouver ; there was the maintenance of the principle that government lands should be held for the settler alone ; there was the preparation of better trade statistics than we ever had before ; there was the principle of a fair wages to labour ; there was the establishment of the department of labour ; there was the publication of the 'Labour Gazette;' there was the introduction of a form of conciliation for the settlement of labour disputes ; there was the abolition of the sweating system on government contracts ; there was the development of the Yukon on the principle that the Yukon must pay for the Yukon ; there was the establishment of cold storage for the preservation of bait for the fishermen of the lower provinces ; there was the appointment of an officer to prevent the infraction of Alien Labour Laws ; there was the construction of the telegraph line to the Yukon ; there was the extension of the government telegraph line to the Straits of Belle Isle ; there was the attempt to prevent the discrimination of rates by railway companies ; there was the large purchases of food stuffs made by the British government in Canada. I submit that the recital of these various things done, works accomplished and legislation enacted by this government shows a record that has not been equalled by any previous government that Canada ever had.

I have sought in a few words to show that no policy can be effective in this country, whether in respect to trade or anything else, except a policy which is moderate and which is not confined to any one class, but is for all; and I am bound to say, in respect to another matter which the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me spoke of, the leader of this government and the government itself have made a record of which they may well feel proud. During the progress of this debate a great deal of attention has been directed to the United States and its people. There is no doubt that the United States is a country peculiarly favoured, having a splendid range of natural advantages and products, an immense population which has flowed to their shores, and another thing which we are often apt to forget, a great deal of British capital to assist in developing the resources of the country. We are sometimes told in this House as well as elsewhere in the country that we have reason to fear an influx of capital from the United States. Did the people of the United States ever take that attitude towards the influx of British capital ? On the contrary, was it not gladly received in the United States, and was it not one of the most potent influences in the development of all the industries of that country ? And if at the present time we see signs of United States capital coming into Canada, and if in the future we are to see more, as I am satisfied we shall, we may say that in this respect at all events we desire the fullest reciprocity that we can have with the United States. Just as they gladly received British capital into their country, we should gladly receive United States capital to assist in building up this country.

The people of the United States have afforded us an example in another respect which we may well imitate. Whatever their

little differences with each other may be, they have in commercial matters and in national feeling shown a united front to the rest of the world. They have fused into one people the various elements of which their population is composed, and have shown a kindly spirit to each other. In that respect they have taught the people of Canada a lesson which they may well take to heart. And when the history of this country for the past few years comes to be written, in the light of cool, calm reflection, I believe that this government, and particularly the Prime Minister, will be credited with an honest, hearty and satisfactory attempt to fuse the different sections of the people of Canada and to make them, what I believe hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House desire them to be—a united, contented and happy people. Not long since I was reading the life of that distinguished and eminent statesman, lawyer and judge, the late Earl Russell; and in that work I came across some lines which he is said to have been fond of repeating, and which, though intended for Ireland, are equally applicable to this country. The words are these :

> What matter if at different shrines
> They prayed unto one God ;
> What matter if at different times
> Their fathers won the sod ;
>
> In fortune and in fame they're joined
> By stronger links than steel,
> And neither could be safe or sound
> Save in the other's weal.

So I believe that, with the keen competition of the people of the United States to face, what we in Canada must have is a hearty, united sentiment to enable us most successfully to meet that competition in the future.

We have heard a good deal during this debate about the various censuses that have been taken; but there is one thing which struck me which has not yet been adverted to. We all know, when the census returns of 1881 appeared, with what gloom and disappointment they were received in this country. We know that when the census returns of 1891 appeared they were received with the same gloom and disappointment. But whether hon. gentlemen opposite are correct in assuming that the last few years have not shown a great increase of population, or whether we on this side are correct in saying the opposite, we can at least say confidently that no gloom or disappointment is abroad in the land on account of the census returns of 1901. The condition of the country has changed; there is a feeling of buoyancy and satisfaction and confidence such as did not exist in 1881 or 1891. When there is a difference of opinion on a matter of this kind, as to whether during the past five or six years the population of this country has increased or decreased or been stationary, if you can get an admission from an opponent or a rival, it seems to me you have the most cogent and powerful argument you could possibly desire. Not long since I read an article from the Boston 'News Bureau' in which I found the most absolute proof of the statements made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce the other night. It says with reference to immigration from Canada to the United States :

> The tide of immigration from Canada to the United States has been checked and she has an expanding population.

Now, what possible object could the Boston 'News Bureau' have in making this statement, desirous as it must naturally be of seeing the United States get as many immigrants as possible from Canada ? There is a proof, not from hon. gentlemen opposite or from hon. gentlemen on this side, but from our keen business rivals on the other side of the line, who would desire to make the very reverse statement if they could possibly reconcile it with the facts.

When one looks at the amendment that has been introduced by the hon. leader of the opposition, and sees that upon the face of it there appears to be a statement that the policy which he proposes to introduce, whatever that policy is—we have not got any particulars of it yet—is to be in the interest of the labour, the agricultural products and the manufacturing industries of the country, it seems to be on the face of it a general policy ; yet those who spoke in favour of that amendment have constantly reiterated that it was the same old policy they had been advocating for years. If that be the case, is there not something a little disingenuous in the wording of the amendment ? Do we not know that the policy which was in operation prior to 1896 was not one of general application to all the industries of the country but only to a few of the leading manufacturing industries. But if the policy which these gentlemen are now seeking to inaugurate is the same old policy that existed previous to 1896, then it follows that instead of being a broad, fair minded policy, suitable for east and west, north and south, it is simply a return to the old policy which applied to a particular class rather than to all classes. Such a policy as that the country pronounced against some time ago and does not want now.

We ought not to be surprised when a gentleman from the west or some border constituency desires that our trade should be as free as possible, whereas another from a manufacturing centre wants higher protection on some particular product. That is just what we may expect in a country with such wonderfully diverse institutions and industries as this country possesses, and no policy that is not favourable to the agricultural, fishing and mining classes, as well as to the manufacturers, will be acceptable to the people.

We heard a good deal from the hon. gentleman who preceded me about the ques-

tion of national defence. It has been well pointed out, from time to time, that this country has done something in the way of national defence. The construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for instance, is a great link which might be utilized in time of war for the transportation of troops. The military expenditures which this government has, from time to time, been making have no doubt had the effect of fitting the young men of the country to take their place in time of war alongside of British regulars, and we have seen that this training has enabled them to turn out capital soldiers in South Africa. These things show what we have done in the matter of military defence, but perhaps the best possible way in which we can do our share in the matter is not so much by direct participation in a common fund as by indirect means. We know that at present the government is concerning itself about enlarging our trade in different directions. We know that it is seeking to enlarge our trade with the old land and Australia and South Africa, and it does seem to me that if we would spend more money in subsidizing vessels of such a character as in time of war might be utilized for war purposes and in the time of peace be used for commercial purposes—if we could devise a system of subsidizing boats of that sort, which would be utilized in time of war, and in connection with which the subsidies might in time of peace make a considerable reduction in the transportation charges, we would be doing a great work for the people of this country by enabling them to compete on better terms, so far as transportation is concerned, with the people of the United States. That is a policy which would appeal to this country and redound greatly to our benefit.

We are beginning to realize that trade with Australia is a matter in which we are very much concerned and I am glad to learn that the government is taking this matter up in a live manner. The people of the United States are very much alive to the importance of this trade, as I will show by an extract from the 'Philadelphia Record.' The 'Record' says:

> The government of Canada is to send a commercial commission to South Africa in the near future to make a report on trade conditions, with a view to securing for the Dominion some of the African trade which now comes to the United States. At the present time the total trade of Canada with South Africa amounts to but $60,000 in value, while that of the United States with British Africa alone amounts to nearly $20,000,000.
>
> While the endeavour of enterprising Canadian manufacturers to secure a wider share of the African trade is highly praiseworthy, the manufacturers of the United States should be wide-awake to the possibilities of danger to them embodied in this particular feature of Canadian commercial activity. It cannot be denied that natural conditions are as favourable in Canada for many classes of manufactures as they are in this country, while the fostering influence of Great Britain may be exerted in the colonial behalf.
>
> In view of the increasing necessity for trade expansion in all directions in order that production may be maintained at home and the present prosperity continued, the United States cannot afford to look with indifference upon any movement tending to counteract the advantages which our manufacturers have already gained.

That is the opinion of the people of the United States and I am glad to see that this government intends sending some one to South Africa to promote as much as possible trade between us and our fellow colonists over there. We all know that the war must soon come to an end; and when it does and when the beneficient institutions of Great Britain will have their sway in that country, the result will be the same as followed in India after the battle of Plassey. After that event, the great Mr. Burke said that he saw one of the nations of Europe casting into the heart of Asia new manners, customs and institutions, and we know that the result made for the development, prosperity and freedom of that country. We know what the taking hold of Egypt by British statesmen did for the land of the Pharoahs, and we may look into the immediate future, when the war in South Africa will have ended, to an immense revival of trade and prosperity in that part of the world. This government ought to be equal to the occasion and endeavour to get in early so as to get as much of the trade of that country in the future as possible. One would think, from the criticisms of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the manufacturing establishments of this country were not prosperous and that no new industries were being started. Well, one can speak perhaps better of his own locality than of others. We have in the county of Essex a town called Walkerville, which is rapidly becoming one of our great manufacturing centres. It is not as yet a very large town, but has some splendid manufacturing establishments, and we have little or no complaint from the manufacturers of that enterprising town that they are being prejudicially affected by the policy of this government.

I know that those factories are, nearly all, working night and day, and that the difficulty they experienced is that of getting men to do the work they have on hand rather than that they are not being properly treated by this government. I know also that, so far from it being a fact that industries are not coming to this country, within the last two or three years a splendid industry has been established at Walkerville, the Walkerville Steel Bridge Company. That company already employes two or three hundred hands; and the manager told me not long since that he had an immense number of contracts on hand. I would scarcely like to reveal what he told me about the enor-

mous quantity of contracts which they had secured. The owners of that concern, who within the last few years have come into this country and set up that establishment and already have it on a splendid business basis. I might take you to Windsor and Sandwich, where you would find a similar state of affairs. For instance, at Sandwich there is the J. H. Bishop Fur Company, which has been established as a new concern, an offshoot from an establishment at Wyandotte, Michigan. That concern has been established since 1896. I have it on the authority of their manager that their business has steadily grown from the day the establishment was started. Far from not prospering under this government, it has prospered constantly and steadily. I might refer to one or two industries in the city of Windsor, which were running along in a small way up to 1896 but which, since that date have developed so largely that old buildings have had to be enlarged, old plants discarded and newer and larger plants installed, while a larger number of employees have been kept busy. This will give some idea of the condition of the manufacturing industries in that part of Canada. I am satisfied that the great bulk of the manufacturers in this Dominion believe that the incidental protection which is given in connection with the revenue tariff of this government enables them to get along very well and to prosper, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen opposite say to the contrary.

There is another question I would like to speak about for a few minutes, and one which is attracting a great deal of attention, and that is the transportation question. One would think, at times, that this was a comparatively new question, and that the statesmen of this country were only now commencing to realize the importance of it. It is hardly that. Many years ago, this question was agitating the minds of statesmen both on this side of the line and on the other. For example I will read some words which might well have been used by the Prime Minister of this country to-day or the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Public Works instead of having been used years ago, as they were. In 1865, which, as you will remember, was the last year before the abrogation of the reciprocity with the United States, the Board of Trade of the city of Detroit, which is just opposite the city in which I live, called a great convention to discuss certain matters. The board of trade passed a resolution which they embodied in the letter calling delegates together. It was stated that the object for which the convention was called were commerce, finance and communications of transit from the west to the seaboard. And the president of the Detroit Board of Trade in welcoming the delegates to that convention used the following words in connection with the transportation question :

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex).

Communications of transit between the Great Lakes and the sea-board is of vital importance to the North-west. The continued prosperity of the great west demands additional outlets to the sea-board and to the markets of the world for its agricultural, mineral and other products, which will crowd every outlet as fast as constituted.

Again he says :

Any measures which can be devised to ensure the west cheap and speedy transportation of its products to tide water will promote the immediate prosperity of the people east and west.

And again :

But as the natural outlet of the Great Lakes the navigation——

that is of the St. Lawrence.

——is capable of being improved to give a safe and clear depth of fourteen feet to tide water, which to the future of the great and growing west is imperative.

The president elected by these delegates used these words :

Gentlemen, when I stand here and look to the resources of the illimitable west, capable of sustaining one hundred millions of men here, and also capable of feeding another one hundred millions of men on the European continent, I ask you to multiply the facilities for placing this grain on the European markets at a price below what it can be grown there. Do your best; this mighty west will crowd these avenues to the sea-board to place this food in the eastern markets.

Such were the words of the men of that day. No doubt, these Americans were speaking, at that time, more particularly of their own great North-west. But times have changed, and we know that not only the trade of the North-west of the United States but the immense trade of the North-west of Canada is commencing to come down this great natural outlet to the sea. In my opinion, those who are taking this question up—and the government and the Minister of Public Works have been taking it up, and the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) made an excellent speech on it last year as did also the present Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick)—should advocate every reasonable expenditure to make the outlet from the St. Lawrence and down to the ocean as speedy, as rapid and as cheap as possible. These men are doing a great work for the present and even a greater work for the future of this country. I agree also with something said by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) the other night. Speaking of the deficit in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and referring also to the administration of the canal system, the hon. gentleman said in effect : We in the maritime provinces are willing that you should go on and administer the canals of Ontario, we are willing to go on with that expenditure believing it to be the complement of the Intercolonial Rail-

way and railway transportation to the sea. I agree that that is the principle which must actuate us in this country, whether we are from the west or from the east, whether we are from British Columbia, the North-west, Ontario, Quebec or the maritime provinces. We must be prepared to yield a little to one another, we must be prepared as the Finance Minister so aptly put it, to bear one anothers burdens in this country. It is in that way that the country will be able to prosper and progress as it has done in the last four or five years. A part of this transportation question is the railway rate question. I am glad to welcome the statement of the Minister of Railways that we are on the eve of having a railway commission in this country, or are seeking to have it. I do not imagine for a moment that a railway commission will cure all the ills of which we complain in connection with railway rates. It is not possible, in a country like this, for that to be accomplished. But, if a few men, wisely selected and having opportunities to study the matters, apply themselves carefully and systematically to that question, there is no reason, as I see it why they should not gain information that would enable them to make much better practical arrangements than those existing at the present time. I am glad that the government appointed a man to go all over the country and get as accurate information as possible in this direction. In my section we have a condition of affairs in relation to railway rates of which we think we have a right to complain, and I am glad the government are taking hold of the matter. We complain that Windsor and all that district of Essex county is being discriminated against by some of the railways as compared with Detroit. One would naturally expect that if manufacturers or farmers wished to ship their products from the city of Windsor or from that section of the county of Essex, to the interior, they would be given a lower rate than on goods shipped from Detroit, for, it naturally costs something to transport merchandise across the Detroit river. Yet the fact was brought out by investigation held by this government officer, and also by the investigation held by the Windsor Board of Trade, that, in many directions the people of Windsor and locality have to pay a higher rate for the transportation of their commodities than do the people of Detroit or, for that matter people at points a good deal further in the interior of Michigan. A gentleman who is in a position to speak with authority on the fruit trade said :

> The rate on a American fruit on a long haul is often less than for a short haul over a Canadian line, thus neutralizing the effect of the import duty. Peaches can be shipped from Grand Rapids, Michigan—

that is about a couple of hundred miles, I think, from Detroit——

> ——to points east of Toronto at a lower rate than from Leamington, Ontario.

That is a condition of things that we do not like to see and are desirous of having modified, if possible. Again I quote a statement made by the secretary of the Windsor Board of Trade in connection with this matter :

> The most serious case of individual discrimination presented to the notice of the board is of a manufacturing company doing business in this city. This company contends that manufacturers and shippers in the east get rates coming this way from 20 to 40 per cent better than from Windsor to points east ; that this discrimination enables the Montreal and Toronto business concerns to do business right in this county upon an equality with local manufacturers, while the excessive rates east prevents our entering their market and doing business at a profit.

Now that is a condition of things which I think ought not to obtain. In the same report I read this :

> What we in this locality have to protest and do protest most emphatically against is the absolutely unfair and unjust discrimination which exists as between the shippers of the United States and Canada (notably as between Detroit and Windsor) in favour of the former. The question of water competition does not enter here, being common to both.

I am very glad that the government are alive to this matter, and are seeking to get at the facts in order to apply a remedy, if one can be found and applied. I believe they desire to establish a railway commission, and if we are to have one, it will do much to remedy some of the things we complain of.

I notice in the speech of the hon. gentleman who preceded me, he said that the exportation of wheat from Canada in 1896 was greater than in 1901. Well, perhaps that is correct, the exact figures being 9,919,000 bushels in the former year, and 9,739,000 in 1901. The difference is so small that the argument is rather disingenuous. If we look at flour exports and see the enormous increase which has occurred, one would see where much of our wheat goes to. In 1896 our export of barrels of flour was 186,716; in 1901 that exportation had run up to 1,118,700; showing that while the exportation of wheat was almost stationary, there was an enormous advance in the output of flour which came from the same commodity.

Now from time to time I have read during the past three or four years the glowing accounts which the Minister of Finance has been giving us of the present and future outlook of this country, and I am very glad to note that such is the case. I am reminded of a little story which illustrates my views in the matter. It is said that a certain clergyman was writing a sermon one day, and after he had proceeded a certain distance he penned this sentence: 'I never see a young man with fine physi-

que, and with all his splendid possibilities standing out before him, but I am struck with great admiration.' It is said that the moment after he had penned this sentence he was called away, and immediately after his young daughter came in, and with that curiosity which the fair sex possesses as well as we, she went and looked at what her father had written, and when she saw these words: 'I never see a young man with fine physique, with all his splendid possibilities standing out before him, but I am struck with great admiration,' she wrote below: 'Those are my sentiments, father.' So when I heard the Minister of Finance speaking of the splendid condition of this country, and of its splendid possibilities and prospects for the future, I felt, and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite feel the same way, if they would express their real sentiments, that I could join with him and say: 'Those are my sentiments.'

Mr. E. HACKETT (Prince West, P.E.I.) In rising to make a few observations on the question before the House I need make no apology. The question we are discussing is one of very great importance to the people of Canada. The question of the fiscal policy of this country, and our trade relations with the nations of the world, is certainly one of the very highest moment, and it behooves every representative of the people to express his views upon it. I am not going to follow the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat in the very lengthy speech he has made. He commenced by talking about the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition, and closed up by quoting from a sermon by some minister in times past. It will be impossible for me to follow him all through. He commenced by saying that the leader of the opposition had moved an amendment to the motion made by the Minister of Finance, that he could not understand. He said he did not know what was meant by the amendment, that he did not know what particular industry required protection. That is the statement he made. The amendment moved by the leader of the opposition means this: That adequate protection ought to be given to all the industries of Canada, and that the markets of Canada should be preserved for the Canadian people, keeping in view the fact that we are prepared to grant preferential trade within the empire. But if the hon. gentleman requires any information as to what particular industry is suffering in Canada, all he has to do is to sit down beside the Minister of Finance for a short time, and he will tell him what industries are suffering; because we have seen in the newspapers, and it is known to be a fact, that during the last month delegation after delegation has waited upon the minister asking him to make changes in the tariff, and assuring him that the present tariff has been found very unsatisfactory and requires amending at an early date. Not only has this taken place the present year, but last year also, delegations came to Ottawa with the same object. Yet the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Sutherland) does not know what particular industry requires protection.

The hon. gentleman went on to refer to the great prosperity of Canada under the policy of this government. He spoke of the savings of the people, and he said: Look at the savings banks, look at the amount in the chartered banks where the savings of the people are deposited, and you will see clear evidence of the great prosperity of the people of Canada. Sir, as an old member of this House, I remember many years ago when the people of Canada were putting their earnings in the savings bank, and when we were told by the hon. gentlemen opposite, then sitting on this side of the House, that these savings showed want of confidence on the part of the people in the business of the country, that people would not be placing their savings in these banks if they could employ them in any other industry in which they had confidence. But now we find these gentlemen pointing to these savings of the people as an evidence of the great prosperity of the country. It is an easy matter for them to change front, they have changed their base so often that it has become easy for them to do so.

Another thing the hon. gentlemen referred to was the surpluses. That is another old story. We were told in those days, especially by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, that surpluses showed bad statesmanship; they showed that the gentlemen who were conducting the business of the country could not make a fair estimate of expenditure and revenue; that they were taking from the people millions of dollars every year that should have remained in their pockets, and they had failed to take a clear view of the situation.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say now: What a great thing it is to have a surplus! They did not say that ten or fifteen years ago. The hon. gentleman speaks of their policy when they have no policy. They are opportunists of the worst kind and change their views on every question in connection with the affairs of Canada. He referred also to the exodus being checked. What figures did he give us to show that emigration had been checked? I can only speak for the province of Prince Edward Island and I will tell him that there has been a larger exodus of men and women from that province since this government came into office than ever before. That will be shown by the census returns. I believe we had a fair count down there, but it has been shown by the lack of growth of population within the last ten years that this exodus has not been checked by the policy of the government. I was pleased, however, to find that the hon. gentleman gave credit in one particular to

the Liberal-Conservative party, and that was in regard to the building of the great Canadian Pacific Railway. He told us that that was a great work of national defence and he said that that great work was carried through in the interests of affording transportation for the products of the west and that it was a work of national importance as a means of defence. I remember, Mr. Speaker, that I was a member of this House and that the proudest thing I ever did—I am proud of it to-day and I am getting pretty well advanced in years—was when I voted for the building of that great work which was inaugurated and carried through by that great statesman, the late Sir John A. Macdonald and the Liberal-Conservative party and opposed by hon. gentlemen who are now sitting on the treasury benches. That great statesman was the means of building that great highway through Canada binding with bands of steel this country from ocean to ocean. He was the man who was the means of opening up the whole of the great North-west country and he carried this great work to a successful conclusion beating down the opposition of these hon. gentlemen as well. He built that railway. Day after day, in the House of Commons, I remember, in 1880, when the most factious opposition was offered to the building of that great highway when bogus syndicates were formed and brought here to make offers that could not possibly be carried out, that the Liberal-Conservative party, under the leadership of that great statesman Sir John A. Macdonald, having as his first lieutenant Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., in spite of this opposition, carried through that great work of which the hon. gentleman now speaks as being a work of national importance. Hon. gentlemen opposite opposed it to the utmost of their ability and by every means possible. They opposed it but the good sense of the people of Canada, having every faith and confidence in the leadership of the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, supported him in carrying through his great enterprise in face of the opposition of these hon. gentlemen. I do not think I need refer any more to what was said by the hon. member for North Essex.

In connection with the tariff policy, I wish to say here, Mr. Speaker, that I have referred to my being here and voting for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Another proud moment of my life was when the question of the national policy was introduced by the Liberal-Conservative party under the leadership of Sir John A. Macdonald and of Sir Leonard Tilley in 1879. That policy was the policy of this country after having experience of hon. gentlemen opposite who occupied the treasury benches from 1873 to 1878, during which time every industry in this country was depressed, when everything was going to ruin, when every man in the country had no confidence in his neighbour, when there was no confidence in business, and when the business men of the country approached the hon. Minister of Finance, now the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and asked that the government should do something for them, he said: We are flies on the wheel; you can go some other place and we cannot do anything for you. Sir John A. Macdonald introduced his resolution in the session of 1878 and it became the law of the land in 1879. Under the national policy protection was given to every industry in the Dominion of Canada, the farmer, the miner, the lumberman, the fisherman—all classes of the people were protected by that policy and that policy has a place deep down in the hearts of the people of Canada to-day. I tell the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that their government would not exist for twenty-four hours, unless the fundamental and underlying principle of protection was in their present tariff. Now, speaking of this question, they say that they have a revenue tariff. It is a revenue tariff, but the old national policy was also a revenue tariff. It protected the industries of the country and it brought in sufficient money to meet the expenditures of the country and maintain the public works. While hon. gentlemen have in many ways emasculated the national policy, while the preferential tariff, which has not been of any advantage to Canada, which allows goods, manufactured in foreign countries by foreign labour, to be brought into competition with the workingmen of Canada, closing up the mills of Canada, while they have emasculated that policy, while they have reduced the protection, they still maintain in their policy, protection to certain industries. I ask them why, when the hon. Minister of Finance was waited on by a deputation of woollen manufacturers, he should not have paid some attention to their requests. Why should he allow this great industry, employing thousands of men in Canada, to suffer, and pay no attention to the request of the people engaged in it. I saw, a few days ago, reading in a paper, that a woollen mill established by Lord Strathcona and Lord Mount-Stephen in Cornwall had been closed and that a hundred men had been thrown out of employment and forced to seek employment in a foreign land. They were allowed to go away and the request of the woollen manufacturers was not listened to. The mill was closed and the people employed in it had to seek homes in a foreign clime as a consequence. As to the protective features of the tariff, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce the other evening, when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) was referring to the tariff, and speaking about the tariff being a protectionist tariff, retorted: You do not know the difference between a protectionist tariff and a revenue tariff. It was a very nice state-

ment to make. There are certain features of this tariff that are strongly protectionist, and if you give protection to one industry you must give it to all the rest of the industries. I find that flour pays a duty of 60 cents per barrel. That is for the purpose of protecting the milling industry in Canada. I remember when the duty was placed on flour in 1879 the government were told that they were taxing the bread of the poor man. In the province of Prince Edward Island large importations of flour are made because we do not raise sufficient wheat to supply bread to the people. We were told there, and even in this House as well, that we were imposing a tax upon the working men, that this was one of the prime necessaries of life, but, in answer to that, we told these hon. gentlemen that we could raise sufficient wheat in Canada to make bread for the people of Canada. It was protected and encouraged by the imposition of this duty and instead of our people in Prince Edward Island receiving the rotten maggoty flour they used to get in former days from Boston and New York, they now receive fresh Canadian flour.

Mr. ROSAMOND. And it kept you in good health.

Mr. HACKETT. It kept us in good health and made us strong. We also find in this tariff of the Liberal government, another feature of the old tariff that has not been eradicated, and that is the duty of two cents a pound on pork. When Sir Louis Davies, who has lately been promoted to the Supreme Court of Canada, was a member of this House, although he posed as a free trader, yet he favoured this duty of two cents a pound on pork because it was going to protect the farmers of Prince Edward Island against the corn-fed pork raised in the United States. He posed as a free trader in everything else but he supported the Conservative government in its proposal to put a duty of two cents a pound on pork. I regret that my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) is not in his seat, because I want to tell him that during my long experience of fifteen sessions in this House, I never heard such an amusing speech as his. He was walking upon the edge of a precipice not knowing what moment he might fall into the abyss below. He commenced by telling us that he was a free trader, but by and by he turned around and said he wanted protection on buggies so as to prevent cheap American buggies competing with the buggies made in Canada. Here was this free trader, this quasi protectionist; this man who will vote for the government whether they have a policy of protection or free trade; here he was standing up in the House and advocating an increased duty on buggies. I am a protectionist, and if the government find that our workmen in Canada cannot compete with the cheap buggies made in the States, then I hope they will increase the duty; but it is entirely inconsistent for a gentleman who pretends to be a free trader and who supports what he calls a revenue tariff government, to make such a statement in this House.

Let us look for a moment at what was done in the case of printed cotton on which this government has imposed a protective duty of 35 per cent. Printed cotton had a 30 per cent duty under the old tariff; but this revenue tariff government, this free trade-as-they-have-it-in-England government, increased the duty from 30 to 35 per cent. Why was that done? It was done to benefit the printed cotton mills at Magog, and it was done knowing that the product of these mills would by the preferential tariff come into competition with printed cottons imported from England, and so the duty was increased by 5 per cent. But they did not do the same thing in the case of woollen goods. They allowed the woollen manufacturers to be slaughtered while under the special protection of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) the duty on printed cotton was increased.

The hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) made a long speech last night principally about the Intercolonial Railway and coal. He was endeavouring to defend by some means or other the conduct of the government in having a deficit last year of $500,000 on government railways; but he principally spoke of coal. We find that there is a duty on bituminous coal of 53 cents per ton. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) be in his seat at the present time, I would like to ask him if he wants to have that duty removed? Is it there for revenue or for protection?

Mr. KENDALL. Revenue entirely.

Mr. HACKETT. Revenue entirely! And we were told in this House by the Liberals that when the Conservative government imposed a duty of 53 cents a ton on coal they were robbing the workingmen of Canada. But this government has large surpluses, and yet they go on exacting from the poor people of the country 53 cents a ton on coal entirely for revenue purposes, as the hon. member (Mr. Kendall) says. Surely the hon. member does not seriously mean that.

Mr. COCHRANE. He made a mistake.

Mr. HACKETT. Yes, he made a mistake. I understand this coal business just as well as the member for Cape Breton does. Let me tell him that the sale of coal in Nova Scotia amounted to 771,259 tons in 1879, the year the national policy was put in force. A duty was placed on coal then, to protect that industry because it had been languishing for years, and as a result of that protection the sale of coal in the province of Nova Scotia increased from 771,259 tons in 1879 to 2,071,938 tons in 1891.

If that increase had gone on in the same ratio up to this date, the sales of Nova Scotia coal would be just as large as they are to-day. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) was pleased to compliment the Minister of Finance on what he had done for the province of Nova Scotia in this respect. That gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) entered into an agreement with the Whitney people, called the Dominion Coal Company, and by that agreement he received into the treasury of the province of Nova Scotia a royalty which was placed on the coal mines——

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) He received a higher royalty than was charged to other mines.

Mr. HACKETT. Oh, yes, that strengthens my argument. He was getting more money and that was what he was after at the time, but he placed the coal mines of Cape Breton in the hands of this American monopoly and they are shipping coal to-day to supply the gas companies in Boston and vicinity at the low rate of something over $1 per ton, and they are carrying it thousands of miles along the Atlantic coast for that price. They are doing it at a loss, of course, and the consumers of coal in the maritime provinces are in consequence obliged to pay $1 per ton more for their coal than they were paying before this monopoly got hold of the mines.

Mr. KENDALL. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to put a question ?

Mr. HACKETT. Certainly.

Mr. KENDALL. Admitting that the price of coal in Nova Scotia is 50 cents or $1 too high, which company of all the companies in Nova Scotia to-day supplies the people and the government at the lowest rate ? Is it the Dominion Coal Company or the other concerns ?

Mr. HACKETT. That is a speech and not a question, and it has nothing to do with my argument, which is that the consumers of coal in the maritime provinces to-day are paying $1 a ton more for coal than they were paying before. They are paying that extra price in order that this monopoly may carry coal for the Boston gas works at a very low price.

Now Sir, these gentlemen opposite speak of the taxes of the country. We were told by them in former days, that the people were taxed to death ; that they were being bled white, that the workingmen of the country had to leave it on account of the excessive taxation. What do we find ? We find by their own statements that the taxes of the people of Canada per head in 1896 amounted to $5.42, and in 1901 amounted to $7.21, or an increase of $1.79 per head under the present government, which is equivalent to an increase of $8.95 for every family of five. Yet we were told that these hon. gentlemen were going to reduce the taxes, and that Canada was going to be a cheap country to live in. Instead of that every head of a family has to pay a higher price for all the commodities he uses than he did before these hon. gentlemen came into power. By repealing the specific duties and placing ad valorem duties on the importations of Canada they have taken more taxes out of the people than was done under the tariff policy of the late government.

Then we had a great deal of talk about the expenditure of Canada. We were told that it was far beyond what we could afford, and that if they were returned to power they would reduce it—one said by $2,000,000, another said by $3,000,000, and another had the boldness to say by $5,000,000, a year. What do we find ? The total expenditure of Canada in 1897 amounted to $42,972,000. In 1901, under this government, it increased to $57,928,866, or an increase of $15,000,000 since they came into power. Is that carrying out the promises they made to the people of Canada ? Sir, we want honest government in this country. We want men who, when they make promises to the people of this country, will carry out those promises. We know how a great deal of the public money is used. I had an experience myself of how the money which was extracted from the pockets of the people was used against me in 1900 ; but I, having the confidence of the people of West Prince, was returned at the head of the poll, notwithstanding the fact that public moneys were being corruptly used in digging holes and building breakwaters around the shores. The very fact that these moneys were being used in that way acted as a boomerang and cut off the head of my opponent.

The Finance Minister estimates that for the next fiscal year the expenditure will amount to the enormous sum of $65.250,000. This is something unprecedented. The government have nothing to show for it. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat read a list of the great things they had done ; but he did not show that there was any great public work being carried on to warrant an expenditure of $65,000,000 next year.

The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), to-day in speaking of the expenditures of both governments, made what I consider a very unfair statement. He singled out a few years during which the late government were engaged in building the Canadian Pacific Railway—that gigantic work which the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie said would tax the resources of the British Empire—and he compared the expenditures of those years with the expenditures of the present government—a very unfair statement. The hon. gentleman knows that but for that expenditure the fertile lands of the North-west would have remained unoccupied until the present time. We might have built a few miles over the prairie, but the railway would never have pierced the Rocky

Mountains or reached the Pacific Coast, except for the great enterprise displayed by the government of Sir John Macdonald and the men who built that railway. The Mackenzie government were building the railway across the prairie at the rate of 100 miles a year; but Sir John Macdonald grasped the whole question. He knew the millions of acres of fertile lands which were lying untilled in that great country, untrod by any creature but the buffalo and the Indian. He saw that that country would become the happy home of millions of people, and he brought about the building of that great railroad. The hon. member for Saskatchewan should be the last man in the country to compare the expenditure of those days with the expenditure of the present government, because he cannot point to a great public work which has been constructed by them during their tenure of office.

Then, what was done in connection with the Intercolonial Railway by the late government, those progressive gentlemen who were then carrying on the affairs of Canada. Those who had to travel over it had a good railway from Moncton to Rivière du Loup; but from that point to Point Lévis, a distance of 120 miles, we had to pass over a rickety railway owned by the Grand Trunk Railway. The late progressive government of Sir John Macdonald purchased that part of the Grand Trunk and made it a part of the Intercolonial Railway. We have that also to show for the expenditure of those days. Then, we have another great work connected with the great transportation system—that is, the Sault Ste Marie canal, which was built by the late government on Canadian soil, to avoid the necessity of Canadian ships having to pass through the American canal. In addition to that, they went on improving the canals of Canada and thus making it possible for the products of the west to reach a market by the best means possible.

The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) last night said to us: For 18 years you were in power, and you did nothing to increase the facilities for the people of Prince Edward Island, and nothing was done to develop the great coal and steel industry of Cape Breton. What are the facts? I would be ashamed, if I were in the hon. gentleman's place, to make such a statement as that. I see the hon. gentleman's colleague, and I am sure he will agree with me. The late government, under the leadership of Sir John Macdonald and having Sir Charles Tupper as its minister of railways, built a railway from the straits of Canso to Sydney; and if there has been a boom of late years in the coal and steel industry of Cape Breton, it has been largely due to the building of that railway.

The manufacturers of Sydney have this accommodation from Sydney to Port Mulgrave on the north-east side. It promoted transportation as far as it could be done on

Prince Edward Island and yet this hon. gentleman, who comes from the country, said that nothing had been done in those eighteen years to develop the resources of the country. I would be ashamed, if I were in his place, to make any such statement.

I find also that the public debt has been largely increased. We were told by hon. gentlemen opposite, when in opposition, that the public debt was altogether out of proportion to the population, and that if elected to office they would reduce it. What do we find? We find that notwithstanding the pledges of these hon. gentlemen and notwithstanding the surpluses which the Minister of Finance has had during the past four years, our public debt has been increased over $10,000,000, and next year the Finance Minister tells us he will increase it $6,000,000. So that we have the public debt increasing by leaps and bounds in spite of the great surpluses that we have been enjoying.

I wish to say a word in connection with the transportation question. That is one of the most important before the country to-day, and one which must be grappled with in the near future by this government. Should we have another harvest in the west such as we had last year, unless some preparations be made for moving it out of the country, there will be a congestion of freight and great loss to the farmers. I am therefore in full sympathy with anything that can be done for the purpose of facilitating transportation from the fields of the North-west.

But I propose to diverge for a moment in order to speak of a local matter, in which I am interested, as representing a portion of the people of Prince Edward Island. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is not in his seat, but I see his colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) there, and I would remind him that we were promised last year direct steam communication between Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton for the purpose of conveying the products of the Island to the markets of Cape Breton. The sum of $5,000 had been previously voted for that line of steamships, but that sum was found insufficient, and last session a subsidy of $10,000 was voted. The people of Prince Edward Island naturally expected to have regular steam communication last year, but during the busy season, when every facility was required for the export of produce, no steamer visited our shores, and it was only in December that a boat was provided to call at the island and take a load of freight. That steamer carried away a cargo amounting to nearly one-quarter of a million dollars worth of all kinds of produce. Had she made regular trips in the summer season, I have no doubt that she would have had full cargoes all the time. I would urge on the government to have a direct line of

steamers put on the route next year, fitted up with cold storage, and I am sure that Prince Edward Island, although not very large in area, is entitled to as much consideration as the people of the North-west.

But there is another matter to which I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches, and that is the fast Atlantic service. We know that before Sir Charles Tupper left office, a contract had been arranged with a wealthy corporation for the purpose of providing this fast Atlantic service between Canada and Great Britain. That contract was never completed because hon. gentlemen opposite, when they came to office, were averse to carrying out the arrangement entered into. Instead of that they allowed years to pass, during which they experimented with bottle-necked and all kinds of steamships, and did nothing. Six years have passed and we are still without this fast Atlantic line. I would ask permission to bring to the notice of the government, and especially the Minister of Finance, the resolution passed by the Maritime Board of Trade during last summer. This board of trade is composed of gentlemen from each of the different boards of trade in the maritime provinces. The Boards of Trade of Halifax, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island—each sends its delegates in annual session to this Maritime Board of Trade. That board is therefore composed of active, up-to-date business men, who see the necessity for this fast Atlantic service, and the following resolution was passed by them at their meeting at Chatham, New Brunswick, in August last:

> Whereas, the construction of the Intercolonial and Canadian Pacific Railways was considered in the light of great national undertakings for the development of the foreign and international trade of Canada, and
>
> Whereas, the vast and rapidly-growing development of the trade and resources of our country under these great transport facilities confirms the wisdom of parliament in pledging the revenues of the country in aid of their construction, therefore
>
> Resolved, that in the opinion of this board our national pride is affected and our commercial progress retarded in consequence of the delay in our federal government in establishing this fast atlantic service, and further,
>
> Resolved, that in the opinion of this board there is a sufficient guarantee in the magnificent results which have followed the construction of our railways to warrant the government in carrying out the completion of our national transportation facilities by pledging the revenues of our country to an extent sufficient to carry out without further delay the establishment of the fast Atlantic service, and further
>
> Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the federal government, the several boards of trade in Toronto, Montreal and Quebec; also the members of parliament from the maritime provinces.

I want to bring these resolutions to the notice of the Minister of Finance, who comes from the maritime provinces himself and knows the gentlemen composing this Maritime Board of Trade, and I trust he will pay attention to this resolution passed by them at their annual meeting.

My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Hughes) delivered the other evening his maiden speech in parliament. I have nothing to say with regard to the manner of his delivery, but I must say that the matter was entirely wrong. He spoke of the increase in our imports and exports, and attributed the whole of that increase to our present tariff. Sir, the hon. gentleman was entirely mistaken when he attributed our good harvest, our successful mining and lumber operations, the good catches of our fishermen and everything else good in Canada to the policy and administration of the government. He said:

> How can any reasonable man say that the operation of the tariff is unsatisfactory, under which the trade of the country has increased $150,000,000 in round numbers in five years.

The hon. gentleman forgot to thank Divine Providence for the bountiful harvest we have had. He forgot to thank the late government for having built the Canadian Pacific Railway and developed that western country. He forgot also to thank the people of Canada who, by their energy and industry, unassisted by this government, produced that large quantity of goods which were exported from Canada. The hon. gentleman had no recognition for any of these influences, but he gave the full credit for everything to the government. He spoke of the increase in exports and also of our success in making cheese. He says that cheese had increased in quantity and value. A large increase has taken place in the export of cheese. But, so far as the province from which the hon. gentleman comes is concerned, he has nothing to thank the government for in that. Before this government came into power the late government had sent Professor Robertson, and he had established cheese factories all over Prince Edward Island. And these cheese factories were in operation and the people were reaping the benefit of them before this government came into power. Can the hon. gentleman show that this government has found a market for a pound of cheese for which there was not a market under the late government. Then the hon. gentleman spoke of eggs, and said that there had been an increased export in this line. If he were in his seat, I would ask him to tell me if anything had been done by this government to cause the hens to lay a dozen eggs more than they did, or to find a market for a dozen eggs more than could be sold before. Before the McKinley tariff, we had a market for our eggs in the United States, paying a duty of five cents a dozen. That was increased to fifteen cents a dozen, a prohibitive duty. Mr. Foster, the Finance Minister of the government of that day, said that we must find a market for our

eggs, and the government sent agents to England to open a market there. And hon. gentlemen opposite, then sitting on this side of the House, scoffed at the idea of his being able to transport eggs three thousand miles to England and put them on the market in good condition. But the government of that day succeeded in opening that market and the hon. gentlemen now on the treasury benches are getting the benefit of what was done by their predecessors, they having done nothing themselves. But the hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island, did not refer to the most important question in the eyes of the people of his own province, and that is having a representative of that province in the Cabinet. These hon. gentlemen can speak of eggs and butter and everything else, but they have not a word to say with regard to this important question of a seat in the Cabinet for Prince Edward Island. One singular thing about that is that when the hon. member for West Queen's (Mr. Farquharson) whom I see in his seat, ran his election, one of the reasons held out why the people should vote for him was that he was to have a seat in the Cabinet. It was said that this was a government of premiers, and the hon. gentleman, as a premier of the province, was naturally entitled to a seat in this Cabinet. A few days before the election, the 'Charlottetown Patriot,' the organ of the government, the pocket organ of the hon. member for West Queen's had something to say on this subject. At this time, the friends of the hon. gentleman were appealing to Conservatives to let him in without opposition on the ground that this would strengthen his chances. This is what it said :—

Again, the fact that Premier Farquharson goes o Ottawa without opposition will do much to strengthen his claim to a cabinet position and apart entirely from political leaning, this is what every voter in Prince Edward Island desires. It would be detrimental to our interest if this province were left without a cabinet representative, but difficulty in securing representation will of necessity be encountered. In sending the strongest man available, one who if elected by acclamation is consequently acknowledged strong by both political parties our claims from that standpoint will be greatly strengthened.

The hon. gentleman was not elected by acclamation ; but this editorial shows you how the editor of that government organ regarded this matter at the time. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Farquharson) is here, and occupies a comfortable seat and is not yet in the Cabinet. I think that is very unfair. The day before the election Mr. Dobell was killed in England, and it was placarded in front of the 'Patriot' office that Mr. Farquharson would go into the Cabinet, Mr. Dobell being dead. The hon. gentleman is not yet in the Cabinet. The government is very unfair to the hon. member to keep him looking over the wall so long. He sits there apparently very placid, but he must be murmuring to himself 'so near and yet so far.'

Another point to which I wish to refer is that of bonusing the sugar industry in this country. Several applications have reached me asking me to bring this important matter before the House. Down in Prince Edward Island, Mr. Callaghan, a strong Liberal traversed the province, held public meetings, received subscriptions in the form of agreements to set apart and cultivate land for the production of the beet, for the purpose of creating there a beet sugar industry. It appears that the plant for this industry will cost at the beginning a very large amount of money and the people of Prince Edward Island are asking that the promoters should be granted a small vote for the first two or three years, to enable them to carry out their scheme. But, from the budget speech, it appears that the government will do nothing. The Finance Minister tells us that the Ontario government are bonusing the beet and sugar industry in that province, I would ask the Minister of Finance what benefit it will be to the farmers of Prince Edward Island that this bonus is being given to the province of Ontario ? We want the government to assist the farmer. We know that the payment of steel, iron, silver-lead and other bounties already promised will have the effect of adding $50,000,000 to the debt of the Dominion. Why should not the farmer be given a share of these bonuses ? A very silly remark was made the other evening in this debate to the effect that a bounty should be extended to the farmer for their potatoes, oats, and other products. That, of course, is nonsense. The farmer does not want it. But when the farmer sees a valuable industry that could be created in the province and asks assistance from the government in the same way as it has been given to the steel men and silver-lead people, they feel that they are entitled to consideration. And it is very unfair to the farmer to deprive him of his rights. Who will pay these enormous bounties on steel and silver-lead ? The farmers of Canada. It is the farmer who has his stakes deep down in the soil, whose home is here and who expects to bring up his family here who pays the taxes from which those bonuses come. Yet, while demanding these bounties from him for the benefit of other industries, the government refuses absolutely a bounty in this industry which the farmer believes to be of great advantage to him.

Now, I wish to refer for a moment to the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition. It is a reasonable and fair amendment. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said it was an old friend, and he recognized it. He is a friend of this old friend. It was that old friend that drove him out of power, and this new friend is going to do the same thing. This is an amendment asking for protection for the

agriculturist, for the manufacturer, for the lumberman, for the fisherman, for the miner, for all the classes and all the people of Canada. Therefore, it is an amendment that is going to be accepted by the people of Canada. We have on this side of the House a leader that we are proud of. The hon. gentleman is present, I do not want to flatter him; but, Sir, he is young Canada, he represents young Canada. He is progressive, we are proud of him as a man, and as an able man, and he is going to lead in the near future the government of this Dominion. The people of this country will understand who their friend is, and, Sir, ere long you will find those treasury benches occupied by the gentlemen who are now sitting on this side of the House.

Sir, we have in this Canada of ours great natural resources of which we as a people should be proud. We were left by our fathers a precious heritage which it is our duty to develop. We were left, through the statesmanship of Sir John A. Macdonald, the immense prairies of the North-west purchased from the Hudson Bay Company, Those great fields, those fertile prairies are capable, as I said before, of supporting millions of people; and you will find there before twenty years, Mr. Speaker, when many of us will have passed away, millions of prosperous and happy people. To bring that about the great North-west must be properly developed, the east and the west must join together and work for the upbuilding, of all parts of this confederation. We have also the richest mines in the world, mines in the development of which we have scarcely touched the fringe, yet mines yielding gold, silver, coal, iron and other metals in rich profusion. We have forests and the finest lumber in the world, as yet untouched by the axe of the woodman. We have in addition, surrounding our shores on the east and on the west, the most valuable and extensive fisheries in the world. Having those great resources it behooves us as a people to go on united and work together as one man. We may have our differences in politics. What we need, if we are going to make Canada a great nation, is to strike at the root of corruption that is now prevailing in this government, and to install an honest government in this country. We have the freest institutions in the world, where almost every man has a vote. We have an intelligent population composed of the descendants of the best races of the old world, the Englishman, the Scotchman, the Frenchman, the Irishman, the German, and men of other nationalities of the continent of Europe. Having that great heritage and that intelligent population, why should we not hope in the near future to see Canada take her place amongst the great nations of the world ?

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). It is not my intention to follow the hon. gentleman in that lengthy portion of his speech which was devoted particularly to the interests of the island province from which he comes. It is not my intention either to go into a lengthy discussion of the merits of free trade or protection. It is astonishing to me, Sir, that every year the budget of Canada is discussed in this House, we have to listen to long arguments presented in what I might call an academic form, setting forth the theoretical merits of the policy of protection or the policy of free trade. On one side we hear hon. gentlemen telling us how the policy of free trade has built up England, and that therefore it is one that we should adopt. On the other side hon. gentlemen expatiate on the advantages that the United States have derived from a policy of protection. It seems to me it is about time that we, instead of looking either to England or to the United States for a trade policy, should confine our attention to our own interests, and to an inquiry as to what policy would best suit our special conditions. We are told by one party that we should be free traders because England is free trader ; we are told by another party that we should be protectionists because the United States are protectionists. But it strikes me that the defenders of both systems seem to disregard the fact that these two entirely different systems have both proved eminently successful in the two countries where they are respectively in force. Free trade has been a good policy in England because it was the policy that suited the conditions of England at the time it was adopted; and protection has been a good policy in the United States because it suited the conditions of that country at the time it was adopted. The same inconveniences that are pointed to in the United States by the defenders of a free trade system as resulting from a protectionist policy, have also manifested themselves in free trade England. The concentration of wealth, the undue development of manufacturing industries, the movement of population from the country to the city, have taken place in England just as they have taken place in the United States. Therefore, I am obliged to come to the conclusion that many public men in this country lack confidence in their own country, they seem to be always looking abroad to discover a policy.

For myself, I have never concealed the fact that I am a protectionist in Canada; not because I believe that a system of protection in itself is superior to a system of free trade. In theory I am a free trader, and were I living in England I would stick to the policy of free trade. But protection is forced upon us, not because it has been advocated by so many theorists and economists, but because it is indicated by our circumstances. I fully realize the force of the argument made in this House that under a policy of protection the consuming

population of Canada, to a certain extent, contribute to the enrichment of a small number of men; in other words, that the large consuming classes of Canada contribute to enriching the Canadian manufacturers. This is not a question of personal interest in my case. I represent a county composed almost entirely of consumers; and certainly regret when I see the people of my county contributing so large an amount of money for the enrichment of a small number of men. But certainly I prefer to see our people give their money to enriching Canadian manufacturers, than to see it go to the United States, to Germany, to England, or to any other foreign manufacturers. When we pay our money to Canadian manufacturers it remains in this country, and goes to swell the capital of Canadians, the capital available for the development of Canadian industries, of Canadian mines, of transportation facilities within our own country, to the employment of Canadian labour. I fully sympathize, from a theoretical point of view, with the argument made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that it would be foolish for us to complain that foreign goods are allowed to come into this country and to be sold at a cheaper price than Canadian goods. But I am alive to the fact that should we leave our doors open and allow foreign manufacturers to make a slaughter market of Canada, the consequence would be the closing up of our own manufactories; and after that result had come about, the consuming classes in Canada would be left entirely in the hands of those very monopolists who have been created by a policy of protection in the United States. So I say I would rather stand a little protection in Canada in order to get competition with American trade, than to buy American goods a little cheaper for some time and to put our consumers entirely at the mercy of American monopolists.

I say that I would rather stand a little protection in Canada to get competition against the Americans than pay a little less for four, five, or six years for American goods and then be left entirely in the hands of American monopolists. If I have to choose between two monopolies, I would rather choose the monopoly that would be developed in my own country and which will help to develop the resources of my own country, than, for the purpose of saving a little money for a few years, bring nearer to the fate of the people of this country the day when the whole of this country will be left in the hands of foreign monopolists.

The sooner we realize on both sides of this House that the policy of protection is not a question of choice for the Canadian people, the better it will be for us. The moment hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House realize that the policy of protection was forced upon their party by the popular sentiment and the moment hon. gentlemen on this side of the House realize that the same popular sentiment has forced them to stick to that policy, the better it will be for the people of this country. I am told that the day is coming when the United States will be free traders, or freer traders. Well, let that day come, and I am the first man to say, when we can afford to lower our tariff, when we can afford to stand the competition of American manufacturers, when the American manufacturers themselves stand the competition of the foreign world. Let us open our ports. But, when we are a nation of 5,000,000 which has so much to do yet to develop its natural resources alongside of a nation of 80,000,000 of people, we cannot take upon ourselves to say that we are going to inaugurate upon this continent a policy that will have for its result to give that nation of 80,000,000 of people full control of trade on the American continent.

Now, Sir, I fully agree also with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) that a protection policy is apt to give rise to more causes of corruption on the part of the government, and I find myself in this strange position that I am standing here to defend the policy, and the virtue of the government against one of its own members. I admit that the policy of protection may be a cause of temptation to the government, but, are we going to be told by one of the members of the government that the virtue of the government is so weak that it cannot stand the policy that is imposed upon it by the will of the people? The hon. gentleman has referred to the causes of the corruption of the previous government. No doubt the Conservative government, in the last years of its regime, was corrupt, and it is for that reason that the people changed it. But, all the examples which have been given by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, pointing to the corruption of their predecessors, were owing to causes arising, not from the application of the fiscal policy, but owing to the construction of certain public works. Public works, also, are causes of corruption and may be causes of temptation to the government. Is this government going to abandon the construction of public works in this country? Are we going to abandon the development of the improvements of transportation, are we going to abandon the policy of deepening the St. Lawrence channel, and of diverting our trade which is going through American means of transportation, because the construction of great public works may be causes of corruption? I have more confidence than that in the virtue of the men that the people put at the head of their affairs; and I hope that in carrying out what is the will of the people to-day, as far as the fiscal policy of the country is concerned, as well as in carrying out the big works which have been imposed on them by the interests of the country,

the hon. gentlemen now in power will have the courage to face the situation—though at some times, I quite admit, it might be a little hurtful to the old fighters who have proclaimed principles which they are debarred from applying to stick to that policy.

There is one point, however, upon which I cannot agree with the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), and that is as to the stability of the tariff. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that once the tariff has been changed it should not be changed without proper reason, but, though I am a protectionist for the time being, though I am not a free trader on principle, I am not a protectionist to the point that I think our tariff should remain without being changed. Having, I confess it very humbly, no principle upon this question, being a protectionist because I think the policy of protection is imposed upon us by circumstances, I say that our tariff should change according to circumstances—not according to slight circumstances, but I think the government should be alive to the fact that when the circumstances change which impose upon us a higher tariff, they should not be afraid to raise the tariff, and that when circumstances, on the other side, impose a lowering of the tariff, they should not be afraid to lower the tariff if necessary. We are told of the tremendous results that have been produced in the United States by protection, and of the wonderful achievements of the policy of free trade in England. But, there is another country with which I am going to make a comparison and to which I will point as a good example of a country where a varying tariff policy is the cause of great prosperity. The outside trade of France has not increased very much, but the stability which is marked in the outside trade of France, is also marked in the balancing of capital within the country itself, which, to my mind, is the greatest sign of prosperity. I do not care how many millions of dollars worth may be manufactured, I do not care how many millions are gathered in the banks in one country, I do not care what the figures may show as to the richness of one country or the other : I say the most prosperous country is that in which money, capital and energy are most equally balanced between the greatest number of people living in that country, where you can point to every community, to every city, to every town and to every village and say that there is prosperity. Foreign trade with France is certainly not as big as the English trade or the American trade, or even the German trade, but France stands to-day as the only country where the servant girl, where the farmer, where the little merchant, has always a little money in hand, not only to look to the future of the family, but to lend money to the government when money is needed. After the Franco-Prussian war, when France was bound, after one of the most disastrous wars that ever occurred in any country, to pay an indemnity of 5,000,000,000 francs, twice the total sum was subscribed by the men on the street. Every public loan that has been made in France for the last thirty years has been entirely, and more than entirely subscribed by her own people and by what would be thought elsewhere the poorer classes who always have a few hundred francs and who are able to lend money to their own government. Therefore, I say, that we should be prepared, according to circumstances, either to raise, or to lower, our tariff when we know that one industry or the other for the general good of the country requires it.

Now, Sir, I will come to the second part of the resolution moved by the hon. leader of the opposition which pronounces in favour of preferential trade within the empire. I quite agree with the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) that the only feature in our present policy which appears to be on free trade lines is in fact the most protective feature in it, and the most protective feature we have had in our fiscal policy for some years back. The only difference is, that as it stands now, it does not mean protection in favour of the Canadian manufacturer at the expense of the Canadian consumer, but unfortunately it turns out to be protection in favour of the English and German manufacturer at the expense of the Canadian manufacturer, Take the case of the woollen industry and it goes even further than that. It enables the English manufacturer who cannot compete with the German manufacturer, to import from Germany into England articles manufactured to nine-tenths of their value in Germany, finishing them in England and shipping them to Canada under the preferential clause. Such goods included in the total trade figures of Great Britain, thus getting the benefit which we give to British trade and in reality forcing the deluded Canadian consumer to reduce one-third of his duty in favour of one of the countries that is most inimicable towards Canada. I have inquired a great deal for the last ten months from business men of various kinds, and I find that in the case of many articles that used to be imported from Great Britain at a certain price, the British tradesman or manufacturer, beginning to feel the difference in price caused by the preferential clause has raised his price to our merchants ; or rather, he has abolished the discount which he used to give Canadian buyers for cash. Hence, the benefit which should be given to the Canadian consumer because of the preferential tariff is in fact given to the British or German manufacturer. I therefore hold that the Canadian consumer gets very little benefit from the present preferential clause as it stands.

When that provision was introduced in the tariff of 1897 I voted for it gladly, because, although a protectionist, I am a free

trader to the extent that I would like Canada to trade with as many countries as possible on the principle laid down as the basis of clause 17 of the Tariff Act of 1897 ; and hence I then approved of it entirely. But we have changed that policy year after year. What was the principle of clause 17 of the Tariff Act of 1897 ? It was that every country that would offer to Canada any trade advantages similar to those we offered them would be received by us under the preferential clause and that we would gladly trade with them. But afterwards came our fit of sentimentality ; we have changed that clause, and we have said to the entire world : We are so devoted to Great Britain ; we are so loyal, that we are willing to trade only with the mother country, and we shut our doors to the rest of the world.'

Now, Sir, I claim that this was a retrogressive policy. I claim that the policy of the future, for some time to come at all events, is going to be a policy of protection for every country, but it will take from the theory of free trade the very principle which was at the bottom of the doctrines of Cobden : That freedom of trade being impossible between individuals, the greatest freedom of trade possible will be attained between nations. However, as the hon, member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) pointed out, it is impossible to get to that degree of freedom of trade and to that reciprocal policy between different nations unless one nation has something to offer to the other. We had something to offer ; we still have something to offer if we want to ; but, if we are ready to offer anything to foreign nations and to take something from foreign nations we must stop saying that we are so loyal, and that we are so British—much more so indeed than any Englishman or any Scotchman is in the old country because there they open their ports to every nation in the world. We must stop making ourselves the laughing stock of the whole world, the British people included ; and we must begin to say : We are a common sense nation, we will trade with every people who are ready to trade with us—with the English first because they are the easiest people to trade with, but after that, ready to trade with any reasonable nation that has something to offer us and to which we are ready to offer something.

Take the case of Germany. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have expressed great indignation because Germany has taken from us the advantages she used to give us and that she is now giving to Great Britain. Well, Germany has simply acted as any common sense country and any common sense business man would act. We had, under clause 17 of the Tariff of 1897 a provision which would have enabled us to trade with Germany or with France or with any other country, but now we have taken that provision out. We have said to Germany : We will not have anything to do with you. We have said the same thing to France, and to Italy, and to every country with which we could trade and that would be ready to trade with us. We have said : We only want to trade with Great Britain ; like the child who at the first little noise runs to hide itself under its mother's apron. We are retrograding in our national aspirations, and so far as that is concerned I cannot agree either with the policy of the government or with the policy of the opposition. We have said that we had opened to a certain extent our doors to Great Britain, because Great Britain opens her doors to us. Do we really believe that the Canadian people ignore the history of the trade policy of Great Britain ? It is true that the ports of Great Britain are free to our trade, but they are equally and to the same degree free to the trade of every country on earth, whether that country be friendly or inimicable to Great Britain. As the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) properly said : Great Britain has not adopted this policy of free trade in order to make a display of loyalty—the people of Great Britain are too intelligent and too business-like to do that. They have opened their ports to the trade of the world because it was a policy that suited them ; and at the time they abolished the corn laws, there was a flame or indignation in the colonies and especially in Canada, and some of the political ancestors of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House signed at that time an annexation manifesto because the British people did not see fit any longer to tax themselves in order to take our wheat. Any fiscal policy that Great Britain has adopted was adopted in the interest of the people in Great Britain. They have done their duty in that respect, and I stand here as a constant admirer of British policy because the British people have always common sense enough to frame their policy for themselves.

But I say, Sir, that the best way of proving our loyalty to Great Britain, to the British government, and to the British people, is to show them that we are as intelligent and as patriotic as they are, and that we will frame our policy not to suit or to please the British manufacturer, but in order to please and to suit and to benefit the Canadian people at large. It is all very well to say that England is the only country that admits our goods free, and that therefore we should give to England a trade advantage which we will not give to any other people; but I will take the very argument that was made here by the Minister of Trade and Commerce on that point. Figures have a value only when you take into consideration their relative position in any problem. A country may admit our goods free, and yet not be as favourable to us as another country which taxes our goods, but taxes those of some other country at a higher rate. I do not know what the gen-

eral tariff rate in Germany is; but suppose Germany has a general or maximum rate of 50 per cent, and grants us a minimum rate of 35 per cent. I say that Germany would be treating us with greater favour than Great Britain does when she admits our goods free, and admits with the same freedom American goods, German goods and French goods, most of which, having the advantage of closer communications and much larger markets at home, are in a much better position to be sold cheaply in Great Britain than our goods.

Now, we are told that our trade has increased immensely in Great Britain. I am glad of it, proud of it. But is that really because we have granted a preference to British goods ? Sir, if our exports to Great Britain have developed so largely, it is due to a considerable extent, I am glad to say, to the intelligent efforts of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher). It is because we have sent a better class of goods and have shipped them in better order. The English consumer has too much common sense, and understands his interest too well, to buy bad butter and bad eggs because they come from the loyal colony of Canada. He will buy butter, and eggs, and flour, and anything else that comes from Canada, as long as he gets these things as good and as cheap as he can get them elsewhere ; and the moment that he can get them cheaper and better elsewhere than he can in Canada, he will buy them elsewhere, as he has done in the past.

But there is another consideration—we know it from the authorities on British industry and British politics, British industry is to-day passing through a very trying crisis. Will it last, or is it only temporary ? We do not know ; but we do know that British production in manufacturing is going down all the time, while British trade is increasing. What does that mean ? It means that Great Britain is becoming less a manufacturing country, and more a trading country. Great Britain is doing to-day more business as what I might call the foreign traveller of other nations than she is doing from her own industries. Out of the many millions of our exports that go to Great Britain—I found it out when in England last summer—a large proportion go to the European continent, where the intelligent traders have the skill to sell them as British goods, and we do not get the benefit of selling them as Canadian products. We imagine that we are selling all these products to England, whilst we are selling a considerable proportion to France, Germany, Belgium and Holland, and at the same time we are deprived of the opportunity of going to those countries and saying to them : ' You take so much from us and we take so much from you, let us trade together.' All this because we are more loyal than the King of England and the people of the British Islands.

Sir, to my mind the great danger of our present position is that we do not rely enough upon our own strength. For a certain time, as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said very properly, the Conservative party had a great inclination to look to the United States as their example. At the same time the Liberal party may have had some inclination to look to Great Britain as their example. But even at that time there was much more national feeling in the political parties of Canada than there is now. Have the hon. gentlemen on the opposition side forgotten the day when their great leader, and one of the greatest statesmen of this country, Sir John Macdonald, when accused of discriminating against Great Britain and British connection, said, ' So much the worse for British connection !' Have the hon. gentlemen on the government side forgotten that when the leader of the government was accused of sacrificing British interests in favour of American interests, he said : ' I do not mind where the money comes from ; I prefer the American dollar to the British shilling.' I do not know what is passing over this country, but it seems that for some years we have been acting as if we regretted that our manhood was coming to us, and wanted to go back to our childhood. We are afraid of relying upon our own strength as Canadians. We talk of our great resources and of having a policy for Canada ; but when the time comes for applying such a policy, both parties are so much afraid of being accused of disloyalty that they will go back on their records of the past 50 years.

I am a great admirer of the British people ; and after a visit which I made last summer to England and which I enjoyed greatly, I came back with still greater admiration and sympathy for the British people. The reason is that they are a proud and strong people, and they like a people who are proud and strong. We may get a great many paper compliments for the policy we have adopted, but we do not get any greater esteem than we did when we said to John Bull : 'We are a worthy son of yours, but we are looking to our own interests first and last.'

I was very much surprised yesterday to hear the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). With good, common sense argument—in which, like myself, be gave a good deal of credit to both parties and some blame to both—he proved that it was to our interest to trade all over the world, and a great mistake to stake our policy upon the preference for Great Britain ; and then he concluded by saying that it would not be proper for the people of Canada to repeal the preference. I am prepared to go further and say that the moment we find that the preference policy does not suit us, we should repeal it.

The time is coming when both parties in this country will come to their cool senses. That wave of extraordinary poetical loyal-

ty, as I may call it, is going to die out, and both parties will have to come to the point of standing for Canada and Canada alone. One cannot serve two countries any more than one can serve two masters. We may have our blood sympathies, and I have as much esteem and respect as any man in this House for the man who has a strong love for his mother land; but I will say that there is not one among 10,000 French Canadians who would think of making the slightest sacrifice in favour of France at the expense of the Canadian people, even if we should be in the majority in this country.

What has been the result of the present preferential policy? Five years ago we inaugurated this policy. That was before the South African war. We gave first a preference of 12½ per cent, then 25 per cent, and then 33⅓ per cent to British goods. After having started that policy with the intention of applying it to all nations who would be willing to trade fairly with us, we decided that we were too loyal and would only apply it to the motherland.

Then we entered into the Pacific cable contract. We were told by the greatest advocate of that scheme, Sir Sandford Fleming, that we were interested in that project, not because of any practical benefit to be derived from it, but because of our great love and loyalty to the motherland, and we took the responsibility of five-eighteenths of the capital stock of that company, or £1,700,000 sterling. A contract was signed by the four Australian colonies of New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and New Zealand, which took in all eight-eighteenths, by Canada which took five-eighteenths, and by Great Brtain which took five-eighteenths. Yet, after this contract had been voted unanimously through the two Houses of this parliament, and 'God Save the Queen' had, of course, been sung; and after, in the exuberance of our loyalty and generosity, we had consented to Great Britain being represented by three directors and ourselves only by two, although we had subscribed the same amount, and the Australian colonies by three, what happened? Two of the Australian colonies, with the cognizance and approval of the British government, made a contract with a telegraph monopoly, in violation of the terms of the agreement, and contrary to the pledge of the British and Australian governments; and a year later the loyal Canadian people were asked to assume the responsibility of five-eighteenths of £300,000 sterling additional, because two of the most interested parties, with the consent of the paramount power, Great Britain, had seen fit to go back on their own word, fifteen days after the contract had been signed. That was the second feature of that policy.

I have spoken of the South African war and need not go back to that subject. But I think I may say, with all due respect to the majority of this House, that Canada has done her duty towards the motherland. We voted money for her relief; we allowed her to come and enlist our young men—a thing which Great Britain herself has acknowledged she was not allowed to do at a time when we were but a Crown colony; we allowed our young men, on whom Canada depended to develop her resources, to go and shed their blood in a foreign land. We allowed millions of dollars of the people's money, that could have been certainly well employed in Canada, to be expended in Africa. I respect and admire the feelings of those who were in favour of these sacrifices purely out of patriotism and not merely for the sake of getting votes. But what has been the result of all this?

We are told that we have got, through our loyalty an increased trade in Great Britain. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think as much of that increase is due to the intelligence, energy and skill of the Canadian people, as shown by their sending better products to the old country, than to anything else. And, as I have said, a good deal of that increased trade goes upon the European markets without our getting the credit of it, because our British cousin is skilful enough to keep the whole credit for himself.

Then we are told that Great Britain, having given us military protection for so many years, the least we can do is to help her in her difficulties. I am not going to discuss the views of those who are ready to stand up for Great Britain in her hour of distress. As far as that is concerned, I am much more reasonable than people may think; but what I say is that we should not enter into a general policy of contributing to the military expenditure of Great Britain without knowing where we are. As regards the great expenditure borne by the British people for the defence of Canada, I might refer gentlemen on this side to authorities I think they will not dispute. Without going back to the history of England, where I could find hundreds of authorities, I might simply quote one who is now pretty much outside both parties in England, but who is acknowledged in Great Britain to be an authority on military matters. I refer to Sir Charles Dilke, himself an Imperialist, in favour of getting from the colonies military help, but who admitted last year, in the parliament of Great Britain:

> Our fleet is not necessitated by the colonies but by our position and trade, apart from the question of whether we possess these colonies or not.

The organ of military men in England, the 'Army and Navy Gazette,' said on the 30th March, 1891:

> The Canadians have not yet risen to a proper sense of their obligations to the navy; they contribute nothing to the maintenance of the fleet and the preservation of their sea trade.

On the other hand, it is unwise to lose sight of the consideration that the United Kingdom could ill afford to reduce its navy even if we lost most of our colonies. This aspect of the question is seldom dealt with by the reformers.

I might also quote one of the prophets of the new Imperialism in England, Mr. Asquith, who said last fall at Edinburgh :

Why, if you once lost command of the sea, you would be starved into submission before a single foreign soldier had occasion to set his foot on your shores.

To hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, I might quote an authority that they accepted during many years, though perhaps not without some feeling of revolt, Sir Charles Tupper. Speaking in Winnipeg in 1893 on the argument that Canada should contribute to the British army and navy, and answering the objection to which I am replying that we are such a burden on the British taxpayer, Sir Charles Tupper said :

I deny that we are a burden to the empire. I say that if to-morrow Canada was dissevered from the Crown of England, if to-morrow Canada became a portion of that great republic which lies to the south of us, England could not reduce her army by a man, nor her navy by a ship. She would want more soldiers, and sailors and iron-clads than she has to-day in order to maintain her prestige.

These should prevent me from feeling too uneasy about the obligations and the burdens we are putting on the shoulders of the British taxpayer.

Now, let us look at the other side of the question, and see what has happened since we have shown so much love and devotion to the British taxpayer.

First, as a straight reply to the preference granted to British goods, we have received from the British representatives assembled in parliament three blank refusals to any consideration whatever of the question of preferential trade within the empire. In 1897, Sir Howard Vincent presented in the House of Commons a motion in favour of a preferential tariff on goods manufactured within the empire. Well, the House would not listen to the question. I admit that this was before the jubilee and before the South African war. But Imperial feeling had not made itself felt in Great Britain. Mr. Balfour simply set aside the motion and Sir Howard Vincent withdrew it.

But in 1899 we had adopted our preferential trade policy, the British people had assembled around the Throne, not merely to celebrate the sixtieth year of Her Majesty's reign, but to tell each other how much love and good feeling there was throughout the empire. Sir Howard Vincent brought the same motion on a question of duty on foreign wines. Then British opinion was a little more decided. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, said :

It is not a financial matter of any great importance, but my hon. friend has raised a principle, the importance of which I do not think he has adequately represented to the committee, and it is for that reason, and not on account of the small sum involved, that I feel compelled to object to his proposal. . . . . What my hon friend . . . . asks me to do is to adopt a precedent which would involve a return to a system of differential duties in regard to our colonies, which was abolished forty years ago. . . . . Is my hon. friend prepared, or is the committee prepared, to impose a differential duty—which will have to be of a substantial amount to be of any use—on corn and timber from foreign countries in favour of corn or timber from Canada ? . . . . Now, whatever the force of sentiment in this matter, and I admit the force is very great indeed, surely the sentiment might be tempered with a little business-like consideration , ...

He then spoke of the high protective duties imposed by the colonies on British goods, completely forgetting that Canada was granting at the time a reduction of 25 per cent on British goods, and added :

I say that in such a case as this, to my mind it would be utterly unreasonable that we who bear the burdens of empire should surrender our fiscal freedom in the way my hon. friend proposes. . . . .

I wish to add here the opinion of a gentleman who has become very prominent as a leader of this Imperialistic movement, as an example of what is at the foundation of the moment. I refer to Sir Henry Fowler, who is now a strong supporter of Lord Rosebery :

. . . . I hope every gentleman on this side of the House will support the government——

—he was, ordinarily, an opponent of the government——

—in its resistance to the retrogade policy which is involved in the proposal of the hon. member.

But, of course, a few months later, this same gentleman exclaimed, speaking of the colonies—not of the colonies asking for any preference, not of the colonies asking for fair treatment, but of the colonies shedding their blood and giving their men for the defence of the empire——

These independent, self-governing communities have shown not merely by eloquent words or by enthusiastic cheers, but by spontaneously sending forth thousands of their sons to fight and to die for their fatherland—that our empire is one and indivisable, and that if ever it should be in peril from stress or storm it can summon to its defence a vast army of men of every class and creed and clime. . . . .

Our determination is to maintain our colonies, and to link them to each other and to us by even closer ties. . . . .

—but not to the point of giving us one atom of the favour we give to the British people. I could quote hundreds of extracts of this kind, but I do not think it is necessary.

This last summer, after our repeated proofs of devotion to the empire, the same

question, or rather a question involving the same principle, was brought up in the British parliament. It was brought up by Mr. Fowler, the member for West Bradford, in the form of a proposal that the duty on sugar imported from the colonies should be reduced by 33⅓ per cent, thereby granting to one colonial article the same rate of preference that we have granted to so many British products. And this is what he said :

Canada had carried out a proposal which had extorted enthusiasm from this country ; and he submitted that, in view not only of what Canada had done but of what Australia was capable of doing, the Chancellor of the Exchequer should make a serious attempt to consider the question of an inter-empire preferential tariff. If our colonies were prepared on certain questions to meet us, ought we not to be prepared to meet them ? . . . . The time was ripe for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to respond in a sympathetic spirit to the proposals of the colonies. . . . .

And what did Sir Michael Hicks-Beach reply to that sympathetic appeal ? This :

In pursuance of the same policy, Canada might ask that a duty should be imposed on our corn and flour imported not produced in Canada, and similar claims might be advanced on behalf of Canadian timber, Australian wool, and meat from New Zealand, and so on, through all articles preference would be claimed for colonial produce. . . . . If, on the other hand, we refused to foreign nations the treatment extended to our colonies, what would happen ? We had an export trade with foreign countries double the amount of the trade with our colonies, and were we prepared to risk the loss of this trade by declining to give foreign countries in return for the same concessions the treatment we gave to the colonies ?

There, the principle was laid down straight that Great Britain was not ready to make any sacrifices of foreign relations in favour of her colonies. Then Sir Howard Vincent arose and said :

They owed an enormous debt to Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the boldness with which he had advocated these proposals and for his firm attitude during the general election last year. . . . .

And Sir William Harcourt said :

They all recognized the zeal and valour with which the empire across the seas had sent their forces to aid in this war ; but the taxation for the war would not fall upon them, but upon the petty population of 40,000,000 who occupied little England. And the proposal was that the workingmen, on whom this taxation would fall, were to have an additional burden put upon them in order to give relief to those who did not pay the taxes. . . . .

And Mr. Henniker Heaton said :

If the Chancellor of the Exchequer could see his way to agree to the amendment the greatest enthusiasm would be felt. . . . . A motion such as that which was now before the committee would promote kindly feeling towards England, and its rejection, after such a sacrifice as Canada has made, would cause great disappointment in that part of the empire. It would be thought that we did not care about the colonies when dealing with questions of taxation.

But the Chancellor of the Exchequer replied :

He felt strongly the kindliness and good will shown by the action of Canada. But, greatly as he valued that kindness, he thought the action itself was of far more importance than the actual effect it would have upon a great industry.

What was the result ? In 1897, after appealing to the House, the motion was withdrawn. In 1899, after the Jubilee, but before our proofs of loyalty had been given in the war, that motion was defeated by a vote of 192 to 37. But after the development of the feeling of reciprocity, after the feeling of love growing up among the members of the empire had produced such good and great results, the representatives of the British people crushed the motion in favour of the principle of any advantage being given to the colonies by a vote of 366 to 16. Sir, that has been the result of the development of love of the mother country for the colonies. And we are told now that we should not stand up in the Canadian parliament and say that we have at least one-tenth the feeling of pride in our own country that the British representatives have in theirs ! I think that is but a poor way to prove to Great Britain that we have profited by her example.

The Prime Minister of Ontario was in the old country last winter, and, with his eloquence, with his skill, with his wide knowledge of Canadian affairs, he spoke at a great number of meetings in England. One of the questions he took up was this question of the preference, and another was the question of immigration to Canada. The hon. gentleman has put in pamphlet form and published within the last few weeks some of his addresses in England. It is very amusing to bring together a few paragraphs to see how the expressions of opinion coming from a colonial representative are received in the old country when, on the one hand he expresses a desire to help Great Britain, and, on the other hand, a desire of being helped. Speaking in London on the 25th of July, Mr. Ross said :

I do not think we can keep a standing army for the defence of the empire, but I believe we can contribute something for a naval reserve. We have 50,000 fishermen who, with a little training, could be drawn on liberally for the navy.

Mr. Ross is an acute politician : he knew this would not affect very much his province, and he was ready to grant 50,000 fishermen from Quebec and the maritime provinces to prove our love towards Great Britain. But a few days later, speaking at Manchester on the 31st of July he said :—

I say to you here in Manchester that we are willing—I think we are willing—in Canada to

impose a duty of 5 per cent on all importations from any foreign country, excepting the colonies of the empire, the money to be applied as a war tax or as a defence fund for the defence of the empire. Will you reciprocate that ? Will you impose a 5 per cent tax on all imports from foreign countries, excluding the colonies, as a defence fund for the defence of the empire ? Surely that is a practical basis.

And from the meeting came the cries : No ! No ! Sir, when the colonial statesman was offering freely our blood, was offering freely the arms, and strength, and energy of our youth, his words were accepted graciously ; but when he asked the British people to grant us, not anything comparable with that youth, not anything comparable with the gift we were asked to make, when he simply asked them to impose a small rate of duty, 5 per cent, of which they would get the benefit as a defence fund for the empire, the answer he gets is, no, no. That is imperialism as it is understood on the other side.

An hon. MEMBER. Why talk so much about it ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Why ? In order to make the Canadian people understand what is the real aim of the imperialist party in Great Britain, to show that by sacrificing the blood and the money of this country we are simply playing into the hands of politicians who are trying to make the British people shut their eyes to the iniquities in South Africa.

Sir, there was also the question of the embargo on Canadian cattle to which I referred some days ago. Here is a question upon which we do not ask for a great sacrifice from the British people ; we simply ask that the British government should not wilfully brand our cattle throughout the whole world as being poisoned. The Minister of Agriculture has brought the correspondence before the House. Much of it was brought down in previous years ; but I find here that the hon. minister submitted to the Privy Council of Canada a report in which he made what I may call a summary of the whole question.

Mr. COWAN. Read it.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, it is too long. It is laid on the Table of the House and the hon. member can read it. It might help him to understand many things that he does not understand now. As I said on a previous occasion, the Minister of Agriculture made a splendid campaign in England on behalf of Canadian interests, a campaign of which I was to some extent a witness, because I had an opportunity of speaking with a good many Englishmen, traders and stock raisers, who told me of the most intelligent and persistent efforts made by the Minister of Agriculture. I see that before going to England he had a report adopted by the Privy Council in which I read this :

The minister recommends that urgent representations be made to the Imperial government that the present embargo placed on Canadian cattle by the United Kingdom is not only a serious detriment from a financial point of view to the Canadian cattle trade and the farmers and stock raisers of Canada, and to the purchasers of beef, cattle and stockers in the United Kingdom, but that it is a most unfair and unjust aspersion on the health and reputation of Canadian cattle. It is a publication to all the markets of the world to which Canadian cattle could be exported that in the opinion of the authorities of the United Kingdom it is dangerous to import Canadian cattle. The minister also observes that were this justified by the facts of the case, or the condition of our cattle during many years past, no exception could be taken to it, but with the knowledge of the foregoing facts he desires to press most strenuously the equity and policy of removing Canada from the schedule.

Therefore not only was the case presented to the British public by the Minister of Agriculture, but it was presented officially to the British government by the Canadian government. What was the reply ? In a letter from the Board of Agriculture communicated to this government by Mr. Chamberlain, this is what I find written by Mr. Elliott, secretary of the Board, under date of June 12, 1901 :

The requirement that imported animals must be landed at a foreign animals wharf for slaughter there, is now a statutory one of general application to all imported animals alike, irrespective of any question of the particular country from which they arrive, as will be seen by reference to the Diseases of Animals Act, 1896. The free importation of animals into the United Kingdom is therefore no longer permissible in the case of any country, nor have the board any power to relax the requirements above referred to, or to differentiate between one country and another in that respect——

——it is not probable that parliament would support, nor could the board propose, the modifications or appeal of the Act which was passed five years ago after full consideration and discussion at the hands of those concerned.

Well, Sir, now we are told that because in 1896 the British parliament passed a statute, it must stand for all time to come, sacred as the Bible. But the other day when it was found that the British government could not accept sailors from the colony of Newfoundland for their navy, owing to some obstacle in the constitution of the colony, they said they would remove the obstacle, not only from Newfoundland but from all British colonies, so that in future the British government could come into all the colonies and get sailors for their navy. Bnt when it is a question of removing from a British statute a clause which is an unjustifiable slander upon Canadian cattle, and an impediment to the trade of the loyal Canadian people—no, it is a British statute, it is sacred and cannot be touched ! Are we going to stand that treatment ? We are told we should not stand the treatment that is given to us by Germany. Sir, Germany is a foreign

country. We have not shed our blood for Germany, we have not paid any money to Germany, we have treated Germany like a foreign country, we have asked Great Britain to disallow a treaty made with Germany. But, Sir, the British people have received a little help from the Canadian people. British statesmen, and especially Mr. Chamberlain, were very proud to be able to say upon public platforms in England that the people of the colonies were helping them, that the Liberals of England had no right to denounce the South African war because the whole Canadian people was at the back of England. But when it comes to a question, not of granting us any favours, but of simply doing us justice, when we ask them not to treat us as aliens, the answer is: No there is the British statute. And the British Board of Agriculture will not even take the trouble to ask parliament to repeal an unjust law.

I need not refer to the Alaskan boundary question, I have talked sufficiently about that. Shall I refer to the question of immigration into Canada? Here is a question upon which the British people are as much interested as we are. Mr. Ross wrote in the month of September last a very eloquent letter to the British people, published in the 'London Times,' in which he said it was in the interest of the British people to direct British immigration into the British colonies. He pointed out that during the last ten years, out of 726,000 emigrants, 520,000, or 72 per cent had gone to the United States, while only 90,000, or 13 per cent had gone to British North America. In order to induce the British government to take a hand in the matter he pointed out the advantage, from the military point of view, that she would derive in the future, and he said:—

> Canada would furnish a basis for the food supplies of the empire, and an admirable recruiting ground for the army and navy. Moreover (and this is of great importance), with an addition to our population of such persons as would naturally emigrate from the United Kingdom, the attachment of Canadians to the empire would be greatly and permanently strengthened.

From the general feeling in this country, one would think that this would bring a very enthusiastic reply from the great English organ. Well, it said that it was desirable that the British emigrant should go to the British colonies. But, it said:

> His going to the United States rather than to the Dominion, to South Africa, or to Australia is probably much less an affair of the flag than it is of latitude and longitude. South Africa is closed for the present, though we all hope that before long new openings and brighter prospects will be found there. Australia is a long way off, while the American continent, is, by comparison, close at hand. Canada, as we know, is not 'Our Lady of the Snows,' but nothing can alter the fact that the United States lie south of the Dominion nor its influence on the stream of emigration. If Canada were a part of the United States, or if the British flag waved undisputed from the Arctic ocean to the Gulf of Mexico, the stream of European emigration would probably still flow mainly to the middle latitudes of the North American Continent. No improved 'teaching of the geography and resources of the British Empire' can alter the fundamental fact that temperate zones best suit the people of these islands.

As you see, in the case of South Africa, the present state of the war was shown as the only obstacle in the way of the British emigrant going there; and in the case of Australia it was the long distance that might be shortened by improved means of transportation; but, as far as Canada is concerned, our case is that it is because we are not a temperate country. That is the greatest encouragement received from that great organ of public opinion, when the Prime Minister of one of the provinces tried to attract British emigration to that province. But, there is a higher authority as to the climate of our country. When those Welsh emigrants wanted to come to Canada and when they appealed to the master of the empire, the great prophet who rules over the destinies of this whole empire, who has framed the policy of the colonies for the last four years, the reason given by Mr. Chamberlain why these Welsh emigrants should not come here was that they would require too many woollen clothes! But when it came to a question of emigration to South Africa, to a point where the British government want settlers to go and take the places of these people who had been deprived of their farms, of those people who have been slaughtered, that was the purpose that was to be achieved. Their British blood was wanted to serve Mr. Chamberlain's purpose, and what the British government was not ready to do for the loyal colony of Canada, for the loyal colony of Australia, or for the loyal colony of New Zealand, the British government was ready to do for South Africa. What did we read in the Toronto 'Globe' of 2nd July last?

> Advices received from England intimate that the consent of the Imperial government has been given to a scheme for state aided emigration to South Africa. This news will be received with much regret in Canada and the other colonies which are looking to the British Isles for settlers to occupy and till their vacant lands. After the sacrifices which the colonies have made in blood and treasure to help the mother country, it seems but a poor return for the latter to throw its mighty influence into the scale in favour of emigration to South Africa. Canada has a special reason to feel annoyance.

But, as long as we feel only and we do not give more evidence of our feelings than we have done for the last four years the result will be nil. It is useless talk to go on telling the British government and the British people: 'You may do what you like, you can rely upon us; you can get everything from us. If you do anything against us we will enter a little protest outside of parliament, but both parties are so loyal that no one will dare to stand up in the

Canadian parliament and tell you the truth.' The British government are a very practical and businesslike government: as long as our annoyance is intimated only through newspaper articles, you may rest assured that our men and our money will be well received, but that we will not get anything more satisfactory in the way of help towards immigration, towards the removal of the embargo on cattle, towards anything, not of favour, but of equal treatment and justice.

Now, I come to the question of Chinese and Japanese immigration. It is not my purpose to go into the merits of the question. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith), the other day, dealt lengthily with the question. He gave us the argument that there was nothing contrary to Imperial policy in dealing with that question. He quoted a letter from Mr. Chamberlain to the Governor of Tasmania, written in 1898, saying that it was the undoubted right of every British colony to adopt the immigration policy as they saw fit. But, Sir, Mr. Chamberlain has written many letters since that time. Now, the Imperialistic feeling has developed. The result of the South African war has been felt. What is the result? On the 19th of August last, the London 'Times,' published a letter from a gentleman from British Columbia, Mr. David Falconer, editor of the 'Outlook,' in which I find:

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier, our premier, has said that he thinks British Columbia is entitled to a larger share of the head tax on Chinamen, but, that nothing can be done to stop the emigration of the Japanese for 'Imperial reasons.' Yet, notwithstanding this opinion of Sir Wilfrid's, it seems incredible that Great Britain will deliberately permit the progressive and loyal people of any of her colonies to be plundered by an industrial Mongolian invasion for 'Imperial' or any other reasons if the matter be placed clearly before her.

Now, in an article published on the 2nd of September, the London 'Times' discussed the statement of Mr. Falconer, that the people of British Columbia were united on that point, and the 'Times' added:

> But, if it were so, we should still urge our Canadian fellow countrymen to give a more patient hearing to the 'Imperial considerations' of which Sir Wilfrid Laurier has spoken in connection with this question than Mr. Falconer seems inclined to do.

I suppose most of the members of this House know that in the commonwealth of Australia the parliament has adopted, not a prohibitive law, but a law putting such a test upon the Mongolian emigrant that he is practically excluded. There was a good deal of protest, too, from the British government. Mr. Chamberlain wrote to the governor of Australia, Lord Hopetoun, asking the Australian government to change their policy. The Australian government replied, that they would try to do so, but the moment the Australian parliament was called together, the leader of the opposition, Mr. Reid, denounced the Australian government in such terms that they had to go back to the resolution and carry out their law. Even then the influence of the British government was felt. The motion in favour of prohibition was pressed, and it was defeated only by five or six votes. It was defeated because the Australian government asserted that should it be carried it would be disallowed by the King, a proceeding which has not been adopted for a long time by the British Crown. At first the Australian government tried to make it apply to all emigrants by imposing an English language test, but at the request of the labour party, they framed it in such a way as to apply only to Asiatics. Protests were entered by the Japanese government and a letter was sent by Mr. Chamberlain to the Australian government saying that the Japanese government were threatening to cancel the mail contracts between Australia and Japan, but, the Australian government stood by its law and it is in operation now.

What happened here? As early as the month of October last, not three weeks after the Bill had passed in British Columbia, Mr. Chamberlain wrote at once to the Canadian government to look into the matter. I must say that the Minister of Justice recommended the disallowance of the law, but it was not disallowed immediately, and on the 22nd of January, 1901, Mr. Chamberlain wrote to Lord Minto:

> Downing Street, January 22, 1901.
>
> My Lord,—With reference to my despatch No. 25 of even date respecting the British Columbia Immigration Act, 1900, I have the honour to request that you will invite the serious attention of your ministers to the question of the competence of a provincial legislature to pass such legislation.
>
> 2. It is understood from press reports that the Act is of a restrictive nature, based on the Natal, and having regard to the general principles on which the British North America Act is based, it would appear that such a measure is ultra vires for any legislative body in Canada other than the Dominion parliament.
>
> 3. The whole scheme of the British North America Act implies the exclusive exercise by the Dominion of all 'national' powers, and though the power to legislate for the promotion and encouragement of immigration into the provinces may have been properly given to the provincial legislatures, the right of entry into Canada of persons voluntarily seeking such entry is obviously a purely national matter, affecting as it does directly the relations of the empire.
>
> I have the honour to be, my Lord,
> Your Lordship's most obedient servant,
> (Sgd.) J. CHAMBERLAIN.

Now, Sir, we have the principle laid down in this whole question in dispute between Imperial rights and provincial rights. In 1894 the Imperial government acknowledged, in their treaty with Japan, that every British colony had the undoubted right of excluding Japanese immigrants if it choose to

do so, and that it was a power appertaining to every colony. Now, eight years later, we have the Colonial Secretary writing to a free colonial government telling them that they should take from one of their free provinces the right to say on what principle the basis of the population of that province should be fixed, because it might affect imperial interests. To-day it is a question of Japan. Suppose that to-morrow it is in the interest of the British government to make a treaty with China in order to check what may be considered by England as a hostile invasion of Russia in China; are we, in Canada, going to pay for that? Are we going to let the Chinese come into Canada because Mr. Chamberlain may choose to make a treaty with China? Every time that the British government have a treaty to make with a foreign country, are we going to be told that we have not the right to legislate as to the kind of people that will form the basis of the poulation that will live in this country and that will partake with us the advantages of citizenship in Canada? Who is going to say what the nature of the population of this country shall be? Is it the people of England or is it the people of Canada? I say, Sir, that every provincial government of this country should have the right to say who will enter that particular province and live in that province. I am not discussing the question of Japanese or Chinese immigration in itself; I am simply discussing the principle whether the British government has the right to decide what our constitution means, and what it does not mean. Up to this date we have been told that the great safeguard of our rights was in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and that whenever a constitutional question was raised we had only to apply to that high tribunal which has no concern in our politics, and that our constitution would be interpreted by that body in the light of the principles of the British constitution. Sir, every time that our liberties are confided to the hands of judicial Englishmen I have no objection, because I know the generosity and the breadth of mind of the English judicial tribunals; but I say that the interpretation of our constitution should not be left in the hands of the politicians in England who may have some political objects to serve, and who to serve their purposes might try to exercise an influence on the politicians of Canada. There is one body constituted in the British Empire to interpret the British constitution all through the empire, and it is not the Colonial Secretary who should have the right to dictate to any colonial government how the laws passed by any free province should be treated because they may perchance affect the interests of the British government.

I did not expect to speak at such length upon this question, and I would like to ask if the government will consent to an adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BOURASSA.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) is likely to occupy much more time I suppose so. It was understood, however, that other speakers would follow him this evening. We thought we might sit until twelve o'clock, but if the hon. gentleman feels there should be an adjournment I do not think we can refuse it, though I would much prefer we should sit until midnight.

Mr. BOURASSA. I expect to occupy about three quarters of an hour to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman is not to finish to-night I suppose we might as well adjourn.

Mr. BOURASSA. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 26, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Crown Bank of Canada.—Mr. Guthrie.

QUESTIONS.

ST. CATHARINES WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LANCASTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

Why has not the Order in Council been passed granting to the corporation of St. Catharines for power purposes six thousand cubic feet of water per minute from the old Welland Canal, as petitioned for by the said corporation and Board of Trade of the said city of St. Catharines, and referred to by the Prime Minister on 18th February, 1901, as reported in 'Hansard' on page 109 of that year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). In reply, I beg to say that we are waiting for a report from the engineer.

TEMISCOUATA RAILWAY AND INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. GAUVREAU—by Mr. Talbot—asked:

What price was paid by the Temiscouata Railway Company for the passage of each one of its cars over the Intercolonial Railway Company's branch between the Rivière du Loup station and the wharf, for the years 1900 and 1901?

How many of the said company's cars have passed over the Intercolonial Railway Company's branch line during the years 1900 and 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The price paid by Temiscouata Railway for the passage of cars over the Intercolonial Railway Company's branch between Rivière du Loup station and the wharf for the years 1900 and 1901 was $1 and $1.50, respectively.

2. 2,254.

CENSUS COMMISSIONERS—SOUTH WATERLOO.

Mr. CLARE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who was the commissioner for the taking of the recent census in the South Riding of Waterloo, and what was the amount paid or to be paid him ?

2. What amount is to be paid to the special enumerator for securing information as to the manufacturing interests in said riding, or what arrangement or understanding was come to with him as to amount or manner of payment ?

3. What sums of money, in detail, were paid to the several officers employed in the said riding for their services in connection with taking the census of 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher).

1. Alfred Kaufman, $354.74.

2. Seventeen days at $4, $68; expenses, $9.05—$77.05.

3. H. Hilborn	$53.17
H. Arthur	76.93
J. Leeds	63.06
J. Allison	138.24
G. D. Lewis	132.00
C. Pabst	50.25
F. H. McCallum	67.82
W. E. Guggisbery	87.00
H. Thomson	83.45
H. Sohrt	66.72
H. B. Hagey	69.70
R. N. Kerr	103.24
J. Wahl	113.20
Jos. Kaiser	86.78
W. R. Plum	299.80
	$1,491.36

DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL RIGHTS OVER TIDAL WATERS, &c.

Mr. FARQUHARSON asked :

What action has the government taken, or intend taking, to define the respective rights, privileges and duties of the Dominion and Provincial governments in reference to the rivers, tidal waters and foreshores in the Dominion, as referred to in the British North America Act ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). A reference of questions in difference between the government and the province was made to the Supreme Court of Canada, which decided these questions, and afterwards they were finally decided upon appeal by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. See the report of the decision in 1898, A.C., 701, et seg.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). I would ask permission, Mr. Speaker, to sum up, in a few words, the points I made last night before the adjournment. With regard to the first part of the motion presented by the hon. the leader of the opposition, I said that, in my opinion, the time had passed for discussing in this parliament the respective theories of free trade and protection. The policy of protection, I contended, has been imposed upon us by foreign circumstances. It has not been adopted because of any theory, or because it is peculiar to one party or the other, but because it is the natural policy of Canada. And I maintain that it would be to the advantage of Canada if representatives of both parties would cease discussing the relative merits of protection and free trade, and recognize the irresistible force of existing conditions. The policy of protection, I have pointed out, was forced upon the Conservative party, just as it has been forced upon the Liberal party; and we should be prepared to admit, what we all know to be the case, that so long as outside circumstances do not change, we will have to continue that fiscal policy, which both sides have practically agreed upon. I therefore do not see any necessity for the motion proposed by the hon. the leader of the opposition. There may be questions of detail to be considered—as, for instance, whether the rates of duty should be raised or lowered on certain imports; but in such cases it is the duty of those who want the rates raised, to bring a straight motion asking that the tariff on this or that article should be made higher. But, I do not see any utility whatever in asking the parliament of Canada to declare that a protective policy is necessary in this country, in view of the fact that such a policy has been imposed on both parties during the last twenty-four years, irrespective of the personal opinions of any member.

In the second part of my argument I admitted that I voted with the greatest pleasure for the preference to Great Britain when that measure was introduced by the government, in 1897. But, as time went on

and the results of that preference made themselves felt, I came to the conclusion that instead of its being a measure of freer trade—as no doubt the government meant it to be—it has turned out to be the worst kind of protection, namely, protection to foreign at the expense of home manufactures, and this is a kind of protection that I am not prepared to accept. I further expressed my astonishment at the contradictory position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. In the first part of their resolution, they say that the principle of protection should be proclaimed once more by this House, and then, in the latter part, they ask this parliament to declare itself in favour of discrimination against Canadian products for the benefit of British and German manufactures.

Mr. CLARKE. No, you have not read the resolution.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is the resolution. It is useless to talk about mutual preference and at the same time proclaim the protectionist doctrine. Suppose we should succeed in getting in the British market a preference for our agricultural products, that would no doubt be a good thing for our farmers, but would that afford the slightest protection to our manufacturers? Would that do away with the injury which they claim the present preference is doing them? No doubt if we could obtain a preference for Canadian farm products, that would be of advantage to Canadian farmers, but would it give any relief to those manufacturing industries, of which hon. gentlemen opposite pose as being the special champions? Not at all. A preference by Britain to Canadian farm agricultural products in return for the preference given by Canada to British manufacturers would certainly not aid our Canadian manufacturers, whatever good it might do our farmers.

To my mind, the position taken by both parties on that question of preference to England, and the developments in that line that have taken place in the last three years, are not inspired by any Canadian sentiment or by any sentiment in favour of any class of the Canadian community, but have been forced on public men on both sides by that wave of what, I think, may be aptly described as the morbid feeling of loyalty to the empire which has become developed in this country at the expense of the true feeling of loyalty to national and Canadian interests.

In the course of my argument yesterday, I think I proved also that the preference granted to British goods has not had the results we expected, either in the matter of exports or imports; that the development of our export trade in the British market is not due to that policy, but to the intelligence displayed by Canadian producers and to the course pursued by our government in the matter of transportation and preservation of our natural products.

I made the point also that we have entered into a Pacific cable contract, in which we have been made the victims, as we have had to pay not only the share originally agreed upon in the scheme, but also a further amount in order to redeem the broken pledges of two of the most interested parties.

I also pointed out that for the last three or four years we have given abundant proof of our loyalty to the British empire, that we have given millions of dollars, that we have given freely of our blood and our wealth both in men and money. And what have been the results? First, the refusal by the British parliament of any concession whatever to the colonies in the matter of trade; second, the maintenance without any reason possible of the embargo against Canadian cattle in the British market; third, the sacrifice of Canadian interests in the matter of the Alaskan boundary in spite of the strong position taken by the Canadian government on that point; fourth, discrimination by the British government in matters of immigration in favour of the colonies of South Africa at the expense of Canada; fifth, the declaration by the Colonial Secretary in London of the policy that, while the British government can take the funds of the British people to encourage British emigration to South Africa, they will interfere with the liberty of Canadian people and force us to admit Mongolian immigration into Canada if it suits the interests of the British government—that is, the principle is laid down by the British government that they have the right to control the immigration policy of the Canadian people.

So that I claim that within the last four years, we have displayed our loyalty on every occasion, we have made enormous efforts to secure the good will and favour of the British people, with the result that we have received a great many compliments and a great measure of eulogy in the speeches of British statesmen, an enormous amount of printed matter showing how much the Canadian people are looked to in Great Britain; but, whenever we have asked the British people or the British parliament to manifest that feeling by some measure, not of favour to the Canadian people—because we have never begged for any favours—but simply to show some consideration for the wishes of the Canadian people, we have been told, on one occasion, that there were obstacles in the British statutes, at other times that what we wished was contrary to the principles of the British people. On no occasion have we been able to secure one of the concessions, or one of the equal terms, we have asked from the British government.

I may be told that when I speak in this way I am animated by a feeling of disaffection towards Great Britain and her people. Of course, affection and loyalty are things that are understood differently by

different people. To my mind, the affection, the loyalty and the love that should unite the different members of the British empire should be manifested not so much in words as in deeds. Whenever we have been called upon to prove our loyalty to the British people and the British Crown, we have been glad to take advantage of the opportunity, and we have done it generously. And I say that if we wish to prove that that feeling of reciprocal love is strong, that the new imperialism is based upon a deep sentiment of love and fair play among the different members of the British empire, then, all the deeds should not be on the one side and all the words and compliments on the other.

I was much struck with a remark that was made by one of the London papers at the beginning of the South African war. It was after the first engagement in which the Canadian soldiers had taken part. The newspaper to which I have referred observed that it was not sufficient to mention that so many Canadian soldiers, so many New Zealanders and so many Australians had taken part in the engagement; but that they should be paid high compliments, because the colonists are fond of compliments; and if their services are wanted in the future, they must be praised ungrudgingly in this respect.

It may be that we are fond of compliments, but we are not beggars. I do not ask that the Canadian parliament and the Canadian people should play the part of beggars towards the British parliament and people. I have more pride and more confidence in the national feeling of my country than that. But I say that we should take a position before the British parliament and before the British people that this is a free people, entitled to the same liberty and the same treatment as any other community in the British empire, and that when we come to deal with the United Kingdom, we must deal on equal terms. For every favour we grant them, an equal favour must be done to us. For every advantage given to the British people, a similar advantage must be given to the Canadian people.

I must confess that the position taken by our representatives for the last few years has had something to do with the belief which has developed in Great Britain as to the facility with which Canadians can be satisfied with words and compliments. I am not referring to the position taken by the Prime Minister, and to the speeches delivered by him, at the time of the jubilee festivities. No doubt the occasion was propitious for the exchange of expressions of friendly feeling. No doubt, the Prime Minister, going there as a French Canadian, the representative of a minority in a British colony where that minority enjoyed equal rights and fair treatment, felt called upon to express feelings that are at the bottom of the heart of every French Canadian. So long as this remains a matter of sentiment I shall approve of the expressions of the Prime Minister; and I shall not begrudge it if he goes there this summer and holds the same language. But when it comes to matters of business, the Prime Minister, when leader of the opposition, stated most eloquently and forcibly the best way to win the appreciation of John Bull. That way was to show John Bull that Canada was the worthy son of his sire, and that we are just as businesslike as he is.

In 1899, Sir Louis Davies, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, spent a few weeks in London in order to get the British government to take the right side on the Alaskan boundary question. He stated at that time that he regretted very much that he was not able to secure from the British government the full support that he expected. But, on the very same trip, speaking to the very same people and government, he said that if Great Britain wanted ten thousand men from Canada, she could have them. It has been stated in the British parliament time and again that it was only a matter of time when the British government could secure in Canada all the men wanted for filling up the ranks of their army and manning the ships of their navy, Englishmen and Scotchmen no longer showing any great desire to enter the service.

Last year I referred to the late Congress of the Chamber of Commerce of the empire. The records of that meeting give us some interesting information. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), who spoke yesterday, was there as one of the representatives from Canada. Chambers of Commerce in all parts of the empire were represented there. And what happened? Our representatives from Ottawa, from Toronto from Montreal, joined by representatives from Australia and Cape Colony, proposed to that congress a motion affirming the principle of taxing the colonies for war purposes and getting from them all the material required. This was carried unanimously. But when it came to the point when the Canadian delegates asked for recognition of the principle that Canadians and colonial trade generally should receive in Great Britain similar treatment to that given by Canada to British trade, the representatives from England and Scotland united to crush every motion of that kind made by the Canadian representatives. And yet, Sir, after the congress was over, these Canadian gentlemen went to a banquet of the congress and repeated their assurances of love and loyalty to Great Britain. Again, I say I do not reproach them for having done so, but their declaration should have been coupled with a declaration of pride and confidence in our own country, such a declaration as would make the British delegates understand that if they expected Canadian military help in men and money they should give some evidence of consideration for us.

Last year there was, as there is every year, in London, a demonstration in order to develop what is now spoken of as the real imperialistic sentiment. The occasion was the Dominion Day dinner. This has developed into one of those numerous social functions of which Mr. Chamberlain very cleverly avails himself to gather the colonial representatives and cause them, after a very pompous banquet, to make declarations of love towards the mother country, that he may explain to the British people afterwards that these colonies are so generous that Great Britain may expect anything from them and need not give them anything in return. The late Minister of Justice, Mr. Mills, was there, and what did he say :

. . . . The feeling in favour of the unity of the empire has grown very rapidly during the last five years in Canada. Every one was anxious to see the unity of the empire preserved; to see by degrees some system of union organized which would prove satisfactory to the self-governing colonies and to the United Kingdom. They were satisfied that such a condition of things might be brought about, and that feeling was largely due to the reciprocal feeling which had sprung up in the United Kingdom. . .

Well, sir, it is most amusing that this declaration, which is an acknowledgment of reciprocal feeling on the part of the British people, was made by a Canadian representative just two weeks after the British parliament had repulsed by what I might call a unanimous vote, coupled with ironical cheers and laughter, the idea that the British people could be asked for a slight sacrifice in favour of colonial trade—of which I gave an illustration yesterday.

Now, what is the feeling of British statesmen themselves on that question ? Let me take as an example the most powerful public man in Great Britain to-day, one of the greatest English statesmen in this century, who has forced the imperialist sentiment upon the British people, I mean Mr. Chamberlain. In 1897 the attention of Mr. Chamberlain was called in the British parliament to the preferential policy which had just been adopted by the Canadian parliament. Mr. J. F. Hogan asked :

I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the colonies (1) whether he has observed that the new Canadian tariff provides for preferential trade relations with the mother country; and (2) whether Her Majesty's government will embrace the earliest opportunity of recognizing and, if practicable, reciprocating the action of the government of the Dominion in this important matter ?

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. Chamberlain) :

The answer to the first part of the hon. member's question is in the affirmative. Her Majesty's government cordially appreciate the friendly spirit which is shown by the action of the Dominion government, but I understand that the proposals do not depend on any alteration of the system of free trade established in the United Kingdom.

Mr. BOURASSA.

But when he came to the question of colonial help towards the British army and navy, Mr. Chamberlain was more interested in the colonies. In 1900, a motion was made in the House to lay down the principle of colonial representation in the British parliament. Mr. Chamberlain then said that, though in theory he might agree with the principle laid down by the motion, yet he did not see it was of any use to raise the question now. The seconder of the motion, Mr. Trevelyan, had stated that in the South African war the colonies had displayed all the loyalty that could be desired, but that a time might come when that feeling would cool down; and therefore they ought immediately to give a kind of legislative sanction to that action, and give representation to the colonies, so that in future they might be induced to supply the men and money in every war in which Great Britain might become entangled. Mr. Chamberlain immediately dispelled that idea. He said : You don't know the colonies, you don't know the generosity of the colonies, you can expect everything from them :

I believe that if in any stress, or difficulty, or crisis of our fate, we did make a call on the colonies, their efforts would be immensely greater even than those they have already made.

Now, turning to the other wing of the dominant party in England just now, turning to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, who is the representative of the old Tory element, what have we seen ? Sir Michael Hicks-Beach has repeated time and again that the colonies need not expect anything from Great Britain in the matter of commercial advantages ; that Great Britain would not sacrifice one cent of her foreign trade in order to benefit by that cent the loyal colonies of Great Britain. But when it came to the question of organizing the empire on a military basis so as to give Great Britain the men and money she would like to acquire in order to lessen the burden upon her own people, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach changed his position. He said in Liverpool, on the 24th of October, 1900 :

With an expanding empire we ought to have a much more widely spread system of contribution to Imperial defence than that which we at present enjoy. I do not believe you will find a single colony that will object to that. The whole history of the South African campaign shows that they have come forward voluntarily to a man in a matter which at first, apparently, did not affect them, to place their men and means at the disposal of Her Majesty's government for the safety of the empire, and I am convinced that our colonists in America, in Canada, and in Australia are much too proud to desire to impose on the mother country anything more than she ought to fairly bear for Imperial defence. We have at the present moment a great feeling of enthusiasm on the part of Her Majesty's subjects throughout the world. For the present and future of the empire, I desire to see that feeling utilized. I desire every politician in this country or in the colonies, and every man of business, to do his best to utilize

and to systematize while they can that feeling of enthusiasm.

But when it came to the question of granting any favour to the colonies, in the very same speech Sir Michael said :

To suppose that this country, after fifty years experience of what the freedom of taxation on imports of raw material and food means to us, will deliberately resort to the taxation of raw material and food from foreign countries, is to my mind an impossibility. I do not wish to argue the question further. I wish, as I have said, simply to state my own opinion that any person in our colonies or in this country who founds his views as to the future on the possibility of any solution of this question except on the basis of free trade, is founding his views on a foundation of sand, and I would not for the world have the responsibility of saying to our fellow subjects that we can deal with it on any other basis than that of free trade.

Sir, there is something that I always admire in British statesmen, and that is that when they express their views they do so in no ambiguous manner ; they let us know with whom we have to deal, and with what system we are confronted. But I say that after such declarations we ought to know what are the sentiments of the British people and the British government. Last summer I had the advantage of a long interview with a member of the British government—not a member of the cabinet but of the government—not one of the rising stars of the party in power in England. I put to him this simple question : 'You are working up in this country and in the colonies, through your representatives, a strong feeling of what you call the new imperialism. But are you not afraid that when the people in Great Britain and the colonies find out that you are keeping them under a delusion, a strong reaction will take place ?' He asked: 'What do you mean ?'—I said, 'here in England I hear only of what the colonies have done for Great Britain, of what the colonies will do for Great Britain, of what Great Britain can expect from the colonies ; but I hear nothing of what the colonies may expect from Great Britain.' 'Well, surely,' he said, 'they do not expect anything; we are told by your representatives that the colonies expect nothing.'—He was not disposed to believe me, although very polite in his expressions, when I told him that there might develop a disposition in Canada to expect something from Great Britain, either in a political, a legislative or a commercial sense. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is dangerous for all parties concerned, it is not loyal on the part of the parliament of Canada, to allow the British government and the British people to remain under the impression that Canadians are ready to make any sacrifice and to ask for nothing in return.

I have already stated that last fall, after the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was repealed, without any consideration apparently being given to the wishes of the Canadian government, some strong expressions of opinion were made in the public press of this country. We had the leading organ of the hon. gentlemen opposite in the city of Ottawa, publishing a strong argument against the stand taken by the British government, and next day it was followed by a correspondence, published without a word of dissent on the part of the editorial management. If the language of this correspondence had come from my own disloyal lips it would have raised a feeling of indignation among all the loyal representatives in this House. Let me quote :

Many of our leading newspapers have been representing Britain as an indulgent mother, protecting us with her army, navy and great prestige, and Canada as a selfish and ungrateful dependent, accepting everything and contributing nothing towards the defence of the empire.

The writers who thus slander their own country have profited little by their study of history. When and where, in the last eighty-seven years, has Britain protected us or championed our cause ? . . . .

I assert unhesitatingly that in the settlement of every dispute between Britain and the United States, Canada has been the victim. Like Artemus Ward, who was willing to sacrifice all his wife's relations on the altar of his country, the Imperial government has cheerfully sacrificed Canada's interests to maintain friendly relations with the United States.

Owing to our geographical position, Britain's army and navy could afford but slight, if any, protection to Canada. . . . The only possible enemy that Canada need fear is our neighbour on this continent, the mighty republic. Against their aggressiveness British power and prestige have hitherto failed to protect us, and, if ever there was a possibility of such protection being granted in the past, it is rapidly diminishing if it has not already disappeared.

We are doing far more for Britain than Britain has done for Canada in nearly a century. While we are admitted to the markets of the United Kingdom on no better terms than the worst enemies of the empire, we give British trade a substantial preference. While Britain has never, since the last war with the United States, taken a firm stand to protect us from the rapacity of our neighbours, Canadians have risked their lives, shed their blood and taxed themselves cheerfully to maintain the prestige of the empire. . . . .

It is high time that Canadians became, not less loyal, but more patriotic. While we have no right to condemn the policy of the British government, which has been dictated in the interest, or what has been regarded as the interest, of the empire as a whole, we should look the fact squarely in the face that in any clash of interests between the United States and the Dominion we need look for neither sympathy nor support from the Imperial government. We will be expected to adhere to the traditional policy of Downing Street and sacrifice ourselves for the benefit of the empire and the maintenance of cordial relations between England and the great American republic.

Sir, these sentiments are not exactly mine. My feeling against Great Britain is most certainly not so pronounced as that. For my part I am an Imperialist from a certain standpoint. But my Imperialism is that

of the good old British school that made the empire what it is, and which was expressed in those words of Burke when he vainly protested against the policy of the Imperial government of George III and Lord North, namely : That the secret of British expansion in the world was a 'wise and salutary neglect' towards the colonies. I am one of those who do not ask that the British government should take any part in all our troubles. I am not asking that the British government should be involved in our difficulties. I am not asking any favours commercially or otherwise from the British government. But I do say that if we are forced by the government of Great Britain, or by the government of Canada, or by a feeling of false loyalty in this country, to do for the government of Great Britain and the people of Great Britain what we are not bound to do—what we were never asked to do in the past in commercial or in military matters—then it follows that some compensation should be made by the British people to the Canadian people. Let the British government leave us free to develop our policy, to have the foreign relations we want to have, to trade where we like to trade : I do not ask any favour from the British government. But, if through the influence of the British government, or through our own policy, we are going to proclaim to the British people and to the world at large that we want to trade only with Great Britain; that we want to give favours to the British public which we will not give to other people; then I say that as a consequence, similar favours must be granted to the Canadian people by the British people.

Now, Sir, an Imperial conference will be held in London this summer at which Canada will be represented, if I understand aright, by three of the Canadian ministers. We have before us the letter of invitation that was sent by the British government to the Canadian government, and the reply thereto of the Canadian authorities. When I asked for the production of these papers the right hon. Prime Minister said that I would be disappointed with the text of that correspondence. Well, I may say to the Prime Minister, that every time he and his government stand for the defence of Canadian interests; every time they tell the British government that before being representatives of the British Crown they are representatives of the Canadian people, I shall fully sympathize with them. Therefore, I am not disappointed with the correspondence. I fully approve of the principle laid down in the letter sent by the Canadian government in reply to the invitation of the British government, which states that the only question which may be fruitful of result is the question of commercial relations and a discussion thereon.

But, Sir, I think that the parliament of Canada and the people of Canada are entitled to know upon what basis the Canadian government are prepared to consider commercial relations at that conference. I think this discussion might be fruitful of good result; but I believe that the Canadian representatives, though they undoubtedly know the feelings of the Canadian people, should take the Canadian parliament into their confidence as to the views which they intend propounding at that conference with regard to the future relations of the different parts of the empire. I need not say what my view is—I need not say what the view is of more people than I seem to represent in this House to-day. That view is that this question should be discussed on a purely business basis; that we should not give up one iota of our freedom of trade with any country in the world; and that if we are brought to the point of making trade arrangements either with Britain or any of our sister colonies, it shall be on the basis of purely direct treaties between Canada and any of these sister colonies.

That view further is : That in any treaty that will be made, or in any trade arrangement that will be made either between Great Britain and Canada, or between Canada and any other colony, there should be no mere sentimentality introduced, but that Canada should play the part of an equal business partner and get as much as she will give.

It may be said that the right hon. premier stated in England in 1897 that Canada asked no favours; but, Sir, I claim that circumstances have changed since then. I repeat what I said before : I do not denounce the right hon. gentleman for anything he said at that time on this particular point. Our preferential treatment of Great Britain was an experiment; but now, enlightened by the result of that experiment, seeing that the result has not been what we expected—seeing that trade facilities could be had with other countries,—the right hon. gentleman should not be afraid to take the position of saying to the British government : 'The results have not been what we expected; some of the British traders are taking advantage of our policy to bring German goods into England and export them to Canada as British goods enjoying that preference; and whilst we have denounced the German treaty, Britain herself has been very glad to enter into a trade arrangement by which she enjoys the minimum tariff with Germany, while we suffer under the maximum tariff; and, in addition to that, German goods are exported from England to Canada under the preferential tariff, to the great detriment of our own people.' It will not be harder for the right hon. gentleman to change the position he had taken on this point than it was for him to change the position which he took with regard to another Imperial matter.

In 1897, the right hon. gentleman said that Canada was anxious for representation

in the British government, or rather, that the time would soon come when Canada would ask for representation in the British parliament; but having found out now that the sentiment of the people of Canada is not in favour of representation in the British parliament, the right hon. gentleman has stated in his letter to the British government that no good can be obtained from the discussion of our political relations. Sir, it is the duty of the representative of any country to conform his views to the views of the people of that country.

The second point upon which I think our representatives at the coming London conference should not abandon one iota of our rights, is the vexed question of the embargo on our cattle. It is for them to say that nothing will be discussed in the way of commercial relations between Great Britain and Canada until the embargo on Canadian cattle is removed. Our representatives should say that before we enter into any new trade arrangements, the unjustifiable wrong of barring out our cattle from England should disappear, and that the least we can expect from the motherland is that she will cease branding all over the world that Canadian cattle is diseased, when, in fact, they are not diseased, and when, in fact, further, any cattle disease we ever had in this country was imported from the old country.

Another point upon which the right hon. gentlemen and his colleagues should insist most strenuously is, that the Colonial Secretary should not be allowed to interfere with any legislation that may be adopted in Canada in reference to immigration. The right hon. gentleman and his colleagues should insist that the Colonial Secretary has not the right to send letters to the Governor General of Canada stating that our constitution means this and means that; that such and such powers belong to provincial governments, and that such and such powers belong to the federal parliament. The Canadian representatives should make Mr. Chamberlain understand that the time is passed, and passed long ago, when a Colonial Secretary in Downing Street, a mere politician in England, has the right to interpret the constitution under which the people of Canada live. As I said last night, and I insist upon that point: We are all of us, French Canadians and English Canadians, ready to submit any point in our constitution to the interpretation of the judiciary in England selected for that purpose. However, not as a French Canadian, but as a free British Canadian, I have the strongest objection to the Colonial Secretary writing to the Canadian government to say that our constitution means this or means that, and that the Federal government should interfere with this or that provincial law, because some Imperial interest is supposed to be at stake.

As to the inter-imperial trade advocated by the leader of the opposition, I have clearly stated my views last year. I do not want it, and for two reasons. First, because it is absurd to again beg from the British people what they have three times before declared in their parliament, with sneers at our expense, that they will never grant to us. Second, because, as I said last year, we can only get a preferential treatment in England at the expense of our freedom, commercial, political and military; and that the preference under such circumstances would not be worth our while. We cannot get that preferential treatment in England without having in London a council of some kind that will look after its operation. Surely the hon. leader of the opposition and his party are not prepared to say that after we have entered into an agreement with the British government and all the colonial governments, that the operation of the trade under that agreement should be left entirely in the hands of the British government. Then, does he mean to say that it is impossible to follow up the operation of such a trade by correspondence between the various governments, in London, at Ottawa, at Melbourne, at Christchurch, and the capitals of all the other British colonies? No. The inevitable consequence—and Mr. Chamberlain, with his clearness of mind, has seen it for years—would be the sitting in London of an Imperial council, on which Canada would be represented by one or two gentlemen, who would dine every week with Mr. Chamberlain, and would be too near London to be near enough to Ottawa. We have seen something of this kind at the sitting of the Pacific Cable Board. When Lord Strathcona speaks, with all his devotion to Canada's interests, he speaks as a member of the House of Lords and a capitalist who has large investments in Great Britain, as much as a Canadian representative. This is not owing to any bad feeling or unfaithfulness to the Canadian people on his part; but after all, a man is a man; and when his interests are divided in so many directions, he cannot be expected to be solely a representative of his country. Moreover, it would be most dangerous—and on this point Mr. Ross, the premier of Ontario, has given expression to the same feeling—for the people of Canada to see any part of their policy, whether commercial or political, disposed of by a body of men sitting in London, even if that body should be composed of the best men in the empire. I repeat after Mr. Ross that the only way the Canadian people can have their will asserted is through their representatives in parliament. I have no objection to our representatives going to London once in a while to meet the representatives of the sister colonies, but the operation of a trade policy such as that suggested by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would be utterly impossible unless a permanent Imperial council be created. That policy would entail a considerable diminu-

tion of our liberties, not only in regard to our trade relations but our political relations and our military relations also. Mr. Chamberlain has stated time and again in the British parliament and on the platform—and all his followers and sympathisers in the Liberal and Conservative parties have repeated—that whenever the colonies received any sort of representation or preferential treatment in Great Britain, they would compensate the British people to a greater extent than the amount they received, by military contributions. Therefore if the government of this country are not prepared to discuss a change in our political and military relations, they cannot accept the proposal made by the leader of the opposition on the subject of preferential trade.

Sir, I will sum up what we want said in our name before the Imperial conference. We want it said that we are ready to increase and strengthen our relations with Great Britain and with the sister colonies, but on the condition that we shall not sacrifice one iota of the liberties and privileges we possess, not only by the letter of the law but by the spirit of the constitution; that is, that we want to keep full control of our trade relations, our political relations and our military relations with Great Britain; that we want to keep in the hands of the Canadian parliament, as representing the Canadian people, the full control not only of our relations with the motherland and the sister colonies, but our relations with foreign countries as well. It has been announced by the government—and I hope it will be carried out—that we are going to have agents representing this country in various foreign countries. If we are serious with that policy, and really desire to trade with these foreign countries, and want these agents of ours to be in a position to do good work, they must be empowered to say to any foreign country that while we are British subjects, we are at the same time in the full enjoyment of self-government and can make our own trade policy, and are not childish enough to say that we will trade only with Great Britain and the sister colonies, but are ready to trade with any country that is ready to trade with us on fair terms. This, coupled with a strong transportation policy, which this government seems to have at heart, is the way to build up this country, to develop its resources, to increase its wealth and population. This is a far better way to render service to the empire and to add prestige to the British Crown than by making so many speeches and talking so much of our loyalty and neglecting to take the necessary means to develop our own country. If we do not make up our minds to pursue our own course, to paddle our own canoe, then we shall continue to be as we have been during most of our past life, especially at all critical periods in our history—going backwards and forwards from American influence to English influence, and vice versa.

We shall never attain the development we are entitled to have if the representatives of Canada go to London imbued with any other idea. But if they carry to the foot of the Throne an expression of the loyalty of the people of this country, French-Canadians as well as English-Canadians, and at the same time an expression of the seriousness of the Canadian people in making the British government understand that we are not only a loyal people but a business people, that we are not only loyal to England, but, as the right hon. leader of this House so eloquently expressed it in years past, we are loyal to Canada, first, last and forever, then I shall be the first to congratulate him on his return to this country.

Mr. M. K. RICHARDSON (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, in rising to address this House after so emminent a speaker as the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Bourassa), I feel some temerity in attempting to interest hon. members. There is very much in the hon. gentleman's address with which I am in accord, and I think there would have been a more general accord with many of the sentiments he has expressed, especially with regard to our trade policy, if he had not been so unfair in charging the British government with a lack of response to the offers of this country to give preferential treatment to British trade. What could we expect by the way of response when the British statesmen were told by our representative that we did not ask anything in return for what we were giving—that we not only did not ask anything, but did not want anything in return? He took it out of the power of British statesmen to advocate Canadian interests in that regard.

The subject of a fiscal policy for this country has been discussed so fully and so ably, and has been viewed from so many sides, that few new facts or arguments can be advanced on the subject. However, I will trespass on the patience of the House only for a short time while I present the case from my point of view. In a country that has so many diversified interests and such a variety of products as our country has, a consideration of the fiscal policy which shall be best suited to the wants of the country as a whole must always be a fertile subject for debate and for difference of opinion; and in the discussion of this subject we need to rise above the limited views of what is best for our own particular locality, to sink all sectional prejudices, and candidly ask how any proposed policy will conduce to the advantage or prosperity of the country as a whole. As a firm believer in a confederated Canada, in a Canadian nationality having a distinctive character and a great future, I have listened with intense interest to the budget debate which has continued for some days. I have noticed one peculiar thing—that on this side of the House there is a remarkable

unanimity of opinion as to the fiscal policy which is best suited to this country, while on the other side of the House there has been a charming variety, with all kinds of opinions advocated, from the most extreme free trade views to high protectionist views. Now, the trade policy of a country must have regard to changing conditions, internal as well as external. What may suit a country's needs at one period of its history might become entirely unsuitable at another period. Thus we are confronted with the question what is the best policy for Canada to-day ? We need to view this question, not from the standpoint of the doctrinaire, who has enunciated a lot of theories on protection or free trade, having a world-wide applicability, but from the standpoint of history and experience. For as experience is in individual life, the greatest and the best teacher, so it is in national life.

So much statistical matter has been put before the House in this debate that I shall not attempt anything in that line. Far more figures have been submitted to the House than can possibly be carried in any one's memory, and I do not believe that anything new of much importance can be submitted further in this direction. There are a few questions, however, which may be considered. The first is, has the fiscal policy of this country been conducive to its prosperity and does the policy submitted to us by the Finance Minister meet with the needs and circumstances of the time ? There is one feature of it which we on this side have not much reason to complain of. The country no doubt has reason to be grateful to the government for not having, when they assumed the reins of power, made the radical changes in our fiscal policy which, during eighteen years, they declared their intention of making. We have reason to be thankful that this government has seen fit to continue, in a large measure, the policy of protection to our manufacturing industry which was inaugurated by the Conservative party, and which, during eighteen years in opposition, hon. gentlemen opposite had been condemning from one end of the country to the other. That policy carried the country through very severe periods of agricultural and commercial depression. When in India, Australia and all European countries and the United States, we saw financial institutions wrecked by the hundreds, Canada, thanks to the stability given her institutions by the beneficent operation of the national policy, stood the storm better than any other country in the world. I do not say that we did not feel its effects or that it did not strike us as well as other countries. That would have been impossible because our trade relations with other countries must necessarily always cause us to feel the effects of depression in those countries, but there is no doubt that, thanks to the policy inaugurated by the late government, we came out of the trial much better than did other countries and we owe the present administration some gratitude for continuing that policy in a great measure, despite their pledge to destroy it root and branch. They abandoned the policy in name but have held on to it in principle as the sheet anchor of our commercial and national safety ; and only in so far as they have departed from that policy, has their administration been injurious to the best interests of the country. But these hon. gentlemen are not to-day so much afraid of the name 'protection' as they used to be a few years ago. True, there are some fossils of the party who still call themselves absolute free traders, but we hear to-day none of the diatribes with which these hon. gentlemen were wont to regale us a few years ago against the public pillage by our manufacturers under the guise of protection. And we have had the extraordinary spectacle of prominent gentlemen opposite declaring themselves protectionists without any disguise, as the last speaker and as others who have preceded him have done. Then we have had the declaration of the hon. member for North Norfolk that protection was to have been the policy of the Mackenzie government, and that it was only by a mere accident that that government did not adopt it. The Conservative party, he said, came into possession of a policy which the Mackenzie administration was seriously considering the wisdom of adopting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were many Conservatives in this country who felt that the accession to power of the Reform party might not be an unmixed evil. While in opposition, that party professed to have a monopoly of all the public virtues, and in their denunciations of every form of venality they posed as purest gems of the first water. They were to be rare economists, their advent to power was to be marked at once by reduction of expenditure, and the abolition of useless offices, such as the portfolio of Trade and Commerce. The abolition of the Senate was another reform on their programme, although sometimes they were moderate and simply talked, not of abolishing, but of reforming it. Well, Mr. Speaker, they have carried out in the latter respect, their pledge to the letter, for they are reforming the Senate pretty rapidly, as rapidly as nature will permit. They were to bring about lessened taxation and cheaper living for the artisan and better markets for our farm produce, and last, but not least, a rapid reduction of our national debt. There were many Conservatives who were led to believe that these gentlemen might possibly administer the affairs of the country more economically and do something to improve our trade relations with other countries. Hon. gentlemen opposite declared most emphatically that they would without any delay put our trade relations with the United States on a much more satisfactory basis than the Conservative party could possibly succeed in doing, but we all know how

miserably they have failed. They came into power under most favourable conditions to fulfill the pledges they had given. Circumstances might have existed which would have rendered impossible a reduction of our debt and taxation; conditions might have obtained in which they would not have had the revenue to carry on the affairs of the country, but such was not the case. They came into power under circumstances most favourable for the carrying out of their pledges. But with every condition in their favour, in a period of unprecedented abundance of nature's gifts and unparalleled prosperity, not only has the expenditure of the government been enormously increased, but the national debt has grown to an alarming extent, and we have no hope held out to us that in the near future there will be any reduction in that direction. Rather we have the prospect of a large increase.

We can point to the record of six year's government, or rather mis-government, and ask what pledge have these hon. gentlemen kept. Where are the new or improved markets for our foreign products that were so lavishly promised to the country before their advent to power? Two great assets of the country, which we held as trade hostages for exchange with the United States and Great Britain, have been thrown away. The duty on imports of American corn should have been held as a hostage for some reduction in the American duties on our oats and barley, but that has been thrown away, and thrown away, not in the interests of the Canadian farmers, because not one farmer in a thousand feeds American corn to his animals. In consequence our farmers are suffering owing to the reduced prices they get for their oats, peas and barley. I know that some hon. gentlemen pretend that the admission of free corn to this country is a benefit to our farmers, but I say that where one farmer is benefited, five hundred are injured and possibly a thousand. In my constituency I have addressed audiences where this question came up, and I have asked the question: Is there any farmer in this audience who uses imported American corn for the feeding of stock? And never once did I get an affirmative reply. But every one of them raises peas, oats, barley and other coarse grain, and the prices of all these are lowered by the admission of free corn. We ought to have had something in return for that concession, but the advantage we have enjoyed, this government recklessly threw away.

We had another valuable asset which we might have used in order to obtain a preference for our products in the British market. Trade preference with Great Britain, as conceived by Conservative leaders, was to be a mutual preference. We needed the British market and we needed a preference in that market over other countries for our farm products. However small that preference might be, it would be of some advantage to Canada. And the consumption is so large in the United Kingdom that all we can export there would be but a very small proportion of their requirements. And such a preference would have directed to this country hundreds of thousands of immigrants who would engage in opening up our great North-west. Such a preference, I admit, would be difficult to obtain, especially with regard to bread stuffs. The British public are very sensitive on this point. What British statesmen would dare appeal to the British electorate on the platform of raising the prices on their food, even in the most infinitesimal degree, without having some very strong inducements to offset that proposition? If the proposition were made that Canada should be given a preference in the British market, which might in a very small degree increase the price of bread stuffs the British public would immediately ask: Who wants that preference? Who is asking for it? What reply could be given them? They would have to be told that Canada does not ask for it, that Canada, by her representatives, says she does not want it. Thus we have taken away from British statesmen the argument which might have been used in favour of granting this reciprocal preference to Canada.

I say this great asset was recklessly thrown away. The future may explain, but at present it is inconceivable why this was done. And while we had, in this preference in our market for British manufactures, a great asset which we might have given them in exchange for a preference in this market, this asset has been granted to them, but for what advantage to this country? To what extent has it lowered the price of goods coming from the mother country? It has done so to some extent, but I say that the large proportion of the advantage has gone into the coffers of the British manufacturer. So we have thrown away, out of the prospective revenues of this country, thousands, and, if this system continues for some time, millions, of dollars which we greatly need. Though this government has a buoyant revenue, thanks to the good times which prevails generally throughout the world to-day, and though they claim large surpluses, yet, in the face of it all we see our debt growing and our expenditure and our taxation increasing. In the discussions that have taken place in this House we have heard enough to awaken us to the necessity that exists for the adoption of some great national policy in connection with the transportation system of this country, a policy for which we shall need money. I am opposed to all trade preferences that do not embody the principle of reciprocity. Our sentiment of loyalty and attachment to Imperial interests will not be lessened, but materially strengthened, by mutually beneficial trade relations. And, as a part of the great empire to which we say we are proud to be-

long, we should be prepared to take our proper place, and that, I hold will be the first place in that galaxy of nations that constitute that great empire. While sharing its glory, its power and protection, let us be prepared to share also its responsibilities. I object to, and deprecate the one-sided preference given to British imports, because, if regarded as the right hon. premier has defined it as a free gift from Canada in return to Britain for benefits received, it throws the cost of that lavish gift incidentally upon the farmers and agriculturists of Canada in whose interests it should be held as a hostage. I do not plead for class legislation that favours one class of citizens exclusively, especially if it is to the detriment of any other class. Yet, if there is any one class whose interests should be carefully protected it is our farmers. There is no other class of our citizens doing more for the advancement and progress of our country. By their enterprise, industry and intelligent application of labour, our farmers are doing more to place Canada in the front ranks of national progress than any other class of our people. Witness their splendid triumphs in the world's competitive exhibitions in Paris and in Glasgow and in the Pan-American at Buffalo. Their exhibits of dairy products, of cattle, of horses, of grains, and fruits, have given and are giving Canada a world-wide fame. Everywhere they are plucking victory from defeat, often in conditions when nature in her sterner moods presents an unfavourable aspect. I claim there is no more important task to which the government can address themselves than the opening of markets for our farmers and facilitating transport to those markets. The prosperity of our farming class must necessarily lie at the base of our national prosperity. As representing an agriculture constituency, it does not follow that I have no interest in the men engaged in our fisheries, in our mines, our forests, our factories or our commerce. Each and all demand our intelligent interest. But agriculture is and will be the paramount industry of Canada. A preference for our products in the British market opens up a prospect of untold benefits to the future of this country. Therefore, I claim, Mr. Speaker, that the gift to Great Britain of a one-sided preference was made at the expense of the Canadian farmer and to the detriment of the Canadian artisan.

While this government have been lavish beyond precedent in its expenditure, no great national work has been undertaken; and, while we have urgent needs pressing upon us, the government has been unwilling to undertake to meet them or unable to agree upon any definite line of action. The many serious and costly marine disasters in the passage from our lower St. Lawrence ports to the ocean has so increased the cost of insurance as to place an almost prohibitive freight tariff on shipments by that route, and, consequently our trade is being diverted to United States ports by American railways. This is a serious problem and must be grappled with. The question of expenditure in the solution of this problem must be met in a generous, liberal spirit, because, to a large extent, our continued national prosperity must depend upon a proper solution of this problem. The reckless expenditure of public money to 'fix' constituencies by building wharfs where no freights land, and to improve impossible harbours where no shipping comes, should cease. We were told that, under the new regime, the government's railroads would be made to pay not only expenses but dividends. We have been told that, already deficits in the Post Office Department were being faced, and that soon deficits from that quarter will be a thing of the past in Canada.

But I regard failure in all these lines, sad as they have been, as less to be deplored than the introduction into our public life of that most dangerous principle known as the spoils system, the outspoken adoption of the motto that 'to the victors belong the spoils,' a system that has done more to degrade the public life of the United States, and that has been more prolific of crime and dishonesty than all other causes put together. This is a system which is, happily, unknown in British public life. There is no cloud in the horizon of our future so portentous of danger as the outspoken adoption of this principle by those who have in charge the affairs of the Canadian people. There is always hope of redemption of an individual or character where sense of shame attaches to dishonesty. But an open profession of lowering standards of morals, either in individual character or in the body politic, indicates a defection most serious. So long as a government disclaims and deprecates charges of favouritism, savouring of corruption, public morals are in less danger than when these principles of action are adopted and defended. But when that is done, the effect is to introduce an insidious disease into our social and political life, destructive of all the safeguards of our liberty. Let us be warned in time. We need to be more guarded in this respect than in anything else. The honour of our public life is something that should be as dear to us as our personal honour, as dear to us as our lives.

Mr. Speaker, this country calls upon this so-called reform government to make some honest effort to redeem their pledge of honest, economical government, their pledge of an administration that shall aim at a more equal distribution of the blessings of life and for a patriotism that is less cosmopolitan and more Canadian. And I assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that there is at least, one man, and I trust many

more, on this side of the House, who care less for power than to see an honest, economical yet progressive administration of the government of this country. There has not been, on the part of this government, that sympathy for the agriculturists that there ought to have been. They have asked for something which has been denied. We know that it is an open question whether the introduction of the manufacture of beet-root sugar would be a real advantage to the country. At present it presents itself in a favourable light to many of our farmers. It has been demonstrated that beet root equal to any in the world for the manufacture of sugar can be produced in Canada. It has been shown also that this is especially an industry that deserves assistance from the government. It is an industry that cannot be started individually. It calls for the investment of large capital. But even with ample capital something more is required, for it takes many months, it may take even years to get the farmers of the country educated to the production of the raw material for the manufacture of sugar. Therefore, small concessions have been asked in the way of a bounty on beet-root sugar. That is reasonable, and it is not proposed that the bounty should be continued, but that it should expire with the efflux of time.

Other great opportunities have been allowed to slip past by this government. There was a great opportunity for securing the advantage and prestige of Canada when the various colonies were sending out their contingents to assist the British arms in South Africa. Canada should not have been in the rear in that regard ; Canada had a right to take the first place, and as it did not do so, a great opportunity for Canada's advantage was lost. A great opportunity was lost when this government, on coming into power, failed to take hold of the contract which had been entered into by the preceding government for the establishment of a fast Atlantic steamship line between Great Britain and this country. Had such a line been established, it would now have been carrying the products of our farms and of our factories, in a quick and satisfactory manner, into the great markets of the old world. I need not go into the history of that transaction ; a great opportunity was let go by, and it has not occurred again when conditions equally satisfactory could have been obtained. Another great opportunity was lost when this government failed to obtain reciprocal trade with Great Britain. I know it has been asserted that we could not have obtained from Great Britain those advantages which we desired. But, Sir, we have had no opportunity of knowing whether we could or could not have procured some concession from the British government. We have reason to believe that we could have obtained some concession. There has never been a time in the history of Great Britain, at least during the last half century, when British statesmen were so much disposed to depart to some extent from their free trade principles as they have been during the last few years; and if they are ever going to relax those principles in any degree, the present is the most opportune time to do so when they can thereby bind the colonies and the empire more closely together. So I say that in the contingency which has arisen by the war in South Africa there was a great opportunity of obtaining some commercial concession from Great Britain in favour of the colonies, and of giving a more substantial character to Imperial interests than they have now.

Another great opportunity will soon arise when the representatives of the various colonies of the empire meet in London to discuss questions of this character. What will be the result of that conference ? Canadians will watch, and listen, and wait with expectancy, Great Britain will wait with expectancy, the colonies in the southern seas will await with expectancy the results of that most important meeting. Certainly we all hope that greater wisdom will prevail in the councils in London at that meeting than we have hitherto witnessed, and that the representatives of Canada while faithfully considering the interests of Great Britain, will not forget that their duty is first and foremost to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). In addressing myself for a short time to the House I wish to say in the first place that I do not mean to discuss the admirable essay to which we have just listened. Its moral tone was excellent ; indeed it was a joint effort of morality and beet sugar. I only leave the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) to settle the beet sugar question with his confrere from Pictou (Mr. Bell) who addressed this House the other day. He has forgotten that the beet sugar question is solving itself, and that the Mormons are coming into the North-west in large numbers and building up beet sugar factories under the present government, and that they are going to make a success of it. I submit that if Mormons succeed in the North-west, Christians ought certainly to succeed in the east.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do you want to adopt their policy ?

Mr. FRASER. Well, the hon. gentlemen opposite might desire to adopt their tenets, but I do not approve of them.

Mr. COCHRANE. Your policy is better adapted to Mormons than it is to Christians.

Mr. FRASER. Oh, the hon. gentleman is too old. I wish to begin with the question that was brought before the House by the leader of the opposition ; and not since the Conservative party was dispersed so as not

yet to find out exactly where they stand, was I better pleased than I was with the resolution produced by the leader of the opposition. It is a resolution that will bear a certain amount of dissection. I submit that its terms are somewhat broad, and for myself I can scarcely understand its application.

This House, regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory——

That I can understand. The tariff is too low, there can be no other reason. But if it is unsatisfactory, who is to blame for it? If hon. gentlemen opposite are to be believed, it is their tariff that they enforced previous to 1896. Was it unsatisfactory then? What has made it unsatisfactory since? Is it unsatisfactory because it keeps the hon. gentlemen opposite out of power, or is it unsatisfactory because there is, as I shall be able to show, a substantial decrease in the duties paid. I think that it is the latter reason, it is unsatisfactory because there is a decrease. Now I would like to know how it is going to be amended by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us follow the amendment.

——is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy.

Why a declared policy and if declared, what is to be the declaration? A policy is nothing. It may be a high tariff, a low tariff, or anything you like, it will be a policy. And what is a declared policy? It is not, you will notice, a declared policy upon any special lines, it is a declared policy 'of adequate protection to labour.' What is adequate protection to labour? Are you going to take any of the meanings usually given to the word? Does the leader of the opposition mean, by a declared policy, the old meaning of the word, equal in magnitude, or does he mean the more modern use of the term, as commensurate in fitness, equal, or amounting to what is required? Fully sufficient, suitable, fitting? Or does he take the logical view of it and say that it is fully answering to a given state of things? Now I submit that this House could not with any dignity accept a resolution that did not lay down the terms of the declared policy. A policy is a policy, whether it is declared or not. You should say what is going to constitute the policy. But there is no policy without a substratum of facts on which the policy is to be built. I think the leader of the opposition should have gone back to the resolution of 1878, with which I wish to compare this one. That resolution was moved by the Conservative giant who at that time led the opposition. There was at least something in the resolution moved by Sir John A. Macdonald that appealed to the people of this country and laid the foundation of a policy.

This House is of the opinion.

Not that 'there should be a declared policy,' you see.

This House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy——

Then it was national, now it is declared.

——which by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion.

That is the policy of the late Sir John A. Macdonald. Now as to the results predicted:

That such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade.

That at least did show the lines on which that national policy was to be constructed; but I submit that this resolution shows nothing except a declared policy. I have looked over the speech of the leader of the opposition carefully, and an able speech it is from his point of view. But I do not find anywhere in it, except on two occasions, that he refers to the question, and one is the menace of our neighbours to the south of us, and the other is the policy that we have adopted in our trade relations with Great Britain. Now I want to know if hon. gentlemen opposite are willing that the preferential tariff shall go? Certainly if it is to go, there should be a resolution of this House moved by some one who believes that the preferential tariff is bad for Canada, and that it ought to be abrogated.

Mr. COCHRANE. Ask Bourassa.

Mr. FRASER. Do not mind asking anybody except yourselves. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) believes that, let him spring to his feet and move such a resolution, and let us have a vote on it and then we will see. But not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite dare do it, and I will tell you why. They pretend that good results have not followed from the preferential trade policy, but they know right well that there is not a man in Canada who ought to be allowed to vote, who does not believe that that policy was a step in advance; who does not believe that that policy has done more than anything else to bind together Canada and the motherland and to make this mighty empire what it is. Hon. gentlemen opposite are afraid to move a resolution against that policy. They know that if they did so, they would be deserted by the crowds that used to follow them shouting that they were the only British-connection men in this country. These gentlemen opposite, for the

sake of their own standing in the community should cease condemning the operation of the preferential tariff, or else, they should declare boldly against it.

There is another difficulty in this resolution moved by the leader of the opposition. He speaks of 'a declared policy for labour, for agriculture, for manufactures and industries.' You will notice that 'labour' was not included in the resolution moved by Sir John Macdonald. Of course, if all the other industries spoken of in that resolution were benefited or adequately protected, then labour would be protected if the national policy was a true policy. The industries mentioned cover all the walks of life in which men are engaged, and how are you going to help labour if you do not help the industries of Canada. The one is a part of the other. I suppose the hon. leader of the opposition thought that he might catch the labour vote by saying that he would protect labour. How can you protect labour ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. By preventing Chinamen from competing with Canadian labour. You have not been listening to the member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith).

Mr. FRASER. I have listened to him and I have before now given expression to my views on that question, and if the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) thinks Canada is so small that it is going to be ruined by a few Chinamen, he has a miserable idea of Canada. It is true that there are other questions which enter into the question of Chinese immigration. There is the moral question, which is of great importance, and which has to be considered as well as the question of Chinese competition. Does the hon. gentleman seriously believe that Chinese labour is going to interfere with the labour market of Canada ? If he does not, then his interjection has no meaning. Now, here is a curious thing in the resolution moved by the leader of the opposition. He is going to have a 'declared policy,' but at the same time he will firmly maintain the necessity for such protection as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians. His resolution says :

That this House affirms its belief in a policy of reciprocal trade preference within the empire.

Surely the hon. gentleman knows that again and again it has been declared by the statesmen of England that the only preference that they will have with the empire is a preference on the lines of their own fiscal policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite would raise the tariff higher than it is now, and as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) said: We will pay for everything in cash. Then, the British manufacturers would have the money which we paid ; our manufacturers would have the increased advantage that would be obtained from the higher scale of duty, and the man who bought in Canada would pay the tax in both directions. I submit that you cannot have a high protective policy in Canada and at the same time get free access to the markets of all the colonies. It is nonsense for any one to claim that the two things will go together. Sir John Macdonald wanted reciprocity, for he was too astute a statesman to think that with a high protection in Canada we could get free access to the markets of Great Britain and her colonies. If that be the case, what then ? It is quite evident that we cannot protect our manufacturers by a high protective duty in Canada, and while maintaining the high protective duty get freer access to the markets of Great Britain and her colonies.

I notice that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House are now doing a good deal of talking about our German trade. They have appealed in this country to the feelings of Englishmen as against another race ; they raised the Catholic question and the anti-Catholic question, and having failed in all these they now fall back on the German cry. Well, I do not think that they will succeed in that any more than they did in the others. It was absolutely necessary, in order that we should establish this preferential policy and make it effective, that the Canadian government should do as it has done. If you look at the quantity of trade which we did with Germany, you will see at a glance that the advantages we gained under the preferential tariff were much greater than any advantage we could gain without the preference and still maintaining our former relations with German trade. So much for that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) stated that there was great dissatisfaction in the United States, and I was glad to hear him declare that he was against retaliation, but while he said that, his whole argument simply meant retaliation. In fact, when you read the resolution of the hon. member (Mr. Borden, Halifax) carefully, you will see that it is about the same thing as the resolution proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk. Against whom is he going to put up this high tariff wall if it is not against the people of the American republic? I admit that something may be said in favour of retaliation. When I look at how the American people have treated us at times, my own personal feeling arises, but in my calmer moments the thought occurs to me that I would be serving my country better by refusing to hit back. There are times when we have to possess our souls in patience, and on the whole it would seem to me that the more cordial and more friendly our relations are with the United States the better it is for both countries. Our neighbours in the adjoining republic are, I believe, learning a little, and when I read the other day the following extract from the Boston 'Transcript,' it occurred to me that it might afford food for thought :

The duty preventing the importation of iron and coal from Nova Scotia—England, Germany

and Norway are ready to supply us with iron. There has not been a single day when pig-iron has not been as cheap in Boston as in Pittsburg. We could have bought it if we had not been prevented by the duty, which for a long time was $6.72, and is now $4.00 per ton. Of course this duty has not been paid by the companies, but has been passed along to the communities, which have had to pay higher prices for the manufactures. Instead of wooden fences everywhere we should have had iron; instead of wooden beams in buildings we should have had iron, and the iron manufacture should never have gone to Pittsburg. For all these reasons he urged the legislature to indorse the Babcock bill and reciprocity with Canada.

This is from a republican source. If I may speak personally for my own province, I might say that what we want in Nova Scotia is to get that market in the New England states, and I believe that the thinking people in the New England states are desirous in their own interest to have our trade. Be that as it may, I am of the opinion now and have always held the opinion that the first question with us in framing any policy is to do that which is best for Canada.

The hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Brock) stated that this government had made a reduction of 2·22 on the general average duty of 18 per cent under the Conservative government, and he called this a reduction of 2 per cent. Well, if a reduction of 2 on 18 per cent means '2 per cent,' my arithmetic is at fault. It is in fact a reduction of about one-tenth, and consequently it does not mean a reduction of 2 per cent as the hon. gentleman stated. Now, to reduce the tariff by one-tenth was a substantial reduction for the present government to make. If any gentleman here heard that the town council of any city in which he lived, had conducted the business as well as it ever was conducted, and at the end of the year made a reduction of one-tenth in the taxation, he certainly would say that that was a good council and he would vote for it again. One-tenth reduction means a great deal. It may not be as great a reduction as some of the more advanced supporters of the government would ask, but for myself, as I have already said in this House, I prefer to stand by the government that is proceeding in that direction and that is making progress. Let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite, would they go back to the tariff as it was in 1896, suppose they got into power, or what would they do ? If the present tariff is unsatisfactory to them, what would be satisfactory ? I submit that the people of the country are entitled to know that. One of the things that appeals to me in the present tariff is that we have made an advance, and that the people of this country understand that and know that they have security because we are not continually tinkering with the tariff. That there must be changes, and changes in the direction in which we have gone, there is no doubt. But I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite : If the great capital that is being invested to-day throughout the Dominion is not the best indication that the position this government took when they made that reduction in the tariff is in the interest of the people of Canada ?

Nothing has amused me more in this debate than the speech of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). I believe he told the House that he would give very little opposition to the present tariff. So well he might give little opposition to the present tariff. He comes from a county in which there are extensive coal, iron and woollen industries, and if he were here he would have to admit that never in the county of Pictou were the conditions so prosperous as they are now. The farmers are better off; they can sell all they can raise. For three or four years, under Conservative rule, the Steel Company in New Glasgow did not pay dividends on even its preferred stock. What happened ? The present government came into power. It was said that the works were going to be shut down, that the windows would be closed, and one good Conservative even purchased the shutters. Instead of that, the works have been so busy that for two years they could not permit the men to be idle on Thanksgiving Day, or Christmas Day, and the company has not only been paying dividends on its preferred stock, but has been wiping out all its past indebtedness. Hon. gentlemen have only to look at the newspapers to see the position of the stock to-day. Stock which would have sold at 10 cents if hon. gentlemen opposite had remained in power will easily bring 200. All this has been accomplished under the present tariff. Would the hon. member for Pictou want to make any change in that ? Then, for the last five years the coal mines of Nova Scotia have been worked, I think I can say with truth, to a greater extent than ever before, and the prices obtained for the coal and also the wages paid to the workmen have been larger than for years. We have one or two woollen factories in Pictou, and there is no cry from them that the present tariff is not working well. They are working full time, and the same thing is true of Nova Scotia generally.

In the face of this condition of things, do hon. gentlemen opposite advocate going back to the old tariff ? What declaration are they going to make as to what their policy is ? What hope are they going to hold out to the investors and workers ? Are they going to change the present state of things in which the Dominion of Canada is better off than ever before ? If so, they are not going to get even the most rabid protectionist to vote for them. I believe the people of Canada generally, protectionists as well as free traders, feel that the present state of things is satisfactory. For eighteen years the people of this country were taught the trade question by hon. gentlemen opposite as well as by hon. gentle-

men on this side. There is this much at least to be said, that we have passed the stage of argument, and there is not a man in Canada, with this result of the tariff before his eyes, who will not say that the present is a bad time to talk about protection. I admit that a readjustment may be necessary from time to time, and I will be a protectionist with hon. gentlemen opposite, and go in for any duties they name on this condition, that every man who makes a hat shall receive in return by way of bounty as much as all the other men who supply any article he uses will take from him. That is a protection which I will hold up both hands for. Of course, we shall never have it, because that is the way the Creator left the world at first; but is any other condition fair, in the struggle of life ?

The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) said that the question of the tariff was out of politics—that it was forced upon us at the present time. It can never be out of politics. There is one thing that every public man in Canada must look to—that the predominating force in Canada in a few years will be in the west. We in the older provinces may look at it as we please, but the mighty domain beyond Lake Superior will in a few years control not only the trade and commerce of the country, but this parliament of Canada; and I submit that as low a tariff as possible is necessary for the prosperity of that great country. All classes must be equitably dealt with. The farmer must be dealt with so as not to do injury to the manufacturer, and the manufacturer must be dealt with so as not to do injury to the farmer. That is a ground on which any man in Canada can stand before the electors, and that is the position of the present government.

There is another thing that we must not forget. After all, principles underlie action. Taxation is for the benefit of every man in the country; and while I admit that you can never have the taxation so adjusted that it will fall equitably on every man in Canada, yet that is the object which we should as nearly as possible have in view. These things will exist under any finite government in the world; but the present government have made this reduction, and have made it in the interest of the consumer. Take, for example, the ordinary articles of life. Take a man's clothing, and the iron he uses, and see the remarkable reduction that has taken place in these two items.

I was struck by what my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said. I am sorry he is not present so that I could say in his presence what I am going to say now. I think it is only fair with friends and opponents alike, that we should speak out our views of what they say. I regret that my hon. friend has seen fit to turn himself inside out with such a bad result. I do not think that all his good work performed in the past for the sanctity of the Sabbath and the chastity of the home will ever compensate for the words he uttered the other day. I think that the indications he gave of the struggles he underwent when this question came up were, if not indicative of moral degeneracy, at least laughable. I can understand an honest man wavering between two sets of opinions, wanting to find out the exact state of things and judge accordingly, but I cannot understand that state of mind which could urge such a man to make a speech such as that we have heard from the hon. member for North Norfolk.

I listened with a great deal of pleasure to my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). He found a friend in the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), and at once took that hon. gentleman to his bosom.

But I think he might have spared this House the little lecture he gave us as to what the right hon. the First Minister should do when he goes to the other side. Circumstances will indicate what he should do. But there is one thing on which I must take strong issue with the hon. gentleman. He said that England wanted everything from us and gave us nothing, that she was continually imposing her conditions on us and giving us nothing in return. Well, I am not going to vaunt my attachment to the old land, but I do not think that any Canadian ought to have made such a statement. Whatever may be said of the policy of Great Britain in other respects, he is a poor student of her history who does not see that, so far as her colonies are concerned, she has always done what she conceived to be to the best in their interests. I was reading the life of Sir William Molesworth the other day, and I would commend that work to my hon. friend from Labelle. In it he will find a description of what Buller and others did when there were two camps in English public life—one which looked on the colonies as places furnishing appointments and offices for Englishmen, as places intended by Divine Providence for Englishmen to rule over, and the other which took a broader and more intelligent view, and which believed that these colonies were destined to be great self governing allies of the old land. That struggle ended in Britain giving us all we enjoy as colonies, and particularly a freedom of action equal to her own. Did the hon. gentleman stop to consider for a moment what are the privileges we have obtained from Great Britain. Never have we been asked to contribute a dollar for her army and navy. Yet, even if my hon. friend from Labelle were the poorest lad from the poorest hut of Canada, he would find in any part of the world, should he be subjected to any indignity, every ship of the mighty nation to whom we belong and every soldier turned out to see that his case was righted just as if he had been born and reared in Buckingham Palace. Is that not enough ? What are the other privileges

we have. We enjoy a parliament clothed, except in a few instances where these powers might conflict with the interests of the motherland, with powers as absolute as those of great Britain herself. I come from a province to which Great Britain, as early as 1758, gave us our own parliament. I refer to the province of Nova Scotia, which was given in that year a house of assembly with full control over all the local affairs of that province. I make bold to say that the amount of money spent by Great Britain in building up her colonies, in protecting them from time to time, in looking after their interests and keeping them under her eye just as much as the islands on which her own people live, has been more than we can repay during a life time. What if we were thrown on our own resources ? What would be the result if Canada to-day were unfortunate enough to be a nation with only five and a half million people ? Take our people, with the desire they have to better themselves in all parts of the world, men from the maritime provinces sailing our ships and going to every part of the globe—what if they had to be protected by Canadian money and men. I think that the hon. gentleman might have saved the House that remark. I think he would have been wiser had he studied a little deeper the institutions under which we live. Had he done so, he would have appreciated better the glory of that nation which casts its protecting aegis over us, and would have realized what an advantage it is to Canadians to have a claim on the strength of the empire equal to that of every citizen of Great Britain.

It might not be amiss to take a short resumé of the history of Canada since 1896. What has been the programme of our friends opposite from that date down to the present. The first year they predicted that by destroying the national policy we would bring the greatest disasters on the people. We heard the wails coming up to this House, which no doubt gladdened the hearts of these hon. gentlemen. But when they found that their predictions were falsified, they at once charged us with having adopted their policy. Let me point out to these hon. gentlemen that if all they have said since 1896 be true, they cannot, with any regard for decency or logic, vote for this resolution. By this resolution they declare that the present conditions are unsatisfactory. It appears now that that state of things which they said up to 1896 was the glory of the country is an unsatisfactory condition. I would like them to show in what respect it is unsatisfactory. They must either say that the present policy is not the same as that which existed previous to 1896 or else that it is satisfactory. I care not which horn of the dilemma they take. They must either logically say ; you have adopted our policy but it is unsatisfactory, and therefore all that we taught in the past was false, or you have not adopted our policy, your policy is different from ours, and we were not telling the truth when we accused you of stealing our clothes. I do not care which position the hon. gentlemen opposite take. I suppose that the latter would be more consonant with the facts, but in either case they are condemned out of their own mouth.

As time went on they found that their attacks on our policy would not do. They found an answer to those attacks coming from every factory that was working overtime, from the farmers who had good markets for their crops, from our working men who were in no lack of employment, from our lumbermen who are to-day paying men double the wages they did in 1896. They were, therefore, obliged to change their tune, and they made the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) the burden of their new policy of attack. All through Ontario, and in some parts of the lower provinces, they depicted him in colours of the blackest description. He was a bad man, a man that must be shunned, who went into politics for the purpose of doing evil and doing it continually. His very presence breathed corruption and death. A loathsome pestilence followed in his footsteps, and he required to be put down and kept down. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are two ways in which we can try a man in this House. In the first place, we can try him in the Public Accounts Committee. I have been chairman of that committee since 1896. I need not mention to hon. gentlemen opposite how easy it is for them to get witnesses. The exchequer of the country is at their disposal, out of which to pay the expense of bringing these witnesses. Every facility is given them to prove mismanagement and misconduct on the part of the minister in charge of any department, and of those under his control. Well, not one word has ever come before the Public Accounts Committee to show that the Minister of Public Works ever took one cent dishonestly of public money. He made mistakes no doubt, and would be the first himself to acknowledge it. Who has not made mistakes, but I put him in contrast with the man who held the same position when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, and who had to leave, not only his position in the government, but public life altogether. Is it fair and honourable to single out an hon. gentleman for attack and suspicion and prejudice on vague and general grounds, when not the slightest proof of anything to justify any of these attacks can be brought against him. I care not whether a man comes from the bad province of Quebec or the good province of Ontario or elsewhere, we should judge him according to his merits, we should set his virtues against his vices, and decide which weighs down the scale. But neither in the Public Accounts Committee nor in this

House has any man dared to say that a stiver of the money belonging to the people has been shown to have gone astray under the administration of the Minister of Public Works. Not only has not a single charge been made against him, but none has been made against any officer under him. I say then that when a man in all these years has been subjected to the severest criticism to which a man in the position of the Minister of Public Works is exposed, when he has been exposed to the searching questions and eloquent lash of hon. gentlemen opposite and has come unscathed through that ordeal, would it not be appropriate for hon. gentlemen opposite to ask the government to give them a day of humiliation so that they might pray to be forgiven for the wrongs they have committed and the unjust and slanderous attacks they have made.

There is another theme on which these hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to regain favour among the electorate, and that is electoral corruption. Everywhere, they claim, Liberals were corrupt. Well, let me give you one illustration. I had the great pleasure of taking part in an election about four months ago in the county of York, New Brunswick. At the election of 1901, two gentlemen ran and the Liberal candidate was returned by 70 of a majority. That election was set aside and the same candidates again presented themselves. And the same gentleman opposed him, Rev. Dr. McLeod, a clergyman of the Free Baptist Church. After the election was set aside and when the new election was coming on, the Conservatives came and said : We must run the next election without using money, and we want you Liberals to agree to that. And the Liberals said : Certainly, for it is very hard to carry an election on the lines to which you have forced us. The Conservatives had held the county for fifteen years. Both sides agreed to run an honest election, and the fact that there has been no petition, is proof that it was an honest election. But, whereas, with money used on both sides the Liberals came out with a majority of only 70, when the depraved conduct of the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite, by which the county was held for fifteen years, was removed, the Liberals carried the county by nearly a thousand. With money used, of course they could beat us, for they had more money and better methods than we had. But when no money was used, we carried the county with a rush never known before. So the Conservatives dropped that; they got their commission of judges but they laid no complaints.

There is a matter to which I refer with a good deal of pain, and that is the manner in which elections are carried on among the English speaking people of some of the lower province and Ontario constituencies, and the manner in which they are carried on in Quebec. In the election to which I have just referred, a cry was raised against Sir Wilfrid Laurier because he is a French Catholic, and against his government because it was said to be under French domination. I suppose there are not more than five unsanctified Frenchmen in the whole county, so that the Conservatives felt that they lost very little by abusing the French and by raising the cry of danger from French power. I told the people that I was not afraid of the French, for there were two English speaking people in the country to one Frenchman, and I thought that we could take care of them—we did it at Waterloo, and I thought we could do it again. But think of a man asking the electors to vote for him on the ground that there was danger to two-thirds of the people from one-third of the people. Are we not equal to the French Canadians physically ? And there are two of us to one of them. Are they our superiors intellectually or morally, that we of the majority need to be afraid ? All I can say is that men who were deluded by appeals of that kind—and many honest men in Ontario and the maritime provinces were so deluded—should have a course of education in the primary schools, or an outpouring of grace that will convert them ? But that is not exactly what happens in Quebec to-day. In the general election of 1891, Mr. Loy, a Presbyterian elder was returned by the county of Beauharnois, Quebec, though his opponent was the man who is lovingly called 'the Beauharnois boy' by his friends on the other side of the House. I do not know the relative strength of the races there, but I think I am safe in saying that at least eighty per cent of the electors of the county of Beauharnois are Catholics and French. I am glad to be told by an hon. friend from Quebec province that that is not an exaggerated estimate. And in that county an English speaking Presbyterian elder was returned. That was what might be expected, for a Presbyterian anywhere ought to be returned. There is an election going on there to-day, and I make the statement on the very best information that the cry that is raised against Mr. Loy is that the French Canadian must vote down this man because he is a Protestant and an Englishman. The orators on the Conservative side are asking the electors if they will disgrace their race by returning such a man. And a circular containing a similar appeal has been issued. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite : Is that fair warfare ? Are you going to build up this country by such appeals ? Are you even going to help yourselves eventually ? Do you not realize that there is enough intelligence among Canadians to break down that kind of thing sooner or later—aye, and sooner rather than later ? I may have my national prejudices, but I should be blind to the lessons of the world's history if I did not give every man the place to which his character and abil-

ity show him to be deserving. Hon. gentlemen opposite used to say that they were the only people who could bind this country together. And a little later on, I will make a statement as to what the present premier and the present government have done in the way of unifying and building up the Dominion. But, besides their boasts, there was one other ruse of political warfare to which hon. gentlemen opposite have always resorted. When everything else failed, they attacked the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Minister of Public Works, (Hon. Mr. Tarte) they seem to agree, is a bad man, but in those arts that make the capable bandit the Minister of Trade and Commerce, according to these hon. gentlemen, excels. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), the other day, when he had exhausted those topics which do not throw much light upon the subject under debate—and on both sides there is a great deal said that may not be to the point—turned his gun of eloquence upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He happened to misquote that hon. gentleman—not wilfully of course. I have been twelve years in parliament, and there has not been a single year in which that same thing has not been tried. I have seen the rat attempt to grapple with the lion, the mouse to bite the cat ; I have seen the gull smash itself against the lighthouse without putting out the light—all these things have I seen typified in the attacks upon the hon. minister. I am not his apologist, nor is any apology necessary. But may I throw out a word of kindly honest, and I trust effective advice by assuring hon. gentlemen opposite that they weaken themselves by every one of these attacks. I have just learned that hon. gentlemen opposite in the next election are to have flags upon which there will be certain mottoes. Through a friend, I have obtained one of those mottoes. I understand that it is to be used at the family altar in Conservative homes and carried in the elections on their banners :

> Abuse Sir Dick with spite, for he,
> With truth and wit hath crippled thee.

What has been the result of all the criticisms of hon. gentlemen opposite ? The government stand as they never did before in the affections of the people. The first reason is that they have made a substantial reduction in the tariff—not so great a reduction as I wanted, but such a reduction as, considering the difficulties of the situation, must be regarded as substantial. Moreover, since this government took office, we have had a clean period. I think there is not a Conservative in the country but is as thankful as his Liberal fellow citizens—if he had grace enough to say it that Canada has not been smirched in the eyes of the world since 1896. We may have, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, weaknesses on behalf of certain members of the government. But the present government have been on trial and are now on trial, and, at least, nothing has been shown to be wrong. For my part, I am ready to trust the government that, since 1896, have done their work in all departments honestly and well ; I am going to trust them until I see something wrong in connection with their work. But they have done far more than this, they have settled some questions that were very disturbing. One of these was the binder twine question. For some reason hon. gentlemen opposite have not lately talked much about binder twine. It never was a very big question, but I am thankful it is no longer with us—this question of binder twine and also the question of barbed wire. I remember the tears that were shed by hon. gentlemen opposite about binder twine.

I think I remember once seeing the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), after delivering himself upon this binder twine question, going out, and the copious tears that were falling from his eyes as he went out were a sight to behold. True, the present government took away the duty altogether in order to rectify some irregularities, and it came out all right; so I will say no more about it. The government did this great service to Canada by removing those questions from the arena of politics. I said not that only has no corruption been shown against the Minister of Public Works, but none has been shown against the Minister of the Interior, nor against the Minister of Railways and Canals, nor against any of the members of the government. We had an effort made to show that there was something wrong in the Yukon. We had speeches made so long that they baffled time, and what came of it ? Nothing. There was every opportunity given, though the truth of the matter is this, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition are not able to understand how it is that the present government are honest with the opportunities they have. The whole training of our hon. friends opposite was in the contrary direction, and they cannot believe, and won't believe, that the present government are any better than they were. They say : With those opportunities we would do it, and they are no better than we are. But none of their suspicions have materialized.

Well, there is something more. I say that the present government—and for that most is due to the premier—have done more in these few years to mould together the various races and creeds of this Dominion than was ever done in the same space of time, not only in Canada, but in any other country. Read the history of Great Britain. There, as here, the substratum of the race was the Celt. In Great Britain the first element of the population was the Celt as the foundation, then came the Saxon and Norman, and it took between 500 and 600 years to mould these people together,

In the last ten years, with the same elements in Canada, the Celt (Irish and Scotch), the English and the French, we have made advances in the same direction such as were never made before in any country in the world; and to the premier is largely due the credit for that. With a broad view he looked out upon the whole country, not to the little interests that surround him in his own home, in his own parish, in his own province; but having in view the upbuilding here of a strong community where every element will coalesce, and he said: That shall be my life's aim. I make the statement boldly that if no other result was gained to Canada except what was done in that direction, the present government have done more than any other, and will live when history comes to be written as the great moulders of the races and creeds of Canada into homegenity. We have learned, on the Protestant side, to respect our fellow citizens of the Roman Catholic faith as we never did before; and they have learned that after all there is no law against either our existence or our views. We live with them and understand them better, because in our social relations we find that after all they have vices and virtues like our own. I say we have the components here, parts with which to build up a Canadian nationality which will be greater than any one of the individual races, and to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the leader of this government, is due the praise of making that end attainable.

There is something more they have done, for the betterment of Canada. They have inspired a hope in young and old, particularly in the young, such as they never had before. Did hon. gentlemen opposite ever think of the amount of capital that has been invested in Canada since 1896? I cannot state how much it is. But I will speak of Nova Scotia, and I will say that in the large industries there they want almost unlimited capital and they can get it. Why, there is a contest now between Nova Scotia, Toronto and Montreal as to who will get the chance of investing money. I understand it is the same in Ontario, it is the same in Quebec. Where then is the unrest, where is the unsatisfactory state of things? If the hon. gentlemen opposite are correct, these men are fools to risk their capital in this country when such an unsatisfactory state of things exists. There is not a manufacturer in this House, there is not a farmer in this House, there is not a workingman in this House, there is not a professional man in this House who does not stand better to-day by at least 20 per cent than he did in 1896, in his worldly goods, and in every other respect. I want any manufacturer in this House to stand up and say that he is no better off and has not done a better business since 1896, than previously. I want any farmer to say if he is not in a better position to-day than in 1896; I want any professional man to say if he is not in a better position to-day than in 1896. I am not asking questions to which I expect a negative answer from hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not mean to say that the government did all that. Hon. gentlemen opposite used to say that; but I am asking these questions for the purpose of showing that there is no sense in saying that the present state of things is unsatisfactory.

Business men are agreed at least that when matters are moving in the right direction in their interest they are not willing to make a change. Why then is the tariff unsatisfactory? I think we must come to the conclusion that it is unsatisfactory because hon. gentlemen opposite are not in a position to claim the credit of present prosperity and to ride on the crest of this mighty wave that is passing over Canada. I am bold enough to make this other statement, that we in Canada do not feel depressions as people do elsewhere. In the unlimited sources of supplies that we have, in the soil, in the forest, in the fisheries, in iron and coal, and other minerals, I venture to state that, never at least for two or three generations, will any change that may occur in the direction of bad times strike Canada as it will any other country. We will be the suppliers of the food that the world needs; we will be increasing all the time the quantity of food stuffs that we shall produce; we can, with the preference we give Great Britain, undersell any other country in the market. They will want to purchase articles from us and sell us articles in return, because they know they have a margin that other countries have not.

We have a brighter hope in our country at the present time than we ever had before. I am not a prophet, but I think I see indications in the history of the last five years that Canadians are learning as they never have yet what a country they have, and what marvellous possibilities are before us. If I were to follow the precedents of gentlemen opposite, I would even claim credit for what nature has done. I was down home the other day, down to the province of this whole confederation, down to the province that, for its size, will continue to be in advance of any other province of this confederation. The sunny ways of the premier, if I was a Tory, I would say have been productive in that province of the result that even the robins refuse to go away in winter, and continue to chirp and sing in that province, which is the Florida of Canada. This one thing I say with confidence, that from the Atlantic to the Pacific there is more of hope in Canada and for Canada than ever before. Men feel now that their home here is the best. We used to hear a great deal of talk about loyalty and all that. Now we have the manlier and stronger sentiment that says:

This is the best country in the world, and here I will remain. We see among our young men the conviction that in Canada, such are the advances this country has been making, they are in the line of greater promotion, if they stay here, than if they go elsewhere. It used to be thought in the gloomy days when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, that the only avenue to success for a young man was in the United States. But now there is difficulty in filling up the positions that are calling for capable and honest young men. Young men now say to themselves: This is a country where we can succeed. Is it not wonderful that hon. gentlemen opposite, feeling their pockets better lined than they ever were before, finding that they are expanding their business and making wealth, still turn to the weak and beggarly elements of a defeated and defunct Conservative policy, and call by resolution upon the people of this country to accept—what? A declared policy? No. This country is moving in the right direction, moving in the direction which this government has given it making men mutually respectful of each other. May it be ours sometimes, to forget the bitterness of party strife; may it be ours to discover the good that exists in our political opponents, and may our political opponents see the good that is in us. Let us at least hold out this hope to the people of Canada: That our tariff shall be arranged equitably, and that we shall not benefit any man or any class of men at the expense of others. Let us do injustice to none, especially the poor. And, Sir, when the history of Canada is written, let us hope that the historian will be able to write that the last five years was the proudest period in our history. Sir, we are advancing. We have seen an hon. gentleman in this House who rose above the ordinary surroundings that make for that civilization which people choose to call society; but we have seen him so forget his ideas of the common affairs of life as actually to buy a dress coat and appear at a great social function. Does not that prove that this country is advancing socially as well as materially and morally. Let it be ours to help on the progress of Canada. The hon. mover of the resolution will find no response in this House even from men who have averred an inkling for protection like the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and like the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). They will have none of this resolution. It is only intended to catch the extremists in one direction, but the country is too broad to support such a platform as that. I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that if he seeks to pitch his tent on the graveyard of the issues previous to 1896, he will find that that graveyard has blossomed from a cemetery into a beautiful garden. We are advancing so fast that the government under which this progress has occurred shall receive my confidence and vote. The amendment moved by the leader of the opposition does not commend itself to moderate protectionists even. The protectionists in this House are content while things are moving in the splendid manner they are moving at present, and the protectionists in the country are thinking more of making money than about disturbing the trade relations of this great and now prosperous country. They would be mad to raise an issue that would defeat their purpose.

Mr. E. G. PORTER (West Hastings) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 1, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Huron and Erie Canal Company.—Mr. Calvert.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to the census returns numbers 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, in which the half-breeds of Manitoba and the North-west Territories are classified as Indians. I do not think that it was the intention of the census takers to classify these people as Indians, and I believe they are thus classified owing to some mistake. Is the hon. minister prepared to make a change?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). My attention has been drawn to this, and I propose to make a change in the wording which will meet the views expressed by the hon. gentleman.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding):

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). After having enjoyed, Mr. Speaker, the brief holiday afforded for the proper and due observance of the Easter period, I venture to hope that hon. members of the ministry, and the hon. members of this House in general, have returned to their duties to-day imbued with that spirit of forgiveness and forgetfulness which should characterize the feelings of every man in this country towards his fellow men. And for these as well as for other reasons I might urge I bespeak for myself that consideration which, I believe, is characteristic of this House and is accorded to every beginner in political life. We are apt, in the heat of political discussion, to make use of expressions and to give vent to feelings which, in our calmer, moments we would not use and would not give vent to. If I should, in the remarks which I shall endeavour to make to this House this afternoon, trespass in this way, I ask for myself that consideration which I would ask for any other member situated as I am situated here.

Before the adjournment, I listened with careful attention to the deliverance of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) who preceded me in this debate. I listened to the hon. member's address growing louder and louder in denunciation of the members of the Conservative party and growing louder and louder in praise of the administration of the present Liberal government. If I might be permitted to follow the example set by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), I could best illustrate my feelings on hearing that deliverance by the episode of the lady who, upon one occasion was obliged to return to her home alone as the night was falling. She was obliged to pass through a considerable stretch of wood. She reached the edge of the wood as the night was coming on. But she thought she knew her way perfectly well, and boldly ventured on. Night drew on apace and the darkness thickened. Presently a thunderstorm appeared, the clouds began to roll together and thunder was heard in the distance. Louder and louder grew the thunder, just as louder and louder grew the speech of my hon. friend from Guysborough. Little flashes of lightning were seen to dart here and there across the sky. Presently, the lady lost her way and groped in the dark. In her dilemma, she fell upon her knees and offered this prayer to the Almighty: 'Oh, Lord give us more light and less noise.' I was very forcibly reminded of that episode as I listened to the speech of the hon. member from Guysborough. That hon. gentleman was pleased to make reference to the speech of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) who preceded him. Unintentionally, I think, he paid a very high compliment to the hon. member for South Grey, when he told the House that that hon. member had delivered a very carefully-prepared essay and that he would not undertake to reply. If the hon. member for South Grey had so arranged his facts and so prepared his figures, and if he so delivered himself to this House, as to leave himself open to no criticism from the hon. member for Guysborough, then I say he is entitled not only to the unintentional compliment paid to him by the hon. member, but to the hearty congratulations of this House at large. I should deem it far more honourable to be charged, as the hon. member for South Grey has been, with having carefully prepared my speech, having so arranged my facts and figures as not to leave myself open to unfavourable criticism, than to subject myself to a comment I have heard since the hon. member for Guysborough delivered himself—that that hon. gentleman had the faculty of opening his mouth and letting it say just what it pleased.

The hon. member for Guysborough appeared to be very much troubled over the resolution that was moved by the hon. leader of the opposition and took occasion to inquire what was the meaning of the expression used in that resolution, a 'declared policy.' Well, I am not surprised that the hon. member asked that question. Associated, as he has been for so long a time, with a party which, as a party, have had no declared or definite policy, which, as a party, could not agree amongst themselves as to what their policy should be, and whose only semblance of a policy which they have ever propounded in this House or adhered to in the country is one that they purloined from the Liberal-Conservative party, I am not at all surprised at the hon. member being unfamiliar with the phrase 'declared policy,' or asking the leader of the opposition what he meant by it. I do not take it to be the business of the opposition in this House to formulate and declare a policy for the benefit of the government. But I do take it to be the bounden duty of the government to formulate and announce a definite, a 'declared policy' for the benefit of the country. I can well understand the anxiety of the hon. member for Guysborough to have the leader of the opposition expose in full detail what was meant by the expression used in the resolution to which he referred and to give that policy in all its details. For, no doubt, had the leader of the opposition so declared himself, straightway the Liberal party would do as they did when they came into power—they would purloin the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party and claim credit, as they do to-day, for all the benefits growing from that policy. But let me tell the hon. member for Guysborough without disclosing any party secrets that, while we had in 1878, a national policy, we have now an international policy, one embodying the previous one, but broadening

it, extending its benefits so that it will not only be to the advantage of Canada in particular, but will be to the advantage of the empire in general.

The hon. member for Guysborough took occasion to shelter himself and the government he supports from the accusation made against them of neglecting the opportunity they have been afforded during the course of their administration by these words: 'The tariff is the tariff of the Conservative party; if it is unsatisfactory, they are responsible.' Those are his words. Sir, I deny that position and declare it to be a statement that is not only not in accordance with the facts but it is a direct charge of incompetence against this government. Had he taken occasion to state that the principle of that tariff was the principle supported by the Conservative party, but that it was defective in some of its details and that the government of the day had acknowledged the principle and had acknowledged that the application of it was wanting in some details, I would not have been disposed to quarrel with him, for then it would have been in accordance with the true position.

Sir, no one can properly estimate the detrimental effect of such a hesitating course as has characterized the conduct of this government in regard to that matter. The government has put itself on record that changes are necessary in the tariff and would be beneficial to this country; but they cannot agree amongst themselves what that change ought to be, they cannot agree when that change should take place, and they cannot agree upon what lines they should alter the tariff; and so the manufacturer, the agriculturist, the labourer, the miner, all the people of this country are left to wallow in this maze of contradiction, and it cannot be expected, so long as this hesitating course is pursued, that capital will flow into the country, or that the industries of Canada will flourish and increase as we have reason to expect they would increase under a proper administration of the government.

The hon. member was pleased to inform this House that there were some industries that flourished under the present tariff, and he mentioned one in the province from which he comes, the one at New Glasgow. Well, Sir, I venture the assertion that if he had taken the pains to search for evidence throughout the Dominion of Canada he could have found other enterprises, other manufactures of a different character, who are to-day, to use a homely expression, standing upon their last legs for want of some change in the tariff. I venture to say further that had the hon. member taken the trouble to look for evidence, he could have discovered why the industry he referred to in New Glasgow has flourished. It is one of the bounty fed industries of this government, and I think if he had inquired into the contracts given to it by the present government, he would have discovered the cause of the prosperity of that one industry. But, Sir, I do not pretend to say, nor does the Conservative party pretend to say, that the tariff is all wrong, but we do say that it is imperfect, we do say that it requires amending, we do say that such adjustment of that tariff could be made as would be for the advantage of the industrial pursuits of this country. But while we say that, we charge at the same time that the government have not had the courage of their convictions to make such changes as they themselves know are necessary in regard thereto.

The hon. member for Guysborough next undertook to pay his compliments to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) by soundly abusing them for having been converted to the principles of protection. In the course of his remarks he made use of this expression, referring to the hon. member for North Norfolk:

> I could understand a man wavering between two opinions, but I could not understand such a deliverance as he made. . . . I regret that he turned himself upside down for such a purpose.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty hard language to use towards an hon. member who has enjoyed the confidence of the Liberal party so long as the hon. member for North Norfolk. It is pretty hard language to use against an hon. gentleman who, the hon. member for Guysborough himself was forced to admit, is a pious man, a well meaning man, and an upright man. Sir, I think the hon. member for Guysborough in that statement, reversed the order of things. He has not a very clear perception of the ground upon which he was treading, for the hon. gentlemen to whom he referred, in my opinion, prior to their conversion, were turned upside down, they have now got turned right side up, but unfortunately they have left the member for Guysborough still standing on his head. After the labour of 20 years, after illustration and example were so strong that it was impossible for the Liberal party longer to resist their force, one by one they are being gathered into the fold of protection, therefore there is room for hope for the hon. member for Guysborough.

The hon. gentleman next took occasion to refer to our relations with the republic to the south of us, and referring to the resolution moved by the leader of the opposition, he said:

> Against whom is he going to put up this high tariff wall if it is not against the people of the American republic? . . . In my calmer moments the thought occurs to me that I would be serving my country better by refusing to hit back.

He then proceeded to quote at length from the Boston 'Transcript' an article from an American Republican standpoint, professing

to teach the people of this country how they should administer the affairs of this country, and he expressed his fears at what the result might be should the resolution of the leader of the opposition be carried in this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, for myself I desire to say, from my observation of the course of the Liberal-Conservative party in this Dominion, that while respecting American rights, and while endeavouring to sustain the most friendly relations with them, we have never so far forgotten our personality, we have never so far forgotten the possibilities of this country as to turn to the American republic for advice as to how we should administer the affairs of our country. The hon. gentleman may have his fears, but no such feeling as that pervades the breasts of the opposition in this House. If the hon. gentleman waits until such time as the legislators of the American republic advise the government of Canada how to legislate to the advantage of Canada, he will have the privilege of waiting for a very long time ; and if he cannot dispel his fears until that time arrives, I venture to say that he will depart from this scene without bearing with him the best respects of the Canadian people.

I do not entertain any such respect or admiration for the American republic as I entertain for my own country of Canada. If it is in the interests of Canada to erect a high protective wall against the American republic for the purposes of advancing our material interests, then I say unhesitatingly that I will be willing to lend all the force I can to the erection of that wall—not, Mr. Speaker, in a spirit of retaliation, but in a spirit of self protection. Nor would I hesitate to apply that same principle to any other country on the face of the globe. In saying this I do not forget our geographical position relative to that republic, I do not fail to recognize that we have similar aspirations, I do not fail to recognize the fact that we are descended from the same stock, that we have in many respects similar resources. But as self preservation is the first law of nature in regard to individuals, so those who are entrusted with the welfare of Canada, or of any other part of the British empire, should realize that it is their first duty to protect the interests of their own country. If a preference is to be given to any one, let us give it in our own family. Let charity begin at home. I have such confidence, not only in the motherland but in every colony thereof, that I believe if we approach them in a proper spirit and on a fair reasonable basis, we will not be denied an adequate compensation for any favours we may give, notwithstanding the declaration of the Prime Minister that Canada wanted nothing for the favours she had already given, and notwithstanding his rejection of the offer made at the time he made that declaration.

Just as the Act of Confederation had the effect of binding together the weak and struggling provinces then existing into one vast dominion characterized by strength, stability and progress, so the union of the commercial interests of the colonies with one another and with the motherland, on a mutual preferential basis will have the effect of making the weak strong and the strong stronger, for in union there is strength and will better enable us, as it will every part of the empire, to withstand the fierce competition for trade of other nations and as a matter of defence and self preservation it will take away that element of dependence on other nations and emphasize our entire independence.

Already, the republic to the south of us is claiming to have assumed first place on the commercial list of the world and boasting of its possibilities in the future and that position can only be attained by obtaining possession of the best markets in the world in which to dispose of their surplus products both of manufacture and natural products and the only way to combat that attack is to preserve our own market for our own people for the whole empire to cultivate and hold as much of the markets of the empire as possible for its own people and to shut out as far as possible foreign competition. This principle might not apply and would not apply to all nations, but with Great Britain and her colonies situated as they are in every part of the globe, with the great natural resources at their disposal, with the ability to produce everything under the sun required to build up and maintain the greatest nation on earth, such a possibility is ours.

We need not expect any favours from the United States. The course of their whole existence has been repugnant to that idea, they are our natural rivals and so keen is that rivalry that there is not a minute to lose in putting ourselves in a position to withstand it, and that is one reason why I condemn the present government for its want of action in that direction. On the other hand, it is quite natural for us to expect favours from the motherland. We have always been in receipt of favours from her and in no branch of government perhaps has England shown more concern than for her colonies and the importance and strength of such a policy has never been so forcibly brought home as within the past few years. To-day Great Britain realizes that in the strength and prosperity of her colonies lies her strength and prosperity, and recognizing that fact, I repeat, we cannot show any favour that Great Britain will not be willing to compensate us for.

And then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member turns his attention to his admiration for the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright).

He was good enough to preface his remarks in regard to these two gentlemen by the most ardent declarations of patriot-

ism and loyalty to our mother country. He could scarcely find language strong enough to express his admiration for British connection or to express his gratitude for the shield of protection which the mother country has afforded us. With these sentiments I most heartily agree and were it possible I would paint the picture in even stronger language than he has done. But surely, Mr. Speaker, he did not get inspiration for those sentiments from the hon. Minister of Public Works whom he set out to eulogize.

Contrast if you will the utterances of the hon. Minister of Public Works with those of the hon. member of Guysborough :

Allow me to say so, and allow me to repeat it, we have remained French ; we are more and more so; we are more French than we were twenty years ago, and more than we were a year ago. (Applause)—Hon. Mr. Tarte, at Rouen, France, June, 1900.

We represent over there the France of Europe, and I do not think I am mistaken in saying that before twenty-five years we shall form the majority in North America.—Hon. Mr. Tarte, at Rouen, France, June, 1900.

Canada is much more French than it was thirty years ago, and if the tide of English immigration were to be directed elsewhere, the French-Canadians might recover the majority.—Hon. Mr. Tarte, in ' Le Journal de Paris" April 5, 1900.

Why should London, which is on an island, become the centre of the world, rather than Paris, the city of civilization, of liberty, of justice ?—Hon. Mr. Tarte, in Paris 'Figaro' interview, September, 1900.

The question is :—Shall the country interfere or hold aloof in England's troubles ? I say, and without hesitation, that this is a question upon which no hurried decision should be given ; it is not a question of money, but of principle, and before the Liberal party makes up its mind as to the proper attitude to adopt, it should pause and consult parliament.—Hon. Mr. Tarte, at Montreal Reform Club, October 10, 1899.

These are not the sentiments expressed by the hon. member and they are neither called for or excusable or calculated to have any other effect than that of weakening the allegiance of the people of whom he speaks and arousing the cupidity of Britain's possible enemies. The speaker then thought the highest compliment he could pay these good men was to say that there was no evidence before the public accounts committee to show that the Minister of Public Works had ever used a cent dishonestly, and that no corruption had been shown against Sir Richard Cartwright, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. Well, Sir, I then for the first time learned that in the opinion of a Liberal you must convict them of theft before you have a right to condemn their political action. But, Sir, did the hon. member, when he was uttering these words of praise, forget that scandal known as the Drummond County Railway Deal. Did he forget the refusal of the hon. Minister of Public Works to tell where the money came from to pay for ' La Patrie '? Did he forget the declarations of Mr. McMullen in 1894, in opposition, when he used these words :

I must take exception in the first place to the office (the Department of Trade and Commerce) ever having been created. I do not see why it was created unless it was given a resting place for the balance of his life to the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position, drawing $7,000 a year for virtually doing nothing.

And did he forget the declaration of the hon. Minister himself when he used this language :

We have far too many ministers. To increase them to seventeen appears to be a monstrous piece of folly.

And did he overlook the fact that the hon. minister sat down in that office and quietly drew his $7,000 for doing nothing as Mr. McMullen put it, or as Sir Richard himself put it in Toronto in 1899 ' as largely an onlooker in the government.'

Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) forget the declarations of the Minister of Trade and Commerce as to the expenditures of this country ; did he forget his declarations as to the public debt ; did he forget his promises as to the reduction of taxation, and as to ' that abomination, the customs tax,' as he declared it to be. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) forget that he has seen that same Minister of Trade and Commerce sit down and help to administer the government of this country which has broken each and every one of its pledges which it gave to the people of Canada. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) must have forgotten these things ; or otherwise he would not have ventured to pay the enconiums he did to the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

But, Sir, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) was not satisfied that he had done his whole duty in paying his compliments to these two ministers of this government, but he must needs before ending, pay his special compliments to the Prime Minister himself. And, Sir, the only reason assigned by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) for heaping roses upon the head of the Prime Minister, was, to use his own expression :

That the Prime Minister had been instrumental in cementing the people of this country together, and strengthening the bond of union with the motherland.

Again, I would ask : did the hon. gentlemen (Mr. Fraser) forget the speeches made by the Prime Minister to his French Canadian fellow citizens of the province of Quebec during the last elections, and the speeches he delivered in the province of Ontario ? Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) forget the race cry that was raised in the province of Quebec, or did he forget this utterance that was made use of by the right hon. Prime Minister on the floor of this House :

I hold out to my fellow-countrymen the idea of independence. If we are true to our record

we will exhibit to the world the unique, the unprecedented example of a nation achieving its independence by slow degrees and as naturally as the ripe fruit falls from the parent tree.

The Minister of Finance reproached me a moment ago that I had stated in Boston that the Canadian people have interests altogether at variance with the interests of the mother country.

Sir, I said so in Boston, and I say so now on the floor of the House.

I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspirations is the independence of Canada —to see Canada an independent nation in due time.'

Surely the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) did not draw his inspirations from that utterance of the present premier. Surely he must have been inspired by the utterances of the Liberal Conservative party upon that question, as voiced by Sir Charles Tupper, who when leader of the Conservative party, used this language in the Commons of Canada :

When the Loyalists withdrew from their old homes and raised the standard of Britain on the soil of Canada it was their purpose to create a sister British nation that should be an added glory and a source of strength to the British Crown.

Their work, performed amidst struggle and hardships, still lives. To us have they handed down the honours and privileges of British citizenship and the liberties which appertain to constitutional rule.

Be it ours to cherish this great heritage and to build up in this vast Dominion a nation that shall be ever loyal to the Queen, ever attached to the empire, and ever true to our flag.

Numbered among the British communities that encircle the globe, sharing in British glory, participating in British strength, we shall advance as we shall become a stronger ally of Britain and a brighter jewel in the diadem of the Queen.

But, perhaps, the hon. member (Mr. Fraser) had in his mind the position which the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took on the occasion of the jubilee of our late beloved Queen when as representing Canada he was placed in the first rank of honour extended to any British colony, and when may be the Prime Minister had in his mind the titles which he called tin pot titles before he went to England, but which when he got to England he was glad to receive form his sovereign. Perhaps the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) had in his mind the high position which the Prime Minister of Canada is to occupy at the Coronation of His Majesty King Edward VII. Perhaps the member for Guysborough had all these things in his mind when he made use of the expressions to which I have alluded. But, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) remembered these, he entirely forgot the fact that while the Premier was willing to occupy the first position given to the representative of any British colony, he was the last to call forth the efforts of Canada to assist British arms in their difficulties during the war in South Africa. Yes ; the Prime Minister of Canada was willing to occupy the first position when the empire rejoiced ; but on the other hand he was content to occupy the last position when the empire needed help.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) were both brought up in the Conservative school ; both trained in the Conservative party, and being such bad Conservatives they were no longer continued in the party. But, bad Conservatives as they were, the hon. member for Guysborough has been pleased to say that they make two capital Liberal ministers. I was privileged to hear the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce on the resolution now before the House. The hon. gentleman got rid of a large amount of bile that apparently disturbed his stomach in abusing the enumerators who took the census of 1891 and the government under which these enumerators were appointed.

By a very laboured effort he endeavoured to show by a comparison of figures and by assertion as to the position of the government of that day that these enumerators were a lot of scoundrels unfit to inhabit this country and dishonest enough to violate the oath they were required to take at the dictation of that government.

And while he was bold enough to characterize the work of the enumerators of 1891 as dishonest and bad, although he was forced to admit from the returns of the present census that it was open to argument that they were wrong, he says in this case if they are wrong it is a mistake.

The one class, these of 1891, are unable to defend themselves and he calls them scoundrels and perjurers.

In the latter class they were appointees of the present government and able to defend themselves by inflicting through the ballot box the just punishment of any one guilty of making such an accusation.

But, Sir, the hon. gentleman's allusion to the necessities of the government in 1891 are the mere outpourings of a very imaginative brain, and he is assisted in that imagination by his knowledge of the exigencies of the present government, and he entirely failed to show any necessity in the late government to falsify the census. Surely the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) must have forgotten what has been amply demonstrated since the census of 1901 was taken, namely, that a separate and a private set of instructions were issued to the enumerators in the province of Quebec, differing from the instructions issued to the enumerators in the other provinces. Why was such the case ? What explanation has ever been given of it? I venture to say that the only explanation that can be given is the fact that the representation of this parliament depends on the population of the province of Quebec, and by swelling the population of that province it would lessen the representation of the province of Ontario, where the govern-

ment of the day is notoriously weak. I venture the assertion that that was the reason why these instructions were given to the enumerators of the province of Quebec and not to the enumerators of the province of Ontario.

Another position which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce took in regard to the census was this. He undertook to justify the large expenditure incurred during the past year and during the years which this government has been in power upon the ground that the population of the Dominion of Canada had very largely increased ; and, Sir, in the same breath he was forced to admit, from the returns which have been brought down and placed on the Table of this House, that the census of the Dominion of Canada is, to use his own language, disappointing. But, Sir, while he stated that the growth of the population was disappointing, he did not say, as he might well have said, that the expenditure of this country was disappointing and was altogether out of proportion to the population which inhabited it.

I was obliged, Mr. Speaker, to deny myself the privilege of hearing the hon. Minister of Finance deliver his budget speech. But I have taken occasion to carefully read it, and considering the past utterances of that hon. gentleman and other members of the ministry, and the members who are following them, I realize that my loss in that respect has not been so great as I had supposed. I had anticipated, and not without reason, from professions of the hon. gentlemen of the ministry, that at least something new, something startling would be announced in the budget as having taken place in the administration of public affairs in this Dominion during the past year or that might be expected to occur within the next year. But, Sir, like many others, my expectations have not been realized in that respect, for we have had the spectacle of a Finance Minister presenting to this House this session a leaner bill of fare than has characterized similar occasions during the years the hon. gentleman has been in office. In introducing his budget to this House, he uses this language :

> Mr. Speaker, it is my happy privilege to present to the House to-day another chapter in the continued story of Canada's prosperity.

Only half the truth, Mr. Speaker, is stated in that sentence. If the hon. minister had been frank enough to state the whole case, he would have added these words : 'And another chapter in the continued story of broken pledges and neglected opportunities of the Liberal party of Canada.' That, Sir, would have been the whole truth and the whole statement. Or, had he stated that Canada had continued to prosper notwithstanding the incubus of the Liberal party hanging upon it, he would not have been far from the truth. But, Sir, he could not have stated that as a part of his happy privilege. The hon. Minister of Finance then goes on to say :

> In a country so vast as ours, with such varied conditions, it would be too much to expect that every section and every industry would be able to make the same gratifying report of prosperity. But I think I can truly say that during the past few years we have approached as near to that happy condition as could reasonably be hoped for.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister leaves himself open to the charge of only stating half the case. Had he put the case as strongly as he could have done, or as he should have done, he would have said that we have approached nearer to that happy condition than could reasonably have been hoped for under the present Liberal administration. The people of this Dominion expected, and had a right to expect, from the pledges and promises made by the Liberal party when in opposition, and spread broadcast by them over this Dominion, in the public press, by speeches and in every available manner, and from the fault-finding they made with the administration of the Liberal Conservative party, that when they attained office there would be real reform in the administration of the various departments of the government. We had, I say, a right to expect that. But, Sir, I am happy to be able to say that at the time these gentlemen attained office they found the affairs of the country under Liberal Conservative rule in such a satisfactory condition that there was very little room for improvement. It is either that, Mr. Speaker, or the present administration stand convicted on their own evidence of lacking the courage of their convictions or of having no convictions at all. I venture the assertion, Sir, that there never was a period in the history of Canada when there was such a golden opportunity for a government to use its powers and exert its influence for the benefit and the lasting advantage of this country ; and I venture the further assertion that there has never been a period when these privileges and opportunities have been so sadly neglected. The benign smile of Providence has been continuously resting upon us during that period. All that a country could hope for has been ours. Our agricultural lands have fairly groaned under the wealth of their production. We can thank Providence and the industry of the agriculturist for this ; but I am sorry to say that the hon. Minister of Finance, in delivering his budget, was not pleased to acknowledge either the one cause or the other for this prosperity, but was quite willing to take the whole credit to the government, where credit does not belong. Our industrial pursuits have grown and have assumed larger proportions during that period ; but I venture to say that they have not made such progress or advancement as they would have done under the adminis-

tration of a progressive government capable of taking advantage of the opportunities as they were offered. That, Sir, is the fault of the Liberal government. We had a right to expect that advantage would have been taken of this period of prosperity to lay up something for a rainy day. We had a right to expect that a substantial reduction would have been made in the cost of the administration of the government and in public expenditure. We had a right to expect that the national debt, which had assumed such large proportions, would have been reduced by the surpluses arising annually from the rapidly and continuously increasing revenues. We had a right to expect that the resources of this country would have been carefully husbanded to enable us, in the time of adversity which always follows a period of prosperity, to maintain our financial and commercial position in the world, and to avert as far as possible the evil effects of hard times.

This, Mr. Speaker, would not be expecting too much, it would only be applying the principles of ordinary business prudence to the administration of the affairs of this country. If a merchant, a farmer, or any person engaged in any business depending upon the public for its success were to apply the business methods adopted by the government of the day in increasing his expenditure, and increasing his debt, without increasing materially his sources of income during a period of prosperous trade, ruin and disaster must come upon such a person during a period of hard times as it will surely come upon this government. The principle applicable to individuals is applicable to governments only with greater force, because in the former case failure affects only the individual while with governments the whole people of the whole country share in the disaster.

The principle I would advocate would be to use the surplus revenues in wiping out the debt to the greatest possible extent consistent with the reasonable development of the country.

To expend the revenues in such a manner as will substantially and permanently increase the sources of such revenue.

In making such expenditures to keep first the prosperity and advancement of the country in view and not allow these interests to be sacrificed for the advancement of party.

As wholesome and commendable as these principles may appear, I charge and it has been amply demonstrated on the floor of this House during the present debate by various hon. gentlemen on this side, that the government of the day has entirely ignored these principles and have operated on the vicious principles of increasing the annual expenditure and increasing the national debt, increasing the per capita tax and in making these vast and ever-increasing expenditures, have not made them in such a manner as to permanently and substantially increase the sources of revenue, but have sacrificed the interests of the country to the retention of office by the Liberal party.

But, Mr. Speaker, this vicious principle does not appear to be confined to the Liberal party in power at Ottawa. We have had the figures quoted to show that it does apply here, but, Sir, Liberal governments appear to be all tarred with the same stick. If you will take occasion to refer to the estimates of the province of Ontario for the present year under the administration of Hon. Mr. Ross, you will find this same vicious principle in full operation there. I have taken the figures and here they are :—

Main estimates..	$4,004,228
Supplementaries..	181,947
Further supplementaries... ...	3,750
Railway certificates (dept).. ..	92,248
Annuities (debt)..	102,900
New railway subsidies...	696,000
Temiscamingue railway..	2,234,000
	$7,315,073
Estimated possible revenue.. ..	$4,075,000
Excess of expenditure over receipts..	$3,230,073
Net debt stood at..	$5,800,000
The debt will stand at	$9,030,073

So it will be seen that the disease is spreading. I do not know whether the Liberals at Ottawa caught the disease from the Liberal government of Ontario or vice versa, but certain it is they both have it bad, and it is high time that a long-suffering but now indignant public should apply a remedy, and I doubt not that, on the first opportunity, the punishment inflicted by the public will be made to fit the crime.

I have charged, Mr. Speaker, that the present administration have not done what they should and could have done to improve the opportunities of those engaged in industrial pursuits, and during the six years' administration of the present government there has been seen deputation after deputation almost without number of gentlemen engaged in various industrial pursuits waiting upon the cabinet urging with all their energies the necessity of relief or protection in some form or another to be turned away with the 'sunny smile' and promise of 'serious consideration' but no help. The fact is that during the years these gentlemen were in opposition they condemned in the strongest possible language and on every possible occasion the policy of protection inaugurated by the Conservative party. They had preached almost every other doctrine imaginable from free trade to unrestricted reciprocity, as the only panacea for the evils they imagined this country to be burdened with, but, Sir, when they attained power they found a legacy left to them in the shape of an infant named 'Nationl Policy' Protection, born of Con-

servative parents and reared under Conservative influences, and which had grown so strong and husky that the Liberals were afraid to touch it, afraid either because they had abused it so much or because it had acquired such strength they dared not tackle it, and so they have left it severely alone, only making slight and unimportant changes in rates but nothing in principle, but, Mr. Speaker, the infant was such a lovable thing, it was exerting such a beneficial influence in the industrial enterprises of this country (imperfect though it was) that the Liberal party simply looked on in silent admiration at its operations and one by one watched their pet theories of free trade, &c., fade away and die, and growing bold with association, they have at last adopted the child and it is a clear case of the child ruling the household, for whatever faults the child may have the present government are either afraid or incompetent to correct its manners. It has taken many years of earnest advocacy and practical administration on the part of the Conservative party to convert the Liberal party to the policy of protection. But it is gratifying to know that they have, at last, nearly all been converted to that principle. It seems to me that if there ever was a time when the Liberal party should govern this country it is the time during which they have governed it, a time when the country was strong, when the trade policy of the country was so well established and so perfect that, notwithstanding the action of the government the country could still go on and prosper. The Minister of Finance has been pleased to refer to the agricultural interest in these words :

> In the paramount interest of agriculture, which must long continue to be the foundation of our prosperity, the results of the year have been most gratifying.

Notwithstanding this important statement, the hon. gentleman failed to show that the present government had, by any action on its part in any way contributed to that prosperity. There are a great many ways in which the government could have improved the condition of the agriculturists. They could have prevented the corn of the western states and other products of the country to the south of us coming into competition with the products of the Canadian farms. They could have prevented American meat and American horses from coming into competition with the Canadian product in the Canadian market. They could have obtained, or at least, could have tried to obtain, a preference in the English market for the products of Canadian farms. But, not only have they failed to procure these benefits for the Canadian agriculturists, but they have been pursuing a policy diametrically opposed to this, they have been pursuing a policy which was indicated by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) in an expression he used in referring to a statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) :

> Sir Richard Cartwright was right in refusing agricultural protection. Agriculture protection is a delusion and a snare.

If he had desired to seek further the authority of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) he might have quoted these words which the hon. gentleman is charged with having made use of on the hustings when he undertook to give advice to the Canadian farmer as to what he should do to better his condition, that advice being : If you wish to increase your prosperity you must eat less and work more. But, instead of gaining these advantages for the agriculturists of this country, the present government have seen fit to increase the taxes on those commodities which are of prime necessity for the farmers. And the Minister of Agriculture has given expression to this further phrase, speaking of agriculture protection :

> This kind of thing, instead of helping the farmers hurts them. The thing is nonsense.

I would like to know what the farmers of the Dominion of Canada think of the promise that has been held out to them by the Minister of Agriculture. The Canadian farmer is entitled to every credit for the pluck and industry he has shown in the face of these obstacles, and for having done so much to bring the prosperity which has been showered upon this country. The government of the day, in neglecting the opportunities they have had are worthy the condemnation of the people of Canada.

The Minister of Finance next takes occasion to compliment the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) for what he terms the able administration of that department. And he was able to show by the collection of figures in the Department of Finance that that hon. gentleman had run the affairs of that department for the last year with a loss to the country of $489,941.08, and at the same time to show that he had had an increase of revenue during last year of no less than $235,969.77. That is, taking these figures together, had the revenue of the Post Office Department been the same as under the last year of Conservative rule, the deficit added to the increased revenue from that time to the present would have made a deficit, as compared with the Conservative administration of this department, exceeding $1,000,000, a larger deficit than has ever characterized the department under Conservative rule. Just to illustrate how this department has been run, let me give one example which comes under my own personal observation. The illustration has more a local than a general application, but it is, nevertheless, very instructive. When the Liberal party came into power in 1896, the post office at Belleville held rank as a city office; but on the 30th of Septem-

ber, 1897, it was reduced to the rank of a country office. That is to say, prior to 1897, the several employees of the Belleville post office were on the civil service list, they were obliged to pass examinations and to qualify themselves to fill the position which they then occupied. The number of persons employed at that time was ten; the total cost of the post office was $8,710, and the revenue collected by these ten people from the post office was $17,339.60. The change was brought about in this way—the postmaster, Mr. John Taylor, who was a Conservative, was dismissed without any charge being made against him and without any investigation—in fact in violation of the principle laid down in this House by the right hon. the Prime Minister. The assistant in the post office, Mr. Thomas Duncan was removed, and, if I am correctly informed, a new position was created for him in the railway mail service, where he has since been enjoying a salary of $1,500, whereas, as assistant in the Belleville post office, he only received $1,350. Five members of the staff of the Belleville post office were superannuated, and superannuation allowances are being paid to these five people, amounting to no less than $1,166.79. Three others were dismissed who had not been long enough in the service to entitle them to superannuation, and they were paid gratuities amounting to $583.59. Only two of the total staff of ten were retained in that office. These changes, you will see, provided a position of postmaster for one of the faithful of the Liberal party, and subordinate positions for five others. It is needless for me to say that these positions were filled by the faithful of the Liberal party. Now, the present staff—and I want to compare it with that I have given you—consists of eight persons—

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Porter) to the fact that he is not discussing the question before the Chair. When an amendment has been moved to a motion for Committee of Supply, the discussion should be restricted to its subject matter. That is a well established rule.

Mr. PORTER. I was addressing myself to the question upon the subject of expenditure by the administration in connection with the Post Office Department.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question of that expenditure does not come within the scope of the motion now before the Chair, which is the amendment moved by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) concerning the tariff and the preference with England. I read this passage from Bourinot, page 549 :

> When an amendment has been moved to the question for the Speaker to leave the Chair, the discussion should be confined to its subject matter.

I would draw the attention of the hon. members of the House to this ruling.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is in order quite as much as was the Minister of Trade and Commerce who occupied an hour and a half dealing with the census of 1891, which my amendment certainly does not touch ; and the same freedom of discussion, I think, has prevailed in the speeches of gentlemen on both sides of the House. While I do not find any fault with the rule which you have laid down, at the same time I thought there was an understanding that so far as this debate was concerned hon. gentlemen were not to be confined with that strictness that you might enforce if you thought proper to do so. I would therefore submit, with all proper deference, that the hon. member for Hastinngs is quite as much within his right as hon. gentlemen who have preceded him in this debate.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I have no doubt that the ruling you have laid down is strictly and legally accurate. But I may observe that in the budget debate we have, as a matter of custom for a good many years, given extreme latitude on both sides, both giving and taking. It is fair to say that I have myself, on all occasions in discussing the budget, given myself very full latitude ; and I believe my hon. friend opposite is right in saying that I did so on this particular occasion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We did not object.

Mr. SPEAKER. With the unanimous consent of the House the hon. member may deviate from that rule, but I thought it my duty to point out the rule to the House, and I would recommend that it be observed as much as possible.

Mr. PORTER. I was about to call attention to the position occupied by the Belleville post office as showing the scale of expenditure in the Post Office Department, and to compare the present position of the Belleville post office with that it occupied under Liberal-Conservative rule. At the present time the staff is composed of eight officials ; the cost as given in the Public Accounts laid on the Table of the House is $4,100 ; and the revenue collected in the year ending June 30th, 1901, was $14,822,80. Now those figures are entirely misleading, and one has only to look to some other parts of the Public Accounts to get the true state of affairs as to the cost of the Belleville post office. I have taken the trouble to do so, and I find that to that sum of $4,100 given as the cost of the Belleville post office, must be added the superannuation allowances which are being paid year after year to those people who were dismissed from their offices for the purpose of making room for supporters of the Liberal

cause. Those superannuation allowances amount to $1,116.69. The salary of Mr. Duncan, for whom the office was created—for if I am correctly informed the office had never been in existence before—is $1,500. That must be added to the cost. Then the gratuities that were paid the next year after this change, amounted to $583.59, bringing up the total cost of the Belleville post office to $7,350.28. Now, Mr. Speaker, you will observe from a comparison of these figures that ten officials who have passed an examination and qualified themselves for the position, were paid under Liberal-Conservative rule $8,710, or an average of $871 each; while under Liberal rule eight officials are paid $7,350, or an average of $918 each. The revenue collected by the ten officials under Liberal-Conservative rule was $17,339.60, while the revenue collected from that office by the officials who are being paid more money for their work at the present time, is only $14,882. But this is not the worst feature of the case. Instead of Belleville occupying, as it did under Conservative rule, the proud distinction of giving a first class service, the service in that office has since been sacrificed, and almost every conceivable kind of complaint is being made from day to day in regard to that office

But the full force of the point I am making is shown by a comparison of the Belleville post office with some other post offices. I have taken the trouble to extract from the Public Accounts the figures with relation to other post offices in cities somewhat of the same size as Belleville. The population of Belleville is given at 9,914; the cost of the administration of the post office is $7,350.35; the revenue collected is $14,882.80. Now take the city of Guelph, with a population of 10,539, about 1,000 more than Belleville. The Guelph post office costs this government only $5,441.06, nearly $2,000 less than the Belleville post office; and yet Guelph collects in revenue $23,526.25, or $9,000 more than the amount collected in Belleville. Take the city of Brantford, with a population of 18,250. The post office costs this government $5,702.28, nearly $2,000 less than the Belleville post office, with a population of 9,914; and yet the city of Brantford collects a revenue of $28,796.60, or $14,000 more than the city of Belleville, though the officials in Belleville are paid $2,000 more for doing the work. Take the city of Brockville with a population nearer that of Belleville than either of the others that I have mentioned. Brockville, with a population of 9,013, costs for the administration of the post office $4,509.43, nearly $3,000 less than the Belleville post office; yet the town of Brockville collects $21,894.19, or $7,000 more than the city of Belleville.

Now let us go into the province of Quebec for an illustration. I have taken the city of Sherbrooke, which has a population of 10,010. The cost of the administration of the office there is $5,299, or $2,000 less than the cost of administering the Belleville post office; yet the city of Sherbrooke returns a revenue of $17,471.92, over $3,000 more than the city of Belleville. Going down to New Brunswick we find that in Moncton, with a population of 8,000, the administration of the post office costs only $3,761.93, and the revenue collected is $13,969.68. In the case of Moncton we find that the administration of the post office costs about one-half that of the Belleville post office. In Sydney, Nova Scotia, with a population of 8,000, the administration of the post office costs $4,613.05, the revenue collected is $16,115.39. You will see it costs $3,000 less to administer the post office than is paid for the Belleville post office, although Sydney returns a revenue of $2,000 more.

Now, Sir, another illustration to which I would call the attention of the government is afforded by the city of Charlottetown, in the province of Prince Edward Island. Charlottetown, with a population of 12,000, costs this government $11,795.64 for the administration of the office which collects $16,582.34. Compare that, if you will, with the town of Peterborough in the province of Ontario. Peterborough is put down as having a population of 12,000, the same as Charlottetown. Peterborough costs the government $4,630 for the administration of the office. Charlottetown costs the government $11,795. From this statement I think that the deduction is fairly drawn that if it is right and proper to pay for the administration of the Belleville office a sum so large as $7,350.35, it is wrong for the government to inflict the same work upon these other offices that I have spoken of and only pay the officials one-half the salaries, or, if it is right to pay, at these other places I have mentioned, the sums I have stated, then, it is radically wrong to pay the officials at Belleville nearly twice the sum that is paid at these other places. There is only one conclusion to be drawn, and the conclusion I draw is that at the time these hon. gentlemen made the change in the Belleville post office places had to be made, positions had to be found for the faithful of the party, and it was done in this way to the cost and detriment of the country to the extent of no less than $2,000 or $3,000 a year, and I doubt not that this is only an illustration that could be drawn from the public accounts were one to take occasion to look carefully over the whole list.

Besides the compliment paid by the hon. Minister of Finance to the hon. minister I have already referred to, he only addressed words of congratulation or praise to another head of a department, and that was to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). But, he damned him with faint praise when he gave expression to this language:

> Even if he makes large demands he is able to show large returns.

No doubt the hon. Minister of Finance had in his mind at that time, the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and Sir, I have taken the pains to collect some figures in regard to the management of that railway, which, I think, may be of interest to the House and the country. When the Drummond County Railway deal, to which I have already referred, was before the Senate, it was pointed out there that the transaction was an extravagant and a corrupt transaction, but the answer that was given at that time was that the extension of the road to Montreal would have the effect of putting the Intercolonial Railway on a paying basis and that there would be no longer that deficiency between revenue and expenditure that had been characterizing the road hitherto. According to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance, during the last year there was a deficit in the management of that road of between $400,000 and $500,000; so that, the predictions of the opponents of that deal have been fully verified, and from the public accounts I have taken some figures, which, with the permission of the House, I will state. The deficit in the management of that road, to my mind, has been very largely occasioned by the increased number of officials and the increased salaries they have been paid by this government. Taking the last year of the Conservative management of the road I find the following in regard to the salaries of officials, as compared with the last year under Liberal rule.

Salaries.	1896.	1901.
At $7,000	0	1
6,000	1	2
3,750	0	1
3,600	1	1
3,200	1	0
2,950	0	1
2,500	0	1
2,400	1	4
2,225	0	1
2,100	0	1
1,900	1	0
1,800	2	1
1,700	2	3
1,600	3	2
1,500	2	8

So, you will see that in 1896 there were fifteen officials on the road who were in receipt of $1,500 a year or over, and that in 1901 the number had increased, under the able management of the present hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, to no less than twenty-seven. The salaries paid in 1896 amounted to $31,900, and in 1901 to $67,825, or more than rouble. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance had, at the time he was paying his compliments to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, a fact in his mind which I find very tersely put in one of the New Brunswick papers, an extract from which I have taken occasion to clip. Every hon. member on the government side of the House will remember how, during the Conservative administration, hon. gentlemen opposite were wont to declare that the ministers of that time were lording it over the country in private cars at the expense of the people. Here is what this newspaper says in regard to that branch of the Intercolonial Railway under the present minister:

> Official cars have become so numerous that Mr. Blair found it necessary some time ago to provide a special platform at Moncton for the convenience of the favoured ones who use them or to keep them out of the public gaze as much as possible, and the cost of the platform is charged to capital account. The extent of the private car habit on the Intercolonial Railway, may be judged from the fact that in Moncton shops last year four received heavy repairs, ten light repairs, one was renovated and varnished and one renovated only.

I would like to know what kind of a sermon from that fact would be preached by Mr. McMullen, Mr. Landerkin and other members who then occupied seats on the opposition side of the House.

But, there occurs to me, in connection with the department of Railways and Canals, one thing which is of special interest to the riding which I have the honour to represent and which I think should be brought before the House and upon which the government should offer some explanation. I refer to the Trent Valley canal. This is an enterprise to which both parties in the House committed themselves so long ago, so that, I need not take up any time in discussing the merits or demerits of this scheme further than to say that I am heartily in accord with and will support to the fullest extent that project providing the town of Trenton is made one terminus. I was very much surprised when a few days ago in answer to a question put by the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Ward) as to whether the government has decided or determined where the southern terminus of the Trent Valley canal should be, that is Port Hope or Trenton. The answer was given that the government had not determined. There has already been expended on that enterprise on the Trent river in and near Trenton a large amount of money. Locks and swing bridges have been constructed and the people in the vicinity of Trenton and the west riding of Hastings have been given to understand that the terminus of that canal would be at Trenton. A sum I understand has been in the estimates of this government for several years for carrying on this work and this year there is again a sum asked to be revoted, page 44 estimates, $300,000, for that purpose, although it does not appear to be the intention of the government to go on with the work and it is somewhat curious that the department should ask for this grant when they have not yet determined where the canal shall be. I think, however, Mr. Speaker, the in-

tention and object of the government becomes apparent when one looks into the occasions on which this subject has been prominently before the people during the regime of the present government.

In 1896, when hon. gentlemen of the government assumed office the construction of the southern or Trenton end of the Trent Valley canal was made an issue and it was declared in the press and on the hustings of every riding through which the canal ran that if elected to power the work would certainly be proceeded with and large sums of money expended. This was urged with the object of inducing the electors of West Hastings to support the Liberal candidate, it was a powerful weapon in the hands of the Liberal party although a direct bribe and a dishonest means to secure the vote. It failed, however, and the electors of West Hastings were found to be men too true to their principles to be bought up in this way.

In 1898, there was another election on, this time for the local legislature of Ontario, and notwithstanding previous declarations of the Liberal party that the federal government should not take part in provincial politics, the Trent Valley canal again looms up and again for the purpose of furthering the cause of the Grit candidate as will appear by this article published in the Liberal organ of the town of Trenton.

Trenton Courier, Feb. 21, 1898.

A million and a half for the Trent Valley Canal.

The Dominion government are carrying out their pledges to construct the Trent Valley Canal as the following letter will abundantly prove.

Office of
The Minister of Railways and Canals.

Ottawa, Feb. 12th, 1898.

Dear Mr. Biggar,—I think we are making a very substantial increase this year, as you will observe when the estimates come down in connection with the Trent Valley Canal work. We are doubling the amount which was last year appropriated for the purpose.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed). ANDREW G. BLAIR.

W. H. Biggar,
Belleville, Ont.

Now, what could have been the possible object of writing Mr. Biggar, or of disclosing the amount before the estimates were brought down or of publishing a private letter in the Grit newspaper at that time? Simply and solely because there was an election on, because H. Bleeker was the Liberal candidate and Mr. Biggar was his champion, because that paper was supporting the Liberal cause, because they desired to bribe the electors. Again in 1900, and at the by-election in 1902, the same tactics were used and upon every platform could be heard Liberal promises of this work being carried on by the present government as a reason for supporting the Liberal candidate, but we were able to expose the purpose and show the fraud being practiced in making use of this cry and not carrying out the pledges and promises made in regard to it and the people now understand as the people of the whole Dominion understand that Liberal promises are like pie crust, made to be broken, that it is not a Liberal principle to keep a promise but an established principle to break them. We would like to know whether this old chestnut is to do service again. If not why is it kept in the estimates. Be manly, either tell the people you do not intend to carry on the work, or be honest and go on and do it. Let me just read to the House extracts from the estimates in different years:

Trent Valley Canal.—Estimates.

	Appropriation.
1897-8	$500,000
1898-9	650,000
1899-00	600,000
1900-01	845,000
1901	320,000
1902	615,000

I repeat that the government should be honest enough to take these items out of the estimates if they do not intend to proceed with the work; or let them be manly enough to spend the money and complete the Trent Valley canal.

I took occasion during the early days of this parliament to make certain inquiries regarding the Belleville Harbour Commission. These questions were:

1. Have any resignations, dismissals, appointments or re-appointments been made during the two years prior to the 1st of February, 1902?
2. What person or persons have so resigned, been dismissed, appointed or re-appointed, with dates of such resignations, dismissals, appointments or re-appointments?
3. What reason or reasons existed for such resignations, dismissals, appointments or re-appointments?

These questions were answered by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as follows:

1. Yes, that there had been resignations, dismissals, appointments and re-appointments.
2. That Mr. Thomas Hanley had resigned his position to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the 10th of January, 1901, and the appointment of Mr. George Wallbridge was cancelled on the 19th of April, 1901. Mr. E. G. Sills, of Belleville, was appointed a harbour commissioner for Belleville on the 19th of April, 1901, and Mr. T. S. Carman was also appointed a commissioner for said harbour on the said date.
3. It was considered advisable in the interests of the harbour to cancel the appointment of Mr. Wallbridge and appoint another commissioner in his place, two commissioners having resigned because they were dissatisfied with Mr. Wallbridge and the difficulty there was in getting others to fill the vacancies while he remained a commissioner. Mr. T. S. Carman was appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Hanley, and Mr. E. G. Sills was appointed in the room of Mr. Wallbridge.

I need scarcely say that I was very much surprised as well as disappointed at the an-

swer given by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the questions put by me in respect to this matter, especially in regard to the reasons assigned for the dismissal of Mr. Wallbridge and the appointment of Mr. E. G. Sills in his stead. For the sake of comparison and to understand fully the motives actuating the conduct of hon. gentlemen of the government in regard to this matter I take occasion to state to the House that Mr. George Wallbridge who was dismissed had occupied the position of harbour commissioner of the Belleville harbour for a period of about twelve years prior to his dismissal.

In the Act of this parliament creating the Belleville Harbour Commission it is amongst other things provided that the mayor for the time being of the city of Belleville should be ex-officio a member of the commission, that the board of commissioners should consist of three, thus leaving it in the power of the government to appoint two commissioners.

There is a considerable revenue derived from the harbour of the city of Belleville, and which varies from year to year from $2,500 to as large a sum as $5,000, which revenue is intended to be expended for the improvement and advantage of Belleville harbour. At the time of the creation of this commission the sitting member for West Hastings in which this harbour is situated was Mr. Henry Corby, and upon his recommendation two gentlemen of the city of Belleville were appointed by the Conservative government upon this commission, namely, Mr. Thomas Wills and Mr. Thomas Ritchie.

It is well at this stage of considering this subject to look at the political complexion of that commission and the action of the gentleman who then represented that riding in this parliament. Upon the recommendation of Mr. Corby the two gentlemen whom I have named were appointed to the commission—the one Mr. Thomas Wills, an ex-member of the local legislature of Ontario and a Conservative in politics, the other Mr. Thomas Ritchie, a large retail dry goods merchant of the city of Belleville, a prominent Liberal and a gentleman who has since been the Liberal candidate in West Hastings. The mayor of the city of Belleville at that time and for every year since the creation of the harbour commission was a Conservative. Both these gentlemen subsequently resigned their positions upon the board, and in their stead and under a Conservative government there were appointed Mr. George Wallbridge and Mr. Thomas Hanley, one a Liberal, the other a Conservative. It will be perfectly evident to every member of this House that in making the selection of persons fit and proper to fill so important a position the then hon. member for West Hastings did not consult political interests, he was perfectly fair to both political parties, and appointed or had appointed to that board a representative of each party.

But, Sir, there were large sums of money to be expended by the harbour commission, not only revenue derived from the harbour of Belleville, but moneys granted from time to time by this government for the improvement of that harbour, and it became necessary in the interests of the Liberal party when it assumed the reins of power that the expenditure of these moneys and the management of this commission should be placed in the hands of those who were faithful to the party without regard to whatever sacrifices might be made as to the efficiency of the board, and accordingly we find the changes taking place. The excuse offered by the hon. minister for the discharge of Mr. Wallbridge is one which I am satisfied he could not have given were he acquainted with the qualifications of that gentleman, with the high position which he occupies and has always occupied socially and in a business way in the community where he has always resided, and the respect and esteem with which he is held by all classes of people in the city of Belleville and the time and attention and untiring devotion given by him to the success and the improvement of the Belleville harbour. I feel sure, Sir, that he would blush with shame to offer such an excuse as was offered in the answer to the question which I put to this House. Notwithstanding the answer given by the hon. minister, I venture the assertion that it would be impossible for him to find in the city of Belleville any responsible or respectable man who would say or who has stated that he refused to sit upon the Belleville Harbour Commission because Mr. George Wallbridge was a commissioner.

But, Sir, the exigencies of the party had to be served, and no matter what the qualifications of Mr. Wallbridge, and no matter what the considerations were for retaining him in office, he had to make way for supporters of the Liberal party and men who could use that position for the advantage of the Liberal party.

Mr. Hanley we are told resigned his position on the 10th of January, 1901, and nothing was done in regard to filling the vacancy until the 19th of April, 1901, when Mr. George Wallbridge was dismissed. This gave an opportunity of filling the board of commissioners with two appointees of the present government, and that was done on the same day that Mr. Wallbridge was dismissed. The one gentleman who was appointed to this position, T. S. Carman, is the editor and proprietor of the 'Belleville Ontario' newspaper, an organ known and recognized to be the organ of the Liberal party in that riding, a man who had had no experience and no training for the position; the other appointee, Mr. E. G. Sills, being a retired miller, a defeated candidate

for the local legislature in the Liberal interests, and a man who has never been accused to my knowledge of having qualifications of filling any particular office.

But, Sir, in this manner the Liberal party obtained the control of the harbour commission of the city of Belleville, and if I am correctly informed—and I have my information from a source upon which I think I can safely rely—these two gentlemen since their appointment have entirely or in very large measure ignored the fact that the mayor of the city of Belleville, who happens all the time to be a Conservative, had a right to sit and act with them in the deliberations of that board, and I am told, Sir, that these two Liberals have undertaken to manage the affairs of the Belleville Harbour Commission without consulting the mayor of the city of Belleville and have refused to act upon the suggestion or initiative of the mayor.

That this change was brought about and is being used for political purposes there is the strongest possible evidence to my mind in the fact that just prior to the by-election held in the West Riding of Hastings in 1902, one of the commissioners appointed by this government, Mr. E. G. Sills, was desirous of obtaining the nomination of the Liberal party for that election, and he accordingly resigned his position upon the board and employed the ordinary or the extraordinary means usually employed by a Liberal to obtain such nomination, and during the time the by-election was pending, if I am correctly informed, another of the faithful in West Hastings in the person of Dr. Goldsmith was appointed to fill the vacancy. But, Sir, when Mr. Sills failed to obtain the nomination of the Liberal party for the by-election in West Hastings, the appointment of Dr. Goldsmith was cancelled and Mr. Sills was re-appointed to the position; and, Sir, since this question was put by me to the House, another nomination in the interests of the Liberal party has taken place in the West Riding of Hastings for the local legislature of Ontario for the coming election, and this same harbour commissioner, who has been appointed, resigned and been re-appointed, will be again resigning his position to enable him to fight out the cause of the Liberal party for the local legislature in West Hastings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that these facts, which are uncontrovertible, show as clearly as the noon day sun that this commission has been appointed by the present government not in the interests of Belleville harbour but in the interests of the Liberal party of this country.

Large sums of money, as I have already stated, are expended from year to year in the improvement and maintenance of this harbour, and as a necessary consequence the commissioners who control the expenditure of these moneys employ large numbers of people who are residents of and they would take good care to see were voters of the West Riding of the county of Hastings, and a commissioner like Mr. Sills, who has been paying out these moneys to the voters from time to time, has a strong weapon placed in his hands when he starts in to canvas for an election either for the federal or the local House in the position that he has occupied. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a dangerous and a vicious principle—a principle that is not in the interests of this country, a practice that any government should be ashamed to recognize or have brought home to them in direct violation of the principle laid down by the premier; and in the face of these facts the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have hesitated a long time, and in fact should have absolutely refused to place upon the records of this House such an unwarranted answer as he has placed to the question which I have asked.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have occupied the attention of this House longer than I intended, and I want to say in conclusion that while I entirely disapprove of the manner in which the affairs of this country are managed by the Liberal party, while I denounce the principles of expenditure employed by this government, while I rejoice in the prosperity of this country in spite of the incompetence of the Liberal government, and while I abhor their systematic neglect of the opportunities presented for furthering the welfare of this country, I at the same time declare my unlimited belief in and adherence to the principles of the Liberal-Conservative party, which have always been the principles of progress in this country. Especially, Sir, do I give my adherence to the principles embodied in the resolution moved by the hon. leader of the opposition. I shall await with anxiety, but with perfect confidence, the decision of the people. I believe that when the great jury of this country have the opportunity to try this government upon the indictment of false pretenses and neglected opportunities, their verdict will be guilty and the punishment that will follow will be sure and swift.

Mr. A. S. KENDALL (Cape Breton). It will not be expected, Mr. Speaker, that I should follow the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Porter) through all the sinuosities of the arguments which he has just delivered. I will content myself with a brief reference to a few of the points he endeavoured to make. I think he said that the tariff of the Liberal party was practically the same as that of the late Conservative administration. Let me point out that when the Liberal party in 1893 laid down its platform, that platform was a tariff for revenue, and, if it contained any protection, that protection was only incidental to the main principle. The question now is whether or not the tariff of this

government has fulfilled the expectations of the Liberal party, and is consistent with that platform. We have to-day convincing evidence that by the rearrangement of the tariff the treasury of the country has been filled to overflowing. Ever since the new tariff came into operation we have had an abundant revenue flowing into the treasury of the country, and not, as in former days, into the pockets of a certain class of the community. No doubt a number of gentlemen, who, under former conditions, used to look for a greater share of the taxation imposed on the people, to-day find in the present policy cause of complaint. They do not find to-day flowing into their pockets out of that taxation the large amount they formerly did.

I shall not detain the House at any length by reading manuscript or figures, but will ask the attention of the hon. gentlemen and the House to a few facts. On a number of articles we have made very considerable reduction in the duties, in the interests of the consuming people—not in the interests of the manufacturers, but of the consuming public generally, who, as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) reminded us the other night, are in the majority of ten to one. Let me just draw attention to some of those reductions :

—	Old Tariff.	Preferential Rate.	Reduction.
	p. c.	p. c.	p. c.
Cotton manufactures.....	28·20	21·03	7
Woollen "	32·01	23·03	9
Silk " ...	30·33	21·27	9
Fancy goods.....	29·57	21·88	8
Flax, hemp and jute, mfrs. of.....	22·19	17·92	4
Hats, caps and bonnets...	30	20	10
Gloves and mitts	35	23·33	12
Furs.....	15·95	12·29	3
Iron and steel mfrs.....	21·02	11·21	10
Drugs, dyes & chemicals..	22·57	15·41	7
Earthenware & chinaware	30	20·04	10
Books and printed m atter	23·65	9·67	14
Glass and mfrs. of.. ...	23·35	17·20	6
Leather and mfrs. of.....	19·30	12·25	7

After listening to these figures, will the hon. gentlemen still assert that when the Liberal party came into power they did not change the tariff—and change it in some respects radically—for the benefit of the great consuming mass of the people ?

My hon. friend spoke of the development of the iron industry in New Glasgow under protection. I admit that that industry did develop, to a certain extent, in New Glasgow, under protection, but I would point out that the iron works to-day in Sydney and those in contemplation in North Sydney and Sydney Mines only came into existence because their operations were transferred from a situation where they could not be economically carried on to a situation where the raw materials are close together. Furthermore, I make the statement, on the authority of those men who have invested millions in the new iron industries, that they put their money into these works, not on account of the duty or of any prospects they might have for a market in Canada, but because the situation selected was one which gave them the opportunity to send their products to South Africa and South America and the Mediterranean and other European countries, and there find a sale at profitable rates in neceessary competition with the world. They say they that have invested their money in these works because, owing to the geographical advantages of the locality, the raw materials can be gathered close together, and it is on this basis alone that the iron interests in Cape Breton are being developed. Besides the iron industry in New Glasgow did not flourish under protection. We have printed evidence, prepared by the company that was operating there, to show what profits they were making, and we see by this evidence what wages were paid the labourers. And the business men in New Glasgow, without regard to political complexion, admit that the workingmen there, under the conditions that formerly prevailed, were not paid sufficiently. In fact, I have heard men say that it would have been better had the industry not existed than to have continued it under the conditions which formerly prevailed.

When about three years ago, the Finance Minister brought down his measure to extend the iron bounties, some hon. members on the Conservative side, who were disappointed with the results of the policy of protection to the iron industry, refused along with some hon. gentlemen on this side, to support the resolution of the Finance Minister. On the evening when he brought in his measure, Mr. Foster, the ex-Finance Minister, left his seat and walked out of the chamber, thus giving most practical evidence that he was not in accord with his own leader (Sir Charles Tupper) on that matter. These men believed that although iron is a prime necessity in this country, most necessary for the development of all her industries, yet it is necessarily a very expensive article to manufacture and to handle, that it is a heavy article and costs a great deal in the way of freight, and it appeared to them, as it did to many on this side, that the results of the former policy of protection had been so unsatisfactory that it would not be wise to continue it.

The hon. gentleman referred to some industries which are now hard pressed by the operation of the present tariff, and in so doing he seemed to me to contradict the early part of his speech. But what are those industries ? Up to this time I have heard no serious complaint except in the case of the woollen industries. This is a business about which I know very little,

and consequently concerning which I shall not venture many remarks, but we had here a display of woollen goods some weeks ago, and one of the gentlemen interested told me that he had been engaged in the production of certain lines and found he could not do so profitably. He changed his machinery and went into the manufacture of blankets, a good solid article, and not only sold them to advantage in this market, but actually sent them to England. I am only acquainted with three small woollen factories in the maritime provinces. One of them is in New Brunswick, and it is operated by a friend of my own, Mr. Humphries, a most aggressive Conservative and a member of the local legislature. That gentleman is a strong believer in protection, but he frankly told me, if I remember well, that he had all the business he could do, but found it difficult to get sufficient wool in the locality to keep the mill in operation. In the county of Inverness, there is a small woollen factory. But it makes a high class of goods, and it is working as it probably never worked before. And I am sure that the gentleman who runs the factory told me he could not get the wool at home to do sufficient work to meet the demand for his product. The Oxford Woollen Mills in Cumberland county are well known. In spite of the United States tariff, large quantites of the products of that mill are sent across the border. Some are sent also to Great Britain, which is the home of woollen manufacturing. However, I would say, as many hon. gentlemen on this side have said, if there is any particular industry in Canada which is suffering, and concerning which it can be shown that we have reasonable ground for believing that it should be maintained, I, for one, would be disinclined, at this juncture to favour a reduction of the tariff. But I wish to say to the woollen manufacturers that, though they may be important in a local way, we must not forget that this is a cold country and an expensive country to live in. The English manufacturer and the English artisan have an advantage in the race over our manufacturers and our workmen. A less expensive house will shelter the English workman and his family than is required in our climate. The English workman requires less nitrogenous food, and less warm clothing. And as will be admitted, cheap living will provide a class of men willing to work at low wages. To my mind, it is extremely questionable whether, the facts being as they are, it is good policy to encourage the establishment of industries which have to come into competition with industries having command of the cheaper labour of England or Germany. We have opportunities to divert our labour into channels which will be remunerative without the aid of protection.

Now, the hon. gentleman referred to our relations, as regards tariffs, with the United States. If I were to follow my own feelings, I would say: Put up the tariff wall against them, as they have put it up against us.

Mr. EDWARDS. Against themselves.

Mr. KENDALL. And against themselves, as my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) says. But, speaking from a maritime province standpoint, I say that retaliation is to-day probably the worst thing that could happen to us. We are looking for extended markets. We want to send our coal, and also our fish into the American market. Furthermore, I would point out to the hon. gentlemen, that while retaliation may agree with our feelings it would probably be poor policy for Canada as a whole. I read an article not long ago, I think in the 'Morning Citizen' of this city, which to me, appeared very attractive. It pointed out that, by an imposition of a large duty on pulp wood and on paper, it could be arranged to draw the whole of the pulp and paper industry from the United States into Canada, and that industry would be worth here, probably $50,000,000 annually. I say that on the face of it that was an enticing proposition, and one which would well merit the sober attention of any government, provided there were not behind it serious difficulties. I have not the figures at hand, but I would like to point out generally that, during the last three or four years, the export of pulp wood from Canada has not increased with anything like the degree of rapidity that the export of pulp has increased. It is evident that the opportunities for the manufacture of pulp in this country are so great that, without tariffs or without any government meddling at all, pulp manufacture is goint to be established in this country on a large scale. But I wish to point out where the United States could strike us back, and that in a way that would make every hon. gentleman representing an Ontario constituency come to the government and demand that the duty on pulp wood be removed. There is no duty on hard coal. But supposing that, in a spirit of retaliation, the American government put a duty of a dollar or two a ton on hard coal imported into Ontario. And if you have no duty on your coke, yet you want great quantities of coke, and will need still larger quantities. The duty on slack coal, I think amounts to only three or four cents a ton. The American government could arrange so that every ton of coal should come into Ontario under an export duty of two or three dollars a ton. In my opinion those who suggest retaliation are not wise. And I would point out also, that, at this juncture the sober, level-headed men of the United States, not only of New England from Boston to New York, but many in Chicago, and many in our border

cities are at work educating the people of the American Republic. And I think we see some signs that, perhaps in the not very remote future—I admit that we have to be patient for the time—there may be an opportunity for this country to establish better business relations with our neighbours to the south. I listened carefully to the speech of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell). I always listen carefully to that hon. gentleman's speeches. They contain, as a rule, a great deal of good, sound material; and, even when his argument is, as I think, wrong, I admire the ingenuity of it. But, on this side, we are indebted to that hon. gentleman for several statements, statements of immense importance as coming from that side of the House. In the first place, if I understood him correctly, the hon. member for Pictou said, in effect, that, if his party came into power he would consider it injudicious to remove the preference. I think he must have given more attention to the business situation in England than most of the hon. gentlemen opposite have done. He made a statement to the effect that there was not the slightest doubt that free trade was the best policy for Great Britain. And, best or not best, he pointed out that the public men of that country, without regard to party affiliations, were almost a unit in favour of free trade, that, in fact, not a man over there with a reputation to jeopardize would venture to advocate a policy of protection. I think that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) must have given some attention to statements made by public men in Great Britain. Now, we have so often heard that Great Britain was only waiting for an opportunity to go back to the protective policy, that, at the risk of being tedious, I am going to read a page or two from statements made by leading public men of Great Britain. Mr. Chamberlain, speaking in 1896 of a proposal that a duty should be placed on certain imports from the colonies for the benefit of the colonies, said :

> It involves the imposition of a duty—it may be a small one, but it is a duty—upon food and upon raw material, and whatever may be the result of imposing such a duty the tendency is to increase the cost of living, which would intensify the pressure upon the working classes of this country, and it would also have a tendency to increase the cost of production, which would put us, of course, in a worse position than now in competition with foreign countries in neutral markets. . . . . The advatage offered is not enough to induce this country to take the certain loss and the possible risk which would be involved in revising altogether its present commercial policy . . . . The second point, which is much more important, is that our foreign trade is so gigantic in proportion to the foreign trade of the colonies that the burden of an arrangement of this kind would fall with much greater weight on the United Kingdom than upon our fellow subjects in the colonies. I think, therefore, we may very fairly ask them to better their offer.

Mr. KENDALL.

Lord Ripon, speaking later, said :

> A consideration of these practical difficulties and of the more immediate results above indicated, of a system of mutual tariff discrimination, has convinced Her Majesty's government that even if its consequences were confined to the limits of the empire, and even if it were not followed by changes of fiscal policy on the part of foreign powers unfavourable to this country, its general economic results would not be beneficial to the empire.

Lord Roseberry, speaking before the Manchester Chamber of Commerce in 1897, said :

> Of all the maddest things we have heard in our days, the re-enactment of the corn laws is the maddest we can possibly conceive. Free trade has preserved the empire.
>
> I believe an imperial customs union to be an impossibility, but supposing it were possible, it would be something which would place all the nations of the world in direct antagonism to it. It is something which, if possible, they would all continue to destroy.

I think the hon. member for Pictou must have given more attention to these statements of English public men than most hon. gentlemen on his side of the House, and he must realize that probably for years to come the people of Great Britain will refuse to jeopardize their commerce by any such ineffective arrangement as that of a preferential tariff, at least on the basis proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me say to hon. gentlemen opposite that in theory I am an out-and-out free trader. I will go as far as to say that I believe it would be in the interest of Canada and in the interest of many of the other colonies, and indirectly in the interest of the mother country, if a preferential tariff could be arranged provided we had free trade within the empire. But that is the only arrangement upon which the mother country will grant us a preference ; and it is an arrangement which the manufacturers of this country, either wisely or unwisely, will refuse.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman made another statement that I wish to refer to. In order to let himself down easily with his own friends, he stated that it was by the policy of protection that Great Britain had laid the foundation of her mercantile greatness. He made that statement, if I remember him correctly. Again I will ask the House to bear with me while I read some literature which I think the public men of this country should make themselves acquainted with. I want to show what kind of prosperity reigned in Great Britain as a result of her protective policy, and for that purpose I will read from Spencer Walpole's history of England :

> There are probably few persons who have not had occasion to study the records of the time, who have any notion of the misery into which the poor had fallen. A long apprenticeship had indeed inured them to suffering; but the misery which they endured in 1816 and 1833 was as no-

thing compared with the protracted wretchedness which commenced in 1837 and continued to 1842. In 1839, 1,137,000 persons were in receipt of relief in England and Wales alone; in 1840, the pauper roll contained 1,199,000; in 1841, 1,299,000; and in 1842, 1,429,000 persons. The population of England and Wales amounted at that time to about 16,000,000; so that one person out of every eleven in the country was a pauper. . . . Dead and living were crowded together in miserable dwellings. It is on record that in one case seventeen persons were found living in a room five yards square; that in another case eight persons, two looms and two beds were found in a cellar, six feet under ground, measuring four yards by five. An inquiry was made in 1841 into the condition of some 1,600 of the poor of Little Bolton. Out of the 1,600, twenty-three had no bed to sleep in; eight slept in the same bed; forty-two slept, seven in a bed, in six beds; seventy-eight slept, six in a bed, in thirteen beds; 185 slept, five in a bed, in thirty-seven beds; and 432 slept, four in a bed, in 108 beds. In Rochdale, at the same time, five-sixths of the population had scarcely a blanket among them: eighty-five families had no blanket, and forty-six families had chaff beds with no covering at all. In Paisley, 15,000 persons were in a state of starvation, with little or no clothing, and no bedding on which to lie.

Here follows a description, all of which I will not read, in order to spare the feelings of the House:

The miserable condition of the poor was, of course, due to their poverty; and poverty was not partial, it was catholic. . . . . 'I could tell you,' so ran a letter from Johnstone, 'of mothers dividing a farthing herring and a halfpennyworth of potatoes among a family of seven.' . . . . Girls, as well as boys, women, as well as men, worked under ground. The mines were usually ill-drained and ill-ventilated. The children had consequently often to work in the wet; they were kept at work in any atmosphere in which a candle would not burn. The smallest children were employed as trappers, or in opening the traps in the seams through which the coal laden carts passed. But women, boys, and girls were also engaged as hurriers, or in walking backwards and forwards pushing the carts themselves through the seams. Many of these seams were only twenty-two to twenty-eight inches high, so that none but small children could pass through them. In some cases the child was made to push the car; in other cases children, and even women, were made to draw it by the girdle and chain. The girdle was a band placed round the waist of the hurrier. The chain passed between the drawers legs, and chafed the wretched creature's thighs, as he or she drew the load. Little children of seven worked for twelve hours a day, harnessed like beasts by the girdle and chain; but, unlike the happier beasts of burden, subjected to the task before their growth was complete and their strength mature.

Sir, I think I have read enough to convince hon. gentlemen opposite, and any one may hear of this, that the great prosperity which is enjoyed by Great Britain was not based on protection. I now propose to read from a book called 'Ashworth, Cobden and the League.' I shall not read the solemn description of misery that prevailed throughout the length and breadth of England as it is pictured and I only ask hon. gentlemen opposite to go to the library and take this book of Ashworth and convince themselves that protection is the basis of England's greatness. I shall read a few of the concluding sentences which I have marked:

The correctness of the views entertained by the league, may be estimated by the variety and abundance of social and national advantages which have become apparent in every direction, as the result of the removal of restrictions upon our international trade. This may be said to amount to a practical extension of the area of our country. Our farmers, no longer affrighted by the cheap farming of foreigners, have embarked their capital, drained their land, improved their agricultual machinery, and thus the produce of the home land has been largely increased; meanwhile they have also increased the wages of their labourers; and it may be added, that although the population of the country has increased by about 17½ per cent since 1841——

This book was written away back in the sixties.

—the extent of pauperism has been diminished by upwards of 25 per cent during the same period.

The writer concludes:

The grand truth brought out and emphasized by free trade is, that it enables millions of people more to live in the home land, and to live with less exertion than they could do without it; that it stimulates intellect, improves machinery, and increases the produce of the land, the foundry, the machine shop and the loom, and by exchange of products helps us to utilize the prolific stores of the tropical and semi-tropical regions of the earth, and by extending our trading intercourse, to extend also at the same time our own measure of civilization.

Here follows a long list of the growing exports and imports of Great Britain and I will sincerely ask hon. gentlemen opposite when, again, in this House, or on the hustings they make the statement that it was due to protection that Great Britain developed her commerce, to look at this book and convince themselves, as they must be convinced, that the removal of the barriers to trade which existed in Great Britain gave her people more power over life, and free raw materials upon which to exert their industry.

Mr. Speaker, the government of which I am an humble supporter, is accused of making huge and unwarranted expenditures. I simply ask hon. gentlemen opposite to point out these huge expenditures, to itemize them. Last year and the year previous, when they were being voted upon, they refused to do so. Now, my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) made the statement the other night—and let me say that I always listen to that hon. gentleman's speeches with profound regard—that our government was doing nothing. I propose to show that our government is doing something. I wish to bring before the notice of the House a matter of great importance, and which, in view of what has occurred

in the eastern part of Canada, is deserving of far greater attention than that which has been attached to it. This government was scarcely in power before it made an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. We all know that an arrangement had been made before that time for the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway, which I think hon. gentlemen opposite would be the first to admit did not adequately protect the settlers. By the arrangement which has resulted in the lowering of freight rates on outgoing and incoming materials, Manitoba and the North-west Territories gained $750,000 a year, or in the five years during which that arrangement has been in existence there has been a gain of $3,500,000, about equivalent to the government grant to the Crow's Nest Pass railway. That is something of importance, but, it is not nearly so important as the fact that in making the arrangement some 50,000 acres of coal lands, over which the government had no control previously, were taken over and held for the benefit of the people who may occupy that part of the country in the future. Furthermore, it was arranged that coal was to be put on board cars at a price not exceeding $2 a ton and carried over the Canadian Pacific Railway lines at figures to be decided on by the government. I point to that and I say that the generations of the future will point to that one act of this government as a most important act. Fuel in the North-west Territories, as every one knows, is one of the prime requisites of life, and I point to this matter as I shall refer to it in a later part of my remarks in connection with a condition existing in the maritime provinces of which this government must take cognizance. We are making some expenditures in the endeavour to get the grain of the North-west Territories to the seaboard, and these expenditures are being made, so far as possible, to produce a condition that will bring about competition. A railway is being constructed through the Rainy River district, from Winnipeg to Port Arthur. Large subsidies are being voted to construct a road from Winnipeg to Edmonton, and from there on to the Pacific coast. Will hon. gentlemen say that these expenditures must not be made? These are great and important votes. They are votes that cannot be ignored because the conditions are such, as hon. gentlemen from the west have frequently pointed out, that neither this government nor any other government can afford to ignore the demands on the public treasury for the development of that country from which we will reap such great benefits in the future. Let me say, as I come from the extreme east, that I always listen with sympathy and regard to the requests made by hon. members on both sides of the House who come from the west in respect to this important matter of transportation. It does not directly interest us, but any man who has been over that country and has seen its resources must realize, if he is at all acquainted with the conditions which prevail in the older provinces, that the situation in that vast western country is certainly the most promising one that we have in Canada to-day. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), of course, is one of the great sinners, and let me say, as one of the maritime province men, that I have to stand up and vote for him every time he asks for money with which to deepen the St. Lawrence river. In future Quebec is to be the great summer port of Canada; still, it is necessary that the depth of the channel from Quebec to Montreal shall be maintained at thirty feet. Coal from the maritime provinces is now being transported up the St. Lawrence in boats of two, three, four and five feet more draught than formerly. In 1897 or 1898, in twenty-four days, a time when the St. Lawrence was very low, twenty-three steamers went on the ground. You can understand why the hon. Minister of Public Works had to grapple with the situation. When he took office he found that the dredges were not sufficiently large for this work and he asked parliament to provide him with money. He has been provided perhaps fairly and liberally, although he claims that he has not been given sufficient. The object of his work is one that this government cannot ignore. The deepening of the St. Lawrence from Montreal to the seaboard is a matter of national importance as well as of local importance to a great many of us.

Furthermore, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has a project which I hope in the future to be able to support, namely, the scheme for the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal. Of course we cannot fail to recognize that this is going to cost a great deal of money and that it will be a huge burden for the country to undertake, but it will be for us to consider whether the advantages which this canal will confer in the matter of cheaper transportation, may not outweigh the burdens which it will bring with it. I have been told that heavy freights cannot be carried on the railways at much less than one-half cent per ton per mile, and that on the other hand, heavy cargoes can be carried by water at from one-tenth of a cent to one-twentieth of a cent per ton per mile. From the standpoint of one who has the honour to represent a constituency in eastern Canada, I have also an interest in this Georgian Bay canal. I believe that if we have twenty feet draught in our canal system we will be able to send our coal through to the west, and we can get back what we need—and what perhaps we will need in the future more than we need now—several different kinds of iron ore which are to be found on the shores of the great lakes to carry on our great iron in-

dustry in Nova Scotia. For these reasons, this proposition appeals to me as an eastern man. It has its merit not only from the standpoint of the west, but also from the standpoint of eastern Canada. Of course, the interest which we in the east have in this scheme, will be almost infinitesimal compared with the interest it has for the western people. As to whether a company should construct this canal, or whether the government should construct it I have no very well defined view. I would prefer by long odds to see the government construct this canal, but if we can get a company to undertake to build it under conditions which are fair and which will maintain control over it by the government of this country, I sincerely hope that any further propositions along that line the government may see fit to consider carefully, and to accede to them if they be in the public interest.

The hon. gentleman from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) said that the present government was doing nothing. Let me point out briefly to him the history of this government in connection with the development of cold storage—not for fishermen which I am particularly interested in—but the development of the cold storage system for the benefit of the farmers of Canada. I say that there are two men who ought never to be forgotten by the farmers of Quebec and Ontario, and these men are Mr. Geo. Eulas Foster and Mr. Sydney Fisher. The farmers will have reason to remember these two gentlemen for different reasons. I wish to point out that so early as 1882 a good cold storage system was inaugurated between New Zealand, Australia, and London, and that system was developed up to 1893 and 1894, to a degree that placed the experiment beyond all peradventure of failure. When representations were made to Mr. Foster that a cold storage system was needed for Canada, he seemed, at least not to appreciate the immensity of the requirement. I believe I am speaking the truth when I say that it was with difficulty that a niggardly vote of $20,000 per year could be got with which to endeavour to initiate this business. I find however that for several years only $5,000 or $6,000 was expended out of that small appropriation. As I say, cold storage was no longer an experiment. It was an established fact for Australia, New Zealand, and Argentina, but Canadian public men of that day laid back, and failed to appreciate the crying needs of the country. The evidence of what I say is to be found in the votes for cold storage that this parliament was asked to pass up to the year 1896. But what happened after that? We put a farmer into the Department of Agriculture when the Liberal government came into power. Some hon. gentlemen say that he is a kid gloved farmer, but I have seen him stand up in this House to defend his department, and I think it has been sufficiently demonstrated that the present Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is not only a scientific man but a practical man as well. He took office in 1896. He was not satisfied that the products of Ontario and Quebec were being dealt with to the best advantage for the farmers of these provinces. He at once asked parliament for a vote, not of $20,000; but the first year he was in office he asked parliament for a vote of $100,000 and every year since he got a vote of $100,000, and he expended these votes, and the result is that to-day we have a chain of cold storage extending from the Rocky Mountains into the markets of London, Manchester and Liverpool—a systm of cold storage inferior to none to be found elsewhere in the world. I would be doing an injustice, Sir, if I did not in this connection remember the services which have been rendered to this country by Prof. Robertson, who has enthusiastically directed his great technical knowledge and skill to the successful development and perfection of this system of cold storage. I repeat, that the farmers of Quebec and Ontario should never forget that the public records show that the Hon. Mr. Foster asked from parliament for three or four years the inadequate sum of $20,000 for the establishment of cold storage, and that when the present Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Sydney Fisher, came to office, he at once grappled with the question and had $100,000 a year appropriated, which has been expended every year since then with the result that the farmers of this country to-day are enjoying a prosperity that they were strangers to before.

Now, Sir, I intend to deal at some length with the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, before the House rose for recess, I was endeavouring to persuade hon. gentlemen opposite that the conditions which have been arrived at in Great Britain since the inauguration of a free trade policy, are not based, as has been frequently said by hon. members on the other side of the House, on a prosperity that developed under a system of protection. I think I effectually showed, from the statements of different historians of the period, that never in the history of the British Islands had such a state of distress and degradation prevailed as that which prevailed from 1800 to 1845. I omitted to point out that the population of the British Islands, which at that time was about 16,000,000, has since grown to some 40,000,000, a population which has almost trebled itself in the short space of sixty years; to-day in Great Britain a degree of prosperity pre-

vails which is not equalled in any other European country, unless possibly in France; and the shipping industries of the country, which at that time were considerable, have increased by leaps and bounds until to-day, there are, for every man, woman and child in the United Kingdom, from the King down to the youngest child in a foundling charity, 2½ tons of shipping. I think that is an evidence of very great expansion.

When referring to the development of the iron industry in Nova Scotia up to 1896, I omitted to point out—and I am informed by a man as well qualified as any other man in America to speak on this point—that every iron business inaugurated and built up under a system of high protective duties in the United States, which existed between the state of Maine and New York, had to leave the site on which it was built up, and move away west; that to-day there is nothing but a spot of rust to mark the former sites of those original iron industries which were developed under protection; that in fact the iron business of the United States has moved to the west, where coal, iron and lime lie in juxtaposition to be worked to the best advantage. And, I pointed out that the prosperity we hope to attain from the development of iron in the eastern part of Canada depends entirely upon that industry being placed at the point where it can be most advantageously worked.

Now, Sir, I hope I shall be permitted for a short time to refer to another project which was initiated by this government: that is, the provision of cold storage for fishermen. Up to this time the success which has attended that project has been gratifying; but we have not yet grappled with the problem in the way which in my opinion is required. We have in the maritime provinces a fishing industry which is worth annually anywhere from $13,000,000 to $15,000,000. We have engaged in this business a population of 45,000 or 47,000 fishermen and fishermen's sons, who represent a population of probably 200,000. In the old days, when people were content to work hard and live in a different way from what they expect to live in to-day, our fishing population showed an inclination to remain there. But unfortunately we have to admit that under the improved conditions of life that population in the eastern counties of Quebec, in the Magdalen Islands, and on the shores of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, shows an inclination to move away from the fishing industry, and, instead of going to the North-west and other parts of Canada to take up lands, they move to the United States. Now, this is a serious state of affairs for the whole of Canada, and particularly throughout the maritime provinces, and if there is any method available by which this can be stopped or diminished, I submit that this government is in duty bound to initiate a measure for that purpose. You are to-day engaged in a project to provide a system of cold storage for the shore fishermen. You have some 600 or 700 schooners fitted up for the deep sea fisheries, which lose on an average anywhere from three to six weeks out of the five months fishing season. You can understand that this means an enormous loss to the fishermen and to the maritime provinces. Now, I propose that the government should inaugurate another system for the deep sea fishermen. I propose that somewhere about Grand Manan, in the Bay of Fundy, or somewhere in the western part of Nova Scotia, in the Strait of Canso, and somewhere about Gaspé and the Magdalen Islands—at three or four of these places, large freezers should be erected, costing anywhere from $4,000 or $5,000 up to $15,000 or $20,000 each; and that these should be supplemented by two or three steamers built on the plan of Scotch trawlers, and fitted with refrigerators, to be used to collect bait, and to concentrate at these different points, where the bank fishermen could come and get bait. These steamers could also be used to distribute the bait to small freezers, of which we require some one or two hundred in the maritime provinces. It may be said that this would require a large amount of money. I admit that; but the industry is of such importance to us, from the standpoint of population, and it has such capabilities that I believe the government would be justified in making a very generous expenditure, say $150,000 or $200,000, to meet the requirements of this business.

Furthermore, I must point out that the government has in its custody some $5,000,000 known as the fishery award. For want of a better method to make this serve the fishermen, the government pays out the interest upon it in the shape of small bounties of from $3 to $4.50 to the owners of small fishing boats for shore fishing, and a certain amount per ton is given to the deep sea fishermen. Well, Sir, I think it requires no argument of mine to convince the government and the House that this method of appropriation, while it may be fairly good, could be improved upon; and if funds are short, it would not to any extent effect the bounty given to the fishermen, if a small amount of the capital were utilized to provide the facilities to which I have just referred. I am sure, from what we know of the development of this business on the shores of the maritime provinces, from what we know has taken place between New York and Gloucester, Boston and the Western States of America, we may with confidence look forward to results from a bold policy in regard to the fishing business which will be gratifying and of great benefit to the country.

I recollect, some three or four years ago, attending a banquet to the hon. Minister of Finance in New Glasgow, at which the

Minister of Railways was also present; and in reply to a toast the Minister of Railways said that when he removed from the arena of New Brunswick politics to that of the House of Commons to take up the position of Minister of Railways, he felt, considering the conditions which had existed on the Intercolonial railway for several years before, that it would be possible for him to do something of service to the country in connection with that railway, and perhaps win some little distinction for himself. I take the ground that the policy inaugurated by the Minister of Railways has been a bold, aggressive, successful and effective one in the interests of the country. It will not take many more years to silence the criticisms on the purchase of the Drummond road and the consequent expenditure on the Intercolonial railway. In fact criticism on that measure is practicaly dead to-day. I do not think that there is an hon. gentleman on either side who will have the courage to stand up and criticise the action of the Minister of Railways when he abrogated the arrangements between the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. By this arrangement, which existed between the late government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the agents of the Canadian Pacific Railway were given power to corral the whole of the business of the maritime provinces for their road. Even in the very offices of the Intercolonial railway, its officials were not allowed to solicit traffic for their own road. That arrangement the Minister of Railways abrogated. Is there an hon. gentleman in this House who has sufficient courrage to stand up and condemn the Minister of Railways for his action in that respect.

We have been told that we are doing nothing. But surely this act of the hon. minister was an aggressive and a bold act, particularly in view of the fact that in the last election in the constituency of St. John a determined effort was made to fight the minister to the death on that very issue. However, the result showed that when a man takes a bold stand on a great public issue the people of the country will stand by him. We are criticised for our expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway. I wish to say to the hon. gentleman opposite that the finality of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway is not yet in sight, and some of us on this side are going to insist that much more generous appropriations be made to still further the interests of that line for the people of Canada. Before I am through to-night, I propose to show that the expenditures which have been made have already been so productive of good that the result gives the people of this country, who are enthusiastic believers in the state ownership of railways, good warrant for continuing their advocacy of that policy. I would ask the House to bear with me a short time while I read a few figures dealing with the history and development of that road.

I find that in the six years from 1880 to 1885 inclusive, the average annual expenditure was $1,243,281.62 on a mileage of 863, or an average expenditure per mile of $1,440.65. Taking the next period, from 1885 to 1896, eleven years—and this was the period during which the Intercolonial railway was starved—the average expenditure per year on capital account was $396,384 on a mileage of 1,057. Then taking the next period, from 1896 to 1901—a period of great development on the Intercolonial railway—I find that the capital expenditure only amounted to $1,381,924.80 per year on an average mileage of 1,250. In other words, the average annual expenditure per mile amounted to $1,113.54, between 1896 and 1901 against $1,440 a great many years before, and recollect that our expenditure was in the last period necessarily greater by long odds. Yet in spite of that, we did perform the service per mile at $327 less during the last four or five years than it cost hon. gentlemen opposite to perform it.

Let us look at the average working expenses, and let me again bring to the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite that a saving was affected during the last few years of the Conservative regime. But how was it affected? By reduced wages, by an inferior train service, and by the fact that possibly there was not sufficient business to keep the train hands busy. In 1896-97, only the regular hands were constantly employed, and the train hands engaged for the special were from one-quarter to one-half their time idle. From 1882 to 1886, the average working expenses amounted to $2,382,243 on an average mileage of 891, making $2,674 per mile. From 1887 to 1891 the average working expenses had increased to $3,351,343 or $3,372 per mile, and from 1892 to 1896 the expenses had fallen to $3,083,219 or thereabouts, and the operating expenses of the road were reduced from $3,372 to $2,700 per mile. That was done by the Conservatives, but how was it accounted for? By a reduction of wages, by inferior train service, and by the fact that there was not sufficient business to keep the railway employees constantly at work. Last year we had a large deficit on the road. How do you account for this? In 1896 the money paid for fuel on the Intercolonial railway amounted to $408,861 against $973,268 in 1901, or the coal purchased for the Intercolonial Railway in 1901 cost more than twice as much as it did in 1896. But I shall deal with that matter a little later. So much for fuel. I am dealing now with the three items of fuel, the wages paid to the employees, and the repairs made on the road, and to these three I would call special attention. That is, coal in 1901 cost a great deal more than twice as much as it did in 1896. Now, for repairs, I shall compare the two years 1896 and 1901:

Intercolonial Railway—comparison of cost of repairs, 1896 and 1901.

	1896.	1901.
Repairs to engines, tenders and tools	$230,257	$413,127
Repairs to passenger cars	65,534	128,222
Repairs to postal, express and baggage cars	19,133	31,493
Repairs to freight cars and vans	205,191	326,075
Repairs to rails and fastenings including ties	54,041	78,659
For ties	87,920	123,997
Timber, lumber, etc., for repairs to bridges and snow-fences	82,551	97,973
Repairs to buildings, platforms, including extensions and additions	62,272	100,081
Repairs to tools	8,245	22,374
Total for repairs	815,044	1,322,001

Mr. TAYLOR. That is economy with a vengeance.

Mr. KENDALL. Sometimes, generous expenditure is the wisest economy, as I think I shall show. Now, we come to the question of wages, and for this comparison I will take three years :

Intercolonial Railway—comparison of wages for 1891, 1896 and 1901.

——	1901.	1896.	1891.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Wages of drivers, firemen and cleaners	468,734 14	264,604 16	274,281 45
Wages of conductors, train, baggage and brakesmen	452,385 55	255,412 68	259,940 94
Wages in repairing roadway, fences, semaphores, and laying new sidings	612,571 94	353,687 70	396,937 65
Station masters, agents, clerks, telegraph operators, station baggagemasters, yard masters, switchmen and labourers	506,866 40	303,796 20	297,226 60

It will be noticed that during the five years before 1891, the wages for drivers, firemen and cleaners amounted to considerably more than in 1896 itself. Hon. gentlemen opposite who were then in power were curtailing expenses in that year, with results that we shall see later on. The wages I have given do not include salaries paid to general manager, manager, traffic manager, district superintendents and all high-priced officials. It will be seen that there was an increase in 1901 over 1896 of the total wages as I have just given them of $863,000. Now, let me recapitulate these increases in 1901 as compared with 1896 :

Increase for coal	$564,407
" for wages	863,057
Repairs	506,957
Grand total of increases in expenses of 1901 over 1896	$1,934,421

I have a note to the effect that there was an increase of labour of about 70 per cent, and the receipts show also an increase of about 70 per cent in 1901 as against 1896.

Now, the freight carried in 1895-6 was 1,379,618 tons, and in 1901 the freight carried was 2,111,310 tons, or an increase of 731,962 tons. The number of passengers in 1896 was 1,471,866, and in 1901, 2,025,296, or an increase of more than half a million passengers carried on the Intercolonial Railway in 1901 over the number carried in 1896. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite talk about increased working expenses. Is it reasonable to suppose that this huge addition to the business of the Intercolonial Railway could be made without a corresponding increase in cost ? And let me remind hon. gentlemen opposite—and I do not wish to criticise the former minister too harshly—that possibly, in a legitimate desire to curtail the expenses of the Intercolonial Railway during a period of depression from 1891 to 1896, the hon. gentleman went too far and starved the road to a condition that made it more expensive than it otherwise would have been to bring it up to the condition that the trade of the country required in 1901. Now, let us look at the revenue :—

	1895-6.	1900-1.	Increase.
	$	$	$
Earnings from passenger traffic	971,426	1,607,166	635,740
Freight traffic	1,788,813	3,121,006	1,332,193
Mails and express freight	197,400	244,062	46,662
Totals	2,957,639	4,972,234	2,014,595
	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Earnings per mile of railway	2,589 00	3,782 00	
Earnings per train mile	76 97	79 39	

Earnings per mile of railway in 1891, $2,721.

Now let us compare the gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway at different periods with the capital employed at different periods :

	Average Yearly Capital.	Average Gross Yearly Earnings.	Rate per cent on Average Capital.
	$	$	
1887-91, inclusive..	50,927,597	2,920,278	5·73
1892-96 " ..	55,680,771	2,979,362	5·35
1897-01 " ..	59,391,990	3,849,267	6·48
1900-01 " ..	63,975,000	4,972,000	7·77

In 1892-96 was the period when the expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for different reasons were curtailed. Now it will be observed that in the years of the reduction of expenses from 1891 to 1896, the percentage of gross earnings on capital employed fell from 5·73 to 5·33, and that percentage rose in 1897-01 to 6·48, and in the last year, as I have stated, to 7·77.

Let us compare the average deficits for several terms of years. The average deficit since the opening of the road in 1876 has been $207,478. The average deficit from 1876 to 1896 was $230,608. The average deficit of $267,461, extending over a period of 10 years (1887-96), was reduced by 57 per cent during the past five years.

Now, in the face of these figures I venture to reassert what I said a few moments ago, that the railway policy of the present administration has been bold, aggressive, and, as I said before, effective in the best interests of the country. I may also say for the information of the leader of the opposition who was not in his seat when I made the remark before, that I consider that the end of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway is not yet in sight, that we want large sums of money for still further development. I think before long we may expect that a fast line of steamers will leave some British port for some port on the St. Lawrence, and that on the way to the St. Lawrence this fast line of steamers will probably call at North Sydney. But I want to point out that before the fast Atlantic service can be made effective for the rapid delivery of passengers and mails, a very considerable expense will have yet to be made on the Intercolonial Railway, and this expense will be as justifiable as most of the expenditures made during the previous years. I wish to point out that one of the difficulties on the Intercolonial Railway is a very heavy grade between Truro and Amherst, that is what is known as the Folly River Mountain. That grade will probably have to be avoided, and for that purpose a line of railway will have to be constructed from Amherst to Pugwash, which is now one of the termini of the short line. Furthermore, this road will have to be carried across the harbour of Pictou, a bridge will have to be built there, and then the road may be connected with the present road a little way outside of Pictou Landing. Furthermore, it is impossible economically to convey heavy loads of freight from Cape Breton West for the reason that soon after leaving the Strait of Canso a mountain has to be climbed. This will have to be avoided, and I have no doubt at considerable expense, by sending the road around the gulf shore to the Strait of Canso.

Now, Sir, I come to a matter of considerable magnitude, a matter which cannot be much longer disregarded and that is the necessity of buildng a bridge across the Strait of Canso. Before the fast Atlantic line can be made effective we shall have to have these improvements made at the points on the Intercolonial Railway that I have indicated, and furthermore we must have a bridge across the Strait of Canso. I propose now to show to the House that large expenditures on the eastern end of the Intercolonial are not only justifiable but are demanded in the interests of the road and in the interest of the country. Sir, what is the situation ? You have a great coal business developing in Great Britain, and with unlimited possibilities. You have heard the story of the development of the Dominion Coal Company ; and I now tell you that Mackenzie & Mann, on the Inverness side of Cape Breton, have got a property which probably within a very few years will rival that of the Dominion Coal Company. It is with some satisfaction that I refer to the coal trade of this country, in the light of recent events.

I was the first public man in the eastern part of Nova Scotia who had the courage to stand up before an audience of miners and tell them that the future of the coal business did not depend on protection. It was a venturesome thing to do and the first time I did it, I was snowed under—I expected to be anyway. In 1891, when I never expected to be a politician (and I never wished to be), at a great meeting in Louisbourg, before there was a coal trade there, before there were facilities for shipping coal, before our coal was going to the United States, to South America and the Mediterranean, I met the champion of the coal trade in eastern Nova Scotia, the gentleman who is now Senator McKeen. I was a mere boy in politics then. I well remember the ridicule he poured upon me when I said the day would come when the great coal measures of Cape Breton, which had been placed there by the Almighty for the use of the people all along the coasts of the Atlantic, would be supplying coal for the markets of the world. It was his game to tell the people that the whole of the coal business depended on protection. I could not blame the people if they disbelieved me. Mr. McKeen was supposed to know all about it. The hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) was good enough to refer to the connection which Prince Edward Island has with the coal trade of Cape Breton. I am glad to see this because it shows that persons in different parts of the maritime provinces

are looking at the relationship which exists between the different provinces of the country. I remember that he stated what I have so often heard on the hustings in Cape Breton that the development of this trade is due to the national policy. I would tell him now, if he were here, that I will agree with him that in 1878, 1879 and in 1880 the imposition of the coal duty was a benefit to the coal trade of Nova Scotia, but that coincident with the imposition of that duty on coal was a rapid lowering of freight rates from the fact that the old fashioned sailing vessels which required anywhere from $2.50 to $3.50 per ton to convey coal from Cape Breton to Montreal, were displaced by steamers, which in turn, were displaced by more modern steamers, and there came a more rapid lowering of the freight rates from $3.50 to $3, from $3 to $2, to $1.25 to $1 and on until they got down, in 1897, to 85 cents, or 90 cents a ton. I would like to ask the hon. member for West Prince : If the duty was of such great value to us, what would he consider to be the value of the reduction in freight rates to the extent of from $1 to $2 per ton ? Now, Sir, I may be taunted with the reply that the party I support has not taken the duty off coal. I will not agree to the removal of duty from coal to any greater extent than at present. I hold that for every dollar's worth of coal that we sell as the result of protection we lose anywhere from $2, $3 as the result of the system of protection, but, I am going to insist as long as I am in this House and as long as the tariff is framed as it is framed on having that duty maintained in order that Ontario may pay a fair share of the public revenues, because we are compelled by our situation down there and by the situation that the tariff creates to take enormous quantities of the products of Ontario on which we have to pay large taxes. That is our situation.

Mr. TAYLOR. What taxes do you pay on produce from Ontario ?

Mr. KENDALL. We pay on all your agricultural machinery, pianos, organs, sewing machines, milling machinery and carriages. Everything you produce goes down there, the trains are loaded with your products and you take nothing back.

Mr. TAYLOR. You pay no taxes on that all the same.

Mr. KENDALL. We pay taxes into the pockets of the manufacturers.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Nonsense, nonsense.

Mr. KENDALL. But I have digressed. I say it is some gratification, as being the first public man who took that stand, to find Mr. James Ross, the leading director of the Dominion Coal Company, a few weeks ago give an interview to one of the Montreal papers, in which he said : My assistant manager has just returned from the Mediterranean, where he has found markets for our coal. I well recollect the ridicule I had to submit to from the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, when I said that our coal would go into the Mediterranean. I also recollect having my own political friends pull me down and say : For God's sake do not make our party ridiculous. It is with some gratification that I point to the fact that the leading man in connection with the Dominion Coal Company made the statement that his assistant manager has just returned from the Mediterranean and that he had found markets not only for their own surplus coal, but, markets for the other collieries in Nova Scotia for all the coal they had to send. Now, I come to another matter and as I think it is somewhat important, I would ask hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to give it their earnest attention. We have had a great development of the coal business. We are glad of it. We have endeavoured to make the conditions under which these large companies operate as generous as possible, consistent with the public good, but before I go into this question, I wish to point out that the Liberal party in Nova Scotia, of which the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was at the time leader, was charged with having created a coal monopoly. There is no monopoly. Right across the water the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company have purchased the property of the General Mining Association and instead of being content with an output of 250,000 tons a year they have an output of 300,000 tons, they are making preparations for an output of 600,000 tons and they will probably before long, have an output of nearly a million tons. Other coal companies in Nova Scotia are operating coal mines. There is no monopoly, and here I wish to point out and I am going to deal with a serious condition, but, I wish to point out before doing so, that this monopoly which the Liberals were said to have brought into existence is selling its coal cheaper than the other companies.

Now, we are confronted with a serious condition. We have a coal business in the maritime provinces which is one of the most strongly placed industries we have in Canada. Sir, this business is getting too strong. The coal producers in Nova Scotia are taxing all the people from Montreal down to Halifax and Cape Breton, a great deal too much for coal. They are taxing the Intercolonial Railway too much for coal; they are taxing the Intercolonial Railway to an extent that will surprise you when I mention the figures. I say that on the Intercolonial Railway last year we paid at least $300,000 too much for coal—an amount which would this year wipe out the whole of the deficit and leave a large amount to the credit of that road. And, Sir, the serious feature of the thing is that we have got to be thankful to these coal companies that they have not charged us at least 50 cents or 75 cents

more per ton. It is in their power to do so. They are within their rights in their charges. I do not quarrel with them on that score. But, a certain condition of things has arisen. These coal producers are the masters of the situation; they are the masters of a natural monopoly, and by combining they can dictate terms to every consumer of coal, including the government, from Cape Breton down to Montreal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is to be done about this ? Every factory, every railway, every householder, is paying too much for coal, and what are you going to do about it ? The coal companies are within their rights.

An hon. MEMBER. Take the duty off.

Mr. KENDALL. Taking the duty off will not help it, because coal from England or from the United States cannot get into that territory. I defy refutation of that statement. Then what is to be done about it ? A condition like this is not entirely new in the history of the world. To-day I pointed out that in British Columbia, when the government was making its arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, as one of the concessions required in return for the sum of $3,800,000 given to that railroad, the government took over some 50,000 acres of coal land and stipulated that when the coal was mined it should be put on board the cars at a price not exceeding $2 a ton, and should be carried to the North-west at rates to be decided upon by the government. I referred to that this afternoon in connection with what was in my mind with regard to the Nova Scotia situation. What is to be done ? The government, as I have shown, has to a certain extent dealt with a similar situation in the North-west. A few years ago in New Zealand, the premier of that colony was confronted with a similar condition. Manufacturers came to him and said : The coal producers of New Zealand are charging a price for coal that absorbs the profits of our business; we have some thousands of people employed; the situation must be met; we have got to get coal cheaper or the government of New Zealand must take upon itself to support the thousands of operatives whom we must throw out of employment. Mr. Seddon was the premier of New Zealand at that time. I do not suppose that he acted in a hurry. There is no doubt he thought the matter over and talked it over. When the crisis came he went to his telephone and called up the leading coal operators and said in effect: I am not going to have 6,000 or 8,000 operatives of factories thrown on the hands of the government for support while you destroy the business of the manufacturers for the benefit of your coal trade; your coal trade is making too much money; you have got the opportunity and you are taking advantage of it: the industries of the country are suffering; we have a government meeting to-morrow at twelve o'clock and I give you until twelve o'clock to-morrow to say whether or not you will supply the manufacturers of this part of New Zealand with coal at such a figure, and if you will not do so, the government will telegraph to England to get out mining machinery and will mine the coal itself.

Now, Sir, there is the situation that I believe the government of Canada has to face. Recollect that the coal companies are within their rights; they can charge us nearly what they like. There is plenty more coal to be developed there but if small operators go there to develop coal mines the large operators will absorb them or put them out of business. Let a Montreal or a Quebec coal dealer undertake to bring coal to any considerable extent from England or Wales, and what would be done ? The coal companies in Cape Breton and Nova Scotia will at once lower the price of coal and teach these men a lesson that they will not want to read again. They can undersell them to almost any extent they wish.

I say, Sir, that the time has come, or the the time has pretty nearly come when that situation which interests some three millions of people from Montreal to the sea board, must be met, and particularly so, as the government of this country is a large purchaser of coal, and will be a larger purchaser in the future than at present. Now, Mr. Speaker I shall make a statement to the House on the strength of two of the best mining engineers of Nova Scotia, one of whom has mined millions of tons of coal. I say on the strength of the statement of these engineers : That to-day, whereas in Cape Breton you are paying $2.70, $2.80 and $2.90 per ton for coal ; the government could mine that coal and put it on its cars for $1 per ton. I say, that in Pictou on the main land, where you pay anywhere from $3.00 to $3.25 per ton ; on the statement of two of the best mining engineers of Nova Scotia, men of large experience—I could give the names in confidence to the hon. leader of the opposition but I do not wish to make them public—on the strength of the experience of these men, I say that this government could in Cumberland and in Pictou put coal on board the cars at $1.25 per ton, for which it is now paying $3 and $3.50 per ton. That would mean a saving of $600,000 or $700,000 a year on the purchases of coal by this government. Is that a small item ? When we were confronted with deficits on the Intercolonial Railway, and when the tax payers of Canada are told by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and perhaps by the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House : That the Intercolonial Railway should be made to pay ; and when with honest efforts to make it pay the result has been that we have during the last few years an average deficit of $114,000 a

year—although I am happy to say that notwithstanding the high price of coal during this current year there is a possibility that the Intercolonial Railway will come out on the 30th of June next without very much of a deficit—I say that when this very large sum can be saved to the people of Canada on the purchase of coal alone, is it not a matter for us to consider? It would be not only a saving of $600,000 or $700,000 a year to the government, but on the basis of the present purchases of coal it would mean a saving of anywhere from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000 to the factories, the other railways, and the householders from Montreal east who purchased this coal. Of course in the near future, with the larger purchases of coal, that saving would be greatly increased.

Now Sir, there is one weak point in what I have stated, I would not advise the government to go into the mining of coal unless the miners of Nova Scotia were willing to make a compact with the government. I wish to tell the hon. gentlemen opposite who are not acquainted with the men who operate the mines in Nova Scotia, something about these Nova Scotia miners so that there may be no misgivings on this point. It is admitted by persons who have travelled over the collieries of Europe and of America, that the Nova Scotia miners are probably the best class of any miners in the world. What is the history of coal mining in that province? Labour there has been organized and highly organized. The mining labour there does not consist of numbers of unorganized men. They are a strong organized body, probably the best organized body of labourers in Canada. They are not like the shifting mining populations of the western states. They are a class of men who are citizens, who own property and have a stake in the country, who are zealous to maintain their churches and schools. And just here let me interject the remark that with all the development that has taken place there, I am a little apprehensive. I would prefer not to see too rapid a development. The danger of a too rapid development is that we may have to draft into our mining population large hordes of men from outside, who will not assimilate with our people, whose aspirations and whose civilization are not the same. Therefore, I am a little apprehensive on this point, and the mining population are a little apprehensive. They are also beginning to see that the ambitions of the capitalists are factors which they may have to fight in the future as they have never had to do in the past, and they want to be left in a position to meet that situation.

I say the miners of Nova Scotia will not be content to have their normal aspirations as citizens crushed out. I do not know whether the miners will agree with this or not; but I say that if the government should go and put a fair proposition before the miners, they will at least consider it. I believe the government will be in a position to put a proposition before them that will be attractive; and if an agreement is made, these miners will stand to it. Let me tell you that in spite of our strong organization in the county of Cape Breton we have not had a strike for 16 years. In Cumberland and Pictou there have been several strikes; but they were due largely to the fact, I am sorry to say, that the managers were probably more unreasonable than the men, for I have heard the statement made by those well qualified to judge that if the same managers who operated the Cape Breton collieries had been in charge of the mines in other parts of the province, many of these disturbances would probably never have taken place.

Now, Sir, there are certain features which I believe can be attached to a policy of governmental mining of coal that will be attractive. You are aware that in other countries, particularly in New Zealand, Great Britain, Belgium and Switzerland there is a movement on foot for the betterment for the condition of labour. I say if the government undertook to secure to the mining population fair wages, compensation for injury and death, and old age pensions—and it would only cost a few cents per ton on the coal to initiate these measures—and if we could guarantee that the present position of the miners as regards their comfort and independence would not be disturbed, I believe it would be possible for this government to make a working arrangement down there that would be highly profitable to all concerned.

My proposition would be that an independent commission should be formed to work these mines. There are numbers of properties which can be expropriated, and a number which can be obtained without expropriating, sufficient to furnish the coal required by the government in the eastern part of Canada for the next hundred years. I believe this proposition would find favour in the minds of the people, who feel that the situation as regards the high price of bituminous coal is becoming intolerable, and I suggest to the government that they investigate this proposition. I do not ask for any hurried action; but I ask that they go over the ground to see that the coal is available, to consult with labour organizations of the country, and to see if some arrangement cannot be made whereby the existing evil may be overcome. These great coal companies will sell coal to-day in the city of Portland at a far lower price than they will to me, who lives within ten miles of the place where the coal is produced. It is true, they may sell there 5,000 tons and to me only one or two tons, yet the difference in the price is so great as to constitute a

burden for which if possible a remedy should be found.

Allow me to come back to the question of bridging the Straits of Canso. I believe that this question has been investigated by an engineer (Mr. Donkin) who has a reputation as wide as Canada, and who holds that the structure can be built for about $4,000,000. I know that when I speak of more millions in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, people are apt to stop for breath, but, Sir, the situation that is developing there is one that will warrant the country in making further large expenditures. I pointed out just now that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann are developing a great coal property. Other properties are developing. The Dominion Coal Company will greatly develop. The Nova Scotia Steel Company is developing not only its steel plant, but also its coal beds. I made a prophecy a few years ago that our coal would go to the Mediterranean, and I think I will venture another prophecy to-night ; that is that where to-day we mine about 3,500,000 tons of coal on the Island of Cape Breton, before the end of another ten years will mine 10,000,000. To this add the development of the iron industry.

There are other public works in the county of Cape Breton and in connection with the Intercolonial Railway to which I must ask the consideration of the Minister of Railways. I said not long ago that we expected before very long to have a fast Atlantic steamship service, and that the point at which the steamers will meet the Intercolonial Railway in Cape Breton will probably be North Sydney. The present accommodation at North Sydney is not sufficient for the present business, and I want to point out this again in justification of many of the acts of the Minister of Railways. In the autumn of 1897, when the Minister of Railways visited the town of North Sydney, he found that the railway had not been extended down to the water. The Messrs. Reid had completed their railway across the island of Newfoundland, and it was necessary in the public interest that a considerable amount of money should be expended in connection with the steamship service and the railway of Messrs. Reid, in Newfoundland. An extension was made which for a short time met or nearly met the requirements of business ; but to-day the business between the Intercolonial Railway and the Reid system of railways has grown to such an extent, that the present facilities providede by the Minister of Railways are entirely insufficient to meet the requirements of the trade, and I am going to urge upon him to make very considerable appropriations in order that the wharf at the end of the Intercolonial Railway may be made wider and longer, and that the water about it may be dredged, so that we may be in a position to acommodate any vessel of any size that is likely to come there. The Intercolonial Railway will be crippled if some appropriations are not made for providing increased facilities, particularly for the eastern end of the road. I wish to point out that that part of the road between St. John and Truro and Halifax and the Sydneys is the part that pays the best, that the expenditures made on it up to this time have been justified by the results, and that still more expenditure is required in order to get still better results. I should also say here that the Webb syndicate are building a railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisbourg, which will open up a valuable piece of country, and in its connections will certainly develop a considerable amount of trade. What its future connections may be is, of course, a matter of conjecture at present.

I have spoken at some length appreciably of the Intercolonial Railway. There is another matter to which I would draw the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals and concerning which I cannot congratulate myself, as a representative of the county, or him as a minister. I have pointed out that the amount of money expended on that road has greatly increased. I have to admit in the hon. minister's favour that the rate of wages to a great many people employed on the track has been increased, but I believe that no industry ought to exist, in this or any other country, which cannot stand on its own bottom and pay its employees sufficient wages to keep them and their families according to the requirements of our civilization. That is a proposition which the people will endorse. I say that there are three classes of labourers on the Intercolonial Railway, the trackmen, the mechanics and the freight handlers, who are altogether inadequately paid. The condition of some of these men in large places like Halifax, Truro, and Sydney is simply pitiable. Everybody knows that no man with a wife and family of three or four children can live decently, where he has to pay a rent of from $10 to $12 a month, on a wage of $1.25 to $1.30 per day, and I shall have in a few days, I hope, the pleasure of supporting the resolution of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) that in the opinion of this House, the time has come when at least nothing under $1.50 per day shall be paid to the workingmen on the Intercolonial Railway. I cannot too strongly emphasize my discontent with the conditions of many of the labouring men along that road.

There is another matter on which I may speak a few moments without wearying the House, as it is one of very great importance to the larger part of our population, the labour element, the hon. members on both sides may as well recognize that this is a question which will not down, and that the movements on foot in other countries are to-day getting a start in Canada. This question, Sir, has got to be dealt with. I congratulate

the hon. Minister of Labour on what he has done. He has done considerable in the interests of labour, and I am happy to know that he has measures yet in contemplation which he proposes to put on the statutes for the benefit of our labouring men. Not long ago a deputation from the Trades and Labour Council of Canada waited on the government. By the courtesy of one of its members I happened to be present, and I think that the members of the government who were there must have been convinced that from British Columbia to Nova Scotia there is a deep-seated conviction in the labour element of the country that labour does not get a fair share of the profits of industry. I think that that point was emphasized, and I take the ground that while we cannot initiate some measures in the interests of labour in this parliament, and that while many such measures must be introduced in the local legislatures, the government of Canada, so far as it is an employer of labour, should be a model employer of labour. I think that that is a proposition which no one, when he goes before the people, will venture to contradict. Some of you may recollect that last session I requested the government to collect during recess from other countries measures that have been there adopted for the benefit of labouring men. The late Mr. Harper was engaged in collecting this information when he came to his death by drowning, and shortly before his untimely demise he intimated to me that he had collected a considerable amount of information on this matter, and told me where I could find the balance, and I am indeed indebted to him for having secured the amount of information I have now in my possession. My hon. friend from Cumberland, as you are aware, Sir, has on the Order paper a notice of motion with regard to rates of wages on the Intercolonial Railway, and I have also a resolution on that paper asking that the government recognize that the time has come when the provisions of the British Workmen's Compensation Act should be made available for the labourers of this country. I quite recognize that this is a very radical measure. Lord Salisbury put it through in 1897, at the instance of Mr. Chamberlain, and shortly afterwards one of Lord Salisbury's supporters resigned his position in the House, and wrote a pamphlet against him entitled 'Conservative or Socialist, Which ?' I saw that in 1898. I got a copy of that measure and showed it to the premier of Nova Scotia in 1898 ; and the following year, when he visited Great Britain, he inquired into its working with the result that he came back convinced that the Act was a workable one, and introduced in Nova Scotia what is known as the Employer's Liability Act, which contains many of the provisions of the Employer's Liability Act of Ontario, with those of the Workmen's Compensation Act of England grafted on it. I take the ground that what is not too good for the British workingmen is not at all too good for his Canadian fellow-labourer, and if this Act has been found workable and beneficial in England, it is a fair proposition for the government to put it on our statute-books for the benefit of its employees.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer very briefly. The Dominion Iron and Steel Company, of Sydney, is, in a certain sense, a child of the government. It receives a large bounty from the government. It has received concessions from the town of Sydney, from the legislature of Nova Scotia and from this government. The country is making an investment in that business, an investment which will probably meet the initial losses which are always incident to the inauguration of a new industry. Sir, I say that business is to a certain extent the child of the government ; and I take the ground that when this parliament bonused that institution and several other similar institutions, it supposed that Canadian labour would not be discriminated against at least. Our workmen down in Nova Scotia—and we have also a number from other provinces—are not narrow-minded men. They recognize that a large amount of skilled labour had to be brought in from the United States in order to operate that plant. No exception is taken to that. And, Sir, I am not one who would deny to a man from the United States a day's work in Cape Breton or anywhere in Canada ; and, if he came over and, as a good citizen was ready to cast in his lot with us, we would do everything we could to help him. But I do not want to see men brought in here if they are going to displace our own men, particularly when the taxes of those men are drawn upon to pay bonuses to these companies. I think that is a fair proposition. I do not wish to be harsh, but I will say that the spirit of the Alien Labour Law has been impudently violated by that company. I say that Canadians have been discriminated against ; I say that men have been brought in here who are not required. I admit that a great many men were brought in who were required. Many of them are able, capable men, and their services will be of value in assisting our development. But I emphatically protest against discriminations against our workmen. To my knowledge, capable men who were occupying similar positions to those filled by friends of the managers are being paid only 50 or 60 or 70 per cent as much as men brought from the United States.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. For the same work ?

Mr. KENDALL. Doing the same work. If I hesitate, it is because I wish to be a little careful, for I feel inclined to say, perhaps, a little more than I will say. I shall reserve anything further for a later day, be-

cause I have been promised by certain directors in that company that the state of affairs will be improved. But I wish to point out to the directors of the Steel Company and the Coal Company, that they and the great banking institutions have made a great investment in Cape Breton in coal and iron, and it will pay them to make an investment in the good feeling of the country. I wish to say—and I feel a little restraint in making this remark—that a document was put into my hands not very long ago issued by the company to the workmen under twenty-one years of age, intimating to these young men that if they did not sign away their rights under the Employer's Liability Act of Nova Scotia, which I have just spoken of, they could consider themselves dismissed. Sir, I say that that is an arbitrary act, that is an act that can only be characterized as an act of oppression. And what I now say I say with deliberation, having thought it out, and I am prepared to take the responsibility of it—that, if the great Napoleons of capital of this country undertake to crush out the legitimate aspirations of our labouring population, if they ignore and violate the regulations and laws of the country which are the offspring of civilization, if I may say so, then I hope to live to see the time when such tyranny will bring to its perpetrators the retribution that tyranny has frequently brought to its perpetrators in the past—I hope to live to see the day when men who make war on humanity will be outlawed. Now, Sir, having made this statement I wish to say again to the investing public: We have a strongly organized labour in Cape Breton, perhaps the most strongly organized in Canada, but I point to the record of that labour element. It is an element that can be relied upon. For sixteen years in the great collieries in the southern part of Cape Breton, we have not had a strike. I say that that is the best security that investors in Cape Breton can have. That is an asset which investors should not undervalue; and again I say that the great operators, the great manipulators of capital in placing investments there should see to it that they make an investment in the good-will of the people. I wish to say to them still further that a policy of antagonism to the legitimate aspirations of labour will be fatal, and I sincerely hope that a wise policy will prevail on the part of those who come to develop that country, as it will be developed. Some years ago, in the local legislature of Nova Scotia, the island of Cape Breton was referred to by one hon. member of that body as the tin can at the tail of the dog. But one of the members representing a Cape Breton constituency said: Not the tin can at the tail of the dog, but the jewel in the swine's snout. Sir, we anticipate great developments, and we want to have not only material development but social development as well. And we want the processes which have developed our mining population up to its present status during the last thirty or forty years to be continued, and are determined as far as possible that elements which are calculated to break up the happy condition that now prevail shall be, as far as possible, thwarted.

Mr. Speaker, I have occupied the time of the House longer than I anticipated. But I did want to say a word or two about the resolution now before the House, and I will content myself with a very few words indeed. I may say to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that I sympathize with him to a certain extent in putting that resolution before the country. I did hope, when he began to read the resolution that it would shed some light upon his fiscal policy, that it would not be merely nebulous and indefinite. There may be some light in it, but it reminds me a good deal of a ray of moonlight in a very foggy night. I cannot understand what the hon. gentleman seeks to do. I would like him to particularize, to point out just where he is going to improve the tariff. I would like to remind the hon. leader of the opposition that a gentleman who occupied the position of leader of the Dominion government, the late Right Hon. Sir John Thompson, spoke on one occasion of 'mouldering branches' in connection with the tariff, which, in his opinion, might be lopped off with benefit to the country. We have heard no demand for tariff changes except only from hon. gentlemen on this side who think that the tariff is too high, except from one industry, the woollen industry. I wonder if he ever thinks that possibly this woollen industry may be one of the mouldering branches which the late Sir John Thompson had in his mind. Let him not misunderstand me. I am not anxious to see the woollen business suffer to any greater extent than it does to-day. I suppose that is one of the industries to which he wishes to give added protection, but I wish to point out that when a million dollars worth of woollen goods are made in Canada, as compared with a million dollars worth produced in Great Britain, the manufacturer of this country still has an opportunity to sell that million dollars worth for $1,233,000 under the preferential tariff.

Sir, the hon. gentleman proposes to frame a policy for this country, and I was thinking the other day that possibly when he takes a bird's eye view of half a continent, and looks at those resources of Canada which must be the backbone of our prosperity in the future, the four great natural industries: The mining and fishing of British Columbia, the farming of the Northwest, the fishing, farming, lumbering and mining of Ontario, the fishing, farming, and lumbering of Quebec, and the similar industries of the maritime provinces; and when he looks into the future and thinks which of the industries at present in existence are most likely to build up the country, can he doubt what is the best policy for us to pursue? It is best to pursue a policy of developing the great natural in-

dustries of the country, or a policy of fostering a number of manufactures which can scarcely be expected ever to stand alone? Now, there are some manufacturing industries in this country that can stand alone, and one of these is the manufacture of agricultural implements. I have heard statements made by one of the men prominent in that business that to-day they are practically independent, that to-day they can take certain of their implements and sell them in Australia and in Europe in competition with similar implements from the United States; that as a matter of fact they are not able to-day to supply the home market, and that a number of American implements come in here for the reason that our implements can be sold in Europe to better advantage than they can be sold at home. That statement was made to me not fifty feet from where I stand, a few days ago, by a gentleman who knows as much about the business, I presume, as most any one. There are a number of manufacturing industries in this country that are almost as independent as those of fishing and agriculture. Sir, I say that the great natural industries of this country are those to which we can direct our energies the most profitably. I am sure that in the province from which the hon. gentleman comes he can find scarcely an industry that is likely to be benefited by a higher protective tariff than the present one.

Let me say that being a free trader in principle, I agree that the present tariff is merely a tentative measure. I believe that the present is a better tariff than the one that formerly existed, yet it is not the best system, though perhaps it is the best which is within practical politics to-day. I beileve that with the system that prevails in Great Britain, a system of direct taxation on all incomes over $750, the great bulk of our people would be better off than they are to-day. I make the statement that the burden of taxation falls on the shoulders of the people who have to earn their living by the sweat of their brow, and that the rich people of this country are escaping more and more their fair share of taxation. I point to the fact that in Great Britain no man pays a penny on income until he earns over $750 a year, unless he pays it on his spirits, and tobacco, and a few other articles of luxury. His food, his clothing and the materials with which he must work and gain a livelihood, are as free as they can be got anywhere in the world. I believe that system is one which would work in this country, although I admit that it is not within practical politics. I would advocate that system also as a tentative measure, because I believe there is another system of taxation even better, and that is the single tax, or the land tax, but this form of taxation will probably originate in civic and municipal politics.

Now, Sir, before sitting down I wish to say that I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to show me whereby a protective tariff can help the fishermen of this country, whereby it will help the fruit-growers of this country, the miners of this country, or to any great extent the lumbermen or the pulp producers of this country, and the agriculturists of this country, except it may be the market gardeners who produce a few bundles of rhubarb and bunches of summer savory. I say that the great natural industries of this country that depend upon foreign markets and which are the backbone of this country, can in no way be benefited by protection. I accept it as a tentative measure, and only for the present, when we find it difficult to keep our population at home. I accept the present system in order to keep the population in the country, until such time as we will have a number of manufactures well established, not rooted in protection, but rooted in the solid and successful development of the natural industries of this country.

Mr. B. ROSAMOND (North Lanark). I have no desire to emulate the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) who has just taken his seat, in making a lengthy speech. He has spoken about two hours and three quarters by the clock, While I am sorry that I cannot compliment him on the brevity of his speech, I regret also that I cannot compliment him upon having given us any new ideas. He has given us a long and rambling speech without saying anything noticeable upon the budget. He told us just before sitting down that he had no desire to injure the woollen industry. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we ought to be very thankful to him for that much. One would have supposed, if he had been in a patriotic mood, that he would have desired to benefit the woollen industry, but I suppose we must feel grateful to him that at least he has no desire to injure that industry. He was unable to see any light in the amendment which has been moved by the hon. leader of the opposition. I am reminded of the old saying that none are so blind as those who will not see. I think if the hon. gentleman had read that amendment properly and if he had carefully listened to the speech of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), he would have seen a great deal of light and would have been benefited by it. In the early part of his speech he said that some woollen manufacturer in the province of Nova Scotia told him that he could not get wool enough to run his mill. Well, with my knowledge of the facts, the only conclusion I can come to is that gentlemen must have been having a little amusement with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KENDALL. Not at all.

Mr. ROSAMOND. He must have been trying to pull the wool over his eyes, as a matter of fact there are tons of Canadian wool looking for buyers. He went on to say that it was doubtful if we could

attempt to manufacture in Canada in competition with England and other countries. I really think that we cannot wonder at the fact that our population does not grow as rapidly as it should when an hon. member of this House, no doubt a representative man from the province from which he comes, is so pessimistic, or so lacking in ambition for the progress of his own province, that he discourages the establishment of industries in his own province, or in the country. Can we wonder that so many people from the province of Nova Scotia are to be found in the city of Boston and in the New England states ? I think this is one reason why the people of the province of Nova Scotia are said to be unambitious in regard to progress in manufacturing. The hon. gentleman read some extracts from some ancient works giving harrowing accounts of the condition of the working people of England many years ago. Well, I think there can be no question that had he given us the facts of the case relating to the condition of the working people of England he would have pointed out that it was owing to the fact that the corn laws were in existence and that food was dear and difficult to get. This is no argument against protection. Those who are in favour of protection are in favour of enabling the workingman to live as cheaply as he possibly can and he could not live cheaply if the articles of necessity were taxed heavily. The hon. gentleman went on to refer to the great benefit which the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) had conferred upon the country by expending large sums in carrying out cold storage. He did not tell us that cold storage was established by the preceding government, that it was then in its infancy and that a moderate sum was all that was necessary to endeavour to carry it into effect. He failed also to tell us at the same time that the leaders of the opposition of that day, when $20,000 a year was being expended, did all they possibly could to prevent it. They pitched into the government and opposed them in every way possible for expending so much money uselessly and recklessly. If he had told us this I think we could have discounted some of the great praise he gave to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Listening to the hon. gentleman's speech I was at a loss to understand whether he was a protectionist or a free trader, or half way between. At the close of his speech he announced himself as a free trader pure and simple, but, when we consider that he wanted, in the early part of his speech, more advantages for the fishermen, a greater expenditure of public money, and that he was unwilling to take the duty off coal, I think we will agree that these demands are hardly consistent with the profession he made in favour of free trade. He made some reference to the Intercolonial Railway and he made a strong appeal in favour of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) on account of the abrogation of a certain arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am not conversant with railway matters. I am not living anywhere near the Intercolonial Railway, but, I think the only conclusion that any practical business man can come to in the matter is to judge by the results of the running of the railway, and when we consider that during this last year there has been an increase in the capital expenditure of $3,652,313.46 and that in addition to that there was a deficit of $488,186.77, we must believe that there is something radically wrong with the working of the railway. Last week while in Montreal I happened to meet at the Windsor hotel a prominent and a practical railway man, one who is thoroughly conversant with the running of railways and has been for years. I will say, while not wishing to disclose his identity, that he is not connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. He gave it as his decided opinion that there was no railway on the continent of America that was so badly managed as the Intercolonial Railway. I do not think I need refer to that matter any further than to say that if we carried out the idea of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) with reference to the mining of coal, if the government took into their hands the coal industry and managed it in the manner that they manage the Intercolonial Railway, I am quite sure there would not be a business man in this country but would be anxious and desirous that it should be taken out of their hands as quickly as possible. When in Halifax last fall, I happened to see in one of the newspapers of that city a letter written by a prominent commercial man, a man not in public life, but a practical commercial man and a supporter of the present government, as I believe, who was writing in the public press advocating that the Intercolonial Railway should be taken out of the hands of the government and handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway to manage. There can be no other reason for his wishing that that course should be adopted than that the management of the Intercolonial Railway by the government was so outrageously bad, so detrimental to the best interests of the country, so injurious to it in every way that the only course to be taken by practical business men would be to take the road out of the hands of the government and have it managed by some people who could manage it properly. I have no desire to emulate the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat in making a long speech. When I listen to a long speech like that I am reminded of a verse in the psalms of David which says :

A man full of words shall not prosper upon the earth.
Evil shall hunt the wicked person to overthrow him.

If any are to follow me, I hope they will take that to heart and carry out the lesson.

Like many of those who have preceded me in this lengthy debate, I am willing to congratulate the government on having come into power at a time exceedingly advantageous to themselves. No government could have been more fortunate than they were in coming into power at the commencement of an era of prosperity. I think every one will concede that the prosperity of Canada during the past five or six years has been unexampled. I regret, however, that we cannot congratulate the government upon their having made good use of the prosperous times which have blest their period of office up to the present. If they had been prudent business men, and you know we were told that it was a government of business men, one would have supposed that when there was great prosperity in the country they would have endeavoured to reduce the public debt. In fact they promised the people of Canada that if they were given a chance to govern the country they would reduce the public debt. But, notwithstanding the abnormal prosperity; notwithstanding the surpluses which were so lavishly displayed and so glowingly spoken of in every budget speech, the public debt of the country has gone on increasing—I was going to say by leaps and bounds. My idea is, that in times of great prosperity there is no necessity for the government spending unusually large sums of money. In fact, the expenditure of abnormal sums of money in prosperous times has the effect of accentuating that prosperity, and making the contrast all the worse when times get bad. The greater will be the fall then. If there was great depression in the country, then there might be necessity for the government launching out into justifiable public expenditure, and even borrowing money perhaps, because then they would give employment to the people of the country which otherwise they might not be able to get. It is also true that under such circumstances public works could be carried out at less cost than when business is at high pressure and labour comparatively scarce. However, I do not propose to dwell at length upon that phase of the question.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that several hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have expressed themselves as not desiring to injure the woollen industry, while at the same time they deprecate any increase in the tariff. The truth has probably not been quite told as to the manner in which the woollen industry has suffered under the preferential tariff. I have taken from the public records a comparative statement of the imports of woollens under the heads of cloths, coatings, doe skins, over-coatings and tweeds, imported during the financial years ending 30th June, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, and 1901. I take the items I have mentioned because these are the articles which are principally manufactured in the woollen mills of this country.

In 1897, there were 3,166,361 yards imported; the bulk of that of course being from Great Britain; there being only 114,450 yards imported from other countries. In 1898, there were 3,604,286 yards imported; in 1899, there were 4,369,816 yards imported; in 1900, there were 4,562,868 yards imported, and after the 33⅓ per cent preference came into effect, in 1901, the importation was 6,045,534 yards, or, comparing the importations for 1897 and the importations for 1901, there was an increase of 2,879,173 yards in 1901, or, an increase in the importation of woollens of 91 per cent in 1901, as compared with 1897:

——	Total Yards.	Value.	Average Price per Yard.
1897.		$	cts.
Great Britain.....	3,051,911	1,978,459	64·82
Other Countries..	114,450	73,289	64·04
	3,166,361	2,051,748	64·80
1898.			
Great Britain.....	3,427,059	1,906,324	55·62
Other Countries....	177,227	93,230	52·60
	3,604,286	1,999,554	55·47
1899.			
Great Britain.....	4,087,101	2,383,922	58·33
Other Countries....	282,715	147,745	52·25
	4,369,816	2,531,667	57·93
1900.			
Great Britain.....	4,135,430	2,442,420	59·08
Other Countries....	427,438	296,554	53
	4,562,868	2,668,974	58·49
1901.			
Great Britain.....	5,599,541	2,972,357	53·08
Other Countries....	445,993	218,790	49·05
	6,045,534	3,191,147	52·78

Yards imported in 1897, 3,166,361
" " 1901, 6,045,534
Increase in 1901, 2,879,173 yards, or 91% over 1897.

That, Mr. Speaker, will show why it is that the woollen industry of Canada has been depressed, and has been most seriously injured by the tariff now in force. I do not desire to dwell at any length upon that question, because some people might consider it somewhat of a personal matter with me, but I give these figures to hon. gentlemen to show how the woollen industry has been very seriously affected by the preferential tariff.

I shall now with the permission of the House, briefly refer to the result of the last census. It was admitted by the Minister of Finance in his speech on the budget, and it has been admitted by all, that the result

of the census of 1901 has been very disappointing. For my part I had a vague hope that the census would show a population of 6,000,000 in Canada. As a matter of fact the increase in 1901 over 1891 was only 537,812, or about 11 per cent. Contrast that with the increase in the United States. The increase in the United States in 1900 over the census of 1890 was 13,681,137, or about 22 per cent, which is just double our percentage of increase. Then in considering the increase in Canada we must remember that during the ten years we received immigrants to the number of 282,292, or about 50 per cent of the total increase. The cost of getting those immigrants has been $2,400,173, or about $8.50 per head. The population of the United States in 1870 was 38,558,371, and in 1880 it was 50,155,783, an increase of 30 per cent. In 1890 it had risen to 62,622,250, an increase of 21½ per cent, and in 1900 it had still further risen to 76,303,387, or an increase of 21 and eight-tenths per cent. During this present session of parliament the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) taunted the people of the east for their slow progress, and he told us that the population of eastern Canada was hardly increasing at all. I find from the census returns that during the decade between 1891 and 1901 the province of Prince Edward Island lost 5,819 of her population; Ontario increased only 68,621; New Brunswick increased 9,857, and Nova Scotia increased 9,178. The inauguration of the iron and steel works in Nova Scotia must have tended to help towards an increase of population in that province. The province of Quebec which has always a large natural increase, larger than any other province in the Dominion, increased its population during the decade by 160,363. There may be some question as to whether the census of the province of Quebec has been accurate. From some of the correspondence which has come to light, I think there may be grave doubts as to whether the census for the province of Quebec is correct. Manitoba, British Columbia, and the territories have increased 297,227, or 55,027 more than all the eastern provinces put together.

The Finance Minister claimed in his speech that the increase in our population of the last decade was all in the last half of the decade, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce in his speech said something to the same effect; in fact, he went much further than the Finance Minister. I will quote what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said:

> First of all, the increase during the last decade is double the increase which took place during the decade from 1881 to 1891, and next, that the increase during the last five years, from 1896 to 1901, in all human probability equals the total increase of the preceding 15 years from 1881 to 1896. Sir, these are not statements to be made lightly by a man in my position, and I do not make them lightly.

Mr. Speaker, I have always had a very great respect indeed for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I am sorry he is not in his seat now, for I wish to say that I think there is no man his equal for making extravagant statements in this House of Commons.

Now, against this statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, let me quote from the United States census. There was a larger percentage of Canadians in the United States in 1900 than there was in 1890. In 1890, 17 per cent of the total number of Canadians in the United States and Canada put together were domiciled in the United States. In 1900 the total number had increased to 18 per cent, or a total of 1,181,778 Canadians domiciled in the United States. As further evidence of the unreliability of the statements made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, let me say the state of Massachusetts takes on its own account a census every ten years, half way between the national census years. Its records and those of the national count show the number of Canadians in the state as folllows:—

1890	207,601
1895	243,732
1900	293,169

Or 13,306 more Canadians have gone into Massachusetts from 1895 to 1900 than from 1890 to 1895. There can be no doubt that the same is true of every other state in the union to which Canadians go, and the only conclusion we can come to is that the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce was entirely erroneous.

There is another point on which I have to quote the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and that is with reference to the trade of the Dominion. In his last speech he said:

> The total imports per capita in 1890 amounted to about $24. In 1895, they were $22, per capita, and in 1900 they had risen to $36.

At this point I remember very well saying 'Hear, hear.' The Minister of Trade and Commerce went on to say

> The hon. gentleman dislikes to hear that Canada's imports have increased. I differ from him.

Then he went on to say further:

> I take the total volume of trade. In 1890 it amounted to $44 per head; in 1895 it amounted to the same; in 1900 it had risen to $71 per head. And, how does this compare with our neighbours to the south? In 1890 it was $26 per head in the United States; in 1895 it was $23 per head in the United States, and in 1890 their total volume of trade amounted to $29 per head; very little more than one-third per head as much as the people of Canada possess.
>
> Of all countries; of Australia, the United States, Great Britain, Belgium, France, and Germany, Canada has increased at all points; increased in her imports, increased in her exports, increased in her total volume of trade, in a far greater ratio than the best of the others—not by any means excepting Great Britain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have quoted these extracts from the speeches of the Minister of Trade and Commerce for the purpose of drawing a moral from them. I wish to draw certain conclusions, which I think will commend themselves to the good sense and the intelligence of the House. I have shown that the increase in population during the last decade has been disappointingly small; that the bulk of what increase there is has been in the agricultural districts of the North-west; that the increase in the population of the United States has been continuously large; that nearly 1¼ millions of Canadians are now domiciled in the United States; that the exodus of Canadians to the United States has been greater during the last five years of the decade than the first five years, notwithstanding an abnormal prosperity; that the imports into Canada have risen from $22 per head in 1895 to $36 in 1900; that our total volume of trade in 1890 was $44 per head, and in 1900 had risen to $71 per head, while that of the United States was only $29 per head in 1900.

Sir, have we not here the whole secret of our lamentable lack of reasonable increase of population? We are inclined to brag about our enormous imports and exports, and about the great volume of trade per head of the population which we have far in advance of every other country in the world, not even excepting Great Britain, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce said. Sir, does that not point to this fact, that the people of Canada are not endeavouring to manufacture anything for themselves, that we are making no pretense to manufacture what we might manufacture and thus give employment to the people of the country? We are paying large sums of money to induce immigrants to come to Canada—$2,400,000 in the last ten years; and what kind of people do we get? Doukhobors, Galicians and others, not skilled labour. Do you wonder that the skilled labour of England passes our shores and goes to the United States? Can we wonder that the capitalists of England are not sending their money to this country for the purpose of giving it employment when we do nothing to encourage them to come here? We are not even attempting to keep our own young men, who have been born on the soil, educated in our schools and colleges at great expense to the taxpayer, and who would be of great advantage to this country if they could find here suitable employment which would give them an adequate reward for their industry and skill. We are spending large sums of money in the effort to populate this country, and the only people we get are the ignorant people from certain parts of Europe—people who will not be of any great advantage in this country until such time as they are educated. And you will find, Sir, that the descendants of these men whom we are educating, will, unless the fiscal policy of this country be altered, leave it just when they have been educated and converted into desirable citizens. My belief is that until we adopt the policy of the United States, we need not expect the population of this country to grow as we would like to have it grow. Let me quote here from a recent writer:

> It is a great mistake to consider a country prosperous because she receives large revenues from duties on foreign goods consumed by her people. In Canada we import from the United States eighty million dollars worth of manufactured goods, on which a very large revenue is collected, and to which the party in power points with pride. How much richer Canada would be in people, in cash, in power, in everything that goes to make a nation great, if this eighty million dollars' worth had been manufactured or produced by her own sons on her own soil? And the pity of it is that Canada could do it, and Canada would do it if our rulers only had the wisdom and strength to apply to Canada the same principles that have made the United States the greatest producing power the world has ever seen.
>
> No nation can become great and prosperous so long as her output is one of natural products only. The progress, prosperity and wealth of all nations lie in the development of their natural resources; the making of wheat into flour, ores into iron, steels or nickel, trees into lumber; wool into clothing; and so continuing to make from iron, steel and lumber, locomotives, railway cars, agricultural implements, threshing machines, furniture, etc. The continued enlargement and expansion of the industries of the country build it in people, wealth and power.

This policy it is which has built up the United States in such an unexampled degree, and it is this policy which we must adopt if we wish to make Canada prosper in the same proportion. I would like also to quote from an English paper:

> The efforts of Mr. Smart and Mr. Preston seem entirely directed to the importation of a proletariate, or, at any rate, to the populating of the west country with small farmers.
>
> Doubtless this is of supreme importance, but are not capitalists also required? The emigrants will form a home market for Canadian industries, it is true, but the development of industries backed up by British capital will create population. This may seem a paradox, but it is not so. Capital creates population just as much as population invites capital. If the industries advance quicker than the home population can consume, there are populations elsewhere to take off the surplus. As a matter of fact, however, Canada is not even manufacturing enough for her own wants. If Canada had herself made what she imported last year she would have employed 150,000 factory hands who would have earned $65,000,000 in wages, and these hands with their families and the trades and professions which would spring up to supply them, would fill three towns as large as Toronto. What is not sufficiently realized in this country is that Canada is one of the natural workshops of the world, and perhaps the most adaptable of all; she has immense water-power, immense deposits of coal and iron, abundance of timber, good harbours, the finest soil in the world, and an endless supply of fish. In fine, she ought to be able to feed the world, and make everything it wants at the cheapest cost. Surely if this

were properly understood, English capital would be seeking investment over there all the while.

The supply of British capital for Canadian manufacturing industries would also help to find employment for that large class of young men who, we are told, unable to find it at home and being unsuited to agricultural work, are seeking their fortunes in more southern climes.

I do not think we need wonder that British capital should fail to come to Canada. There is no sentiment about capital. Just as water seeks its own level, capital seeks where it can find the most profitable employment, and it certainly will not come to Canada so long as the present condition of things continues to exist. We need still less wonder at capital not coming to this country when we find our Finance Minister in 1898 using these words :

I am afraid there is no rest for the protected manufacturer. I am inclined to think, Sir, that he will find eternal vigilance is the price of his protection. He must be on guard all the time against the attack he knows must always come.

Capital is a most sensitive thing and will certainly not seek employment in Canada so long as we have a Finance Minister imbued with these ideas. One would suppose that a Canadian Finance Minister would desire to see his country prosperous and be happy to do all he possibly could to encourage native industry in its endeavour to find employment, but we find the contrary to be the case under the present regime. Then again we find the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) saying :

Some of the woollen factories are closing up. They say the reason is that they have not sufficient protection. I say it is not. If they cannot live on a 23 per cent tariff, the sooner they shut up the better.

But another strange feature about some of the supporters of the government is that while they are loud mouthed in their professions of free trade, we find them very anxious for protection on certain things. We find, for instance, the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) wanting protection for the farmers who raise horses. Well, if I were to apply to him the language of the Minister of the Interior, I would say that if our western people cannot breed horses profitably under present conditions, they had better give it up altogether. Then there is the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Morrison), who wants protection on lumber and lead products. To him also I could apply the language of the Minister of the Interior. There is another western member, the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith), who wants protection for Canadian labourers against the Chinese. But if he is to be governed by the doctrine announced by the Minister of the Interior, then if white labour in British Columbia cannot compete with the Chinese the sooner it leaves British Columbia and goes somewhere else where it can get employment, the better. But that doctrine will never make Canada prosperous. Until, as an hon. member on this side said some time ago, we are actuated by a broad spirit, until one and all desire that the whole of the country shall prosper, that every industry shall flourish, we never can expect to see Canada in the position she ought to occupy. For my part, and the same may be said of all protectionists—in fact it is the keynote of the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition—we want our farmers protected as well as everybody else. Our farmers have been protected to a considerable extent. They are protected by duties on many of their products such as bacon, cheese and butter. Large sums have been expended on experimental farms in their interest and on arrangements for teaching them how to make cheese and butter profitably. A large staff of men has been employed for this purpose, agricultural colleges have been established at various places, and experimental farms, all at the expense of the Canadian people. I have no objection to that. On the contrary I am delighted to see it, but if we want Canada to prosper we must not confine our attention to one class. We are all anxious to see the country grow, not only in wealth but in population, and until we are actuated by the broad spirit recommended by one of the members for Toronto, we need not expect this country to attain that degree of prosperity which she ought to enjoy. I do not think I can better close my speech than by quoting something which was said, and so well and so profitably said, by the leader of the opposition. At the outset, I stated that I was not going to make a long speech, and I have only now to quote these words which, perhaps the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Borden) will pardon my using :

We want to know what will be the policy of this government, as a government, with regard to the fiscal affairs of the country. We want that to be a declared policy so that the people will know what to expect. In asking that we are asking nothing unreasonable or unfair. We want a policy of protection to our labour, agriculturing, manufacturing and other industries. We want a policy which will give to our people the advantage in their own market—a policy of Canada for the Canadians ; and Canada for the Canadian means not the less Canada for the empire as well. Because in seeking to promote the development, prosperity and advancement of Canada, we are but doing our duty to that portion of the empire which has been specially committed to our charge. And, lastly, we believe in a policy of mutual or reciprocal trade under which, while protecting Canadian interests, we shall give to and receive from the other portions of the empire preference over foreign goods.

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest and pleasure, and, I will admit, with a certain amount of profit, to the discussion on the motion now before you. But I have been amused at the course of reasoning of some hon. gentlemen opposite and

the inconsistencies into which it leads them. The hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) admitted, at the outset of his remarks, that this country was enjoying unbounded and almost unexampled prosperity. Yet, in closing, he told us that unless we adopted a certain policy laid down by the leader of the opposition, we could not enjoy the prosperity we ought to have. But the hon. gentleman is not different from any of his friends in that they contradict not only each other but themselves. We on this side have been twitted with not being a unit in our opinion, and I am free to admit that we are not a unit on all points. But, if that be a crime, which I certainly do not at all admit, we are not alone in our guilt. The hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith) opposed all imports and declared that no country could be made rich by imports, ignoring altogether the fact that Great Britain has imports larger than those of any other country, and yet enjoys a great measure of prosperity. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) took similar ground and said that we ought to adopt a uniform tariff with that of our American friends, implying that if we put a tariff on natural products our people would derive benefit therefrom. In other words, the hon. gentleman would exclude absolutely products from the United States. But the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) stated that he was in favour of a reciprocity treaty, if it could be had. And the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), in opposition to the views of those who would keep out imports, wanted efforts made to increase our trade with Germany. So, Mr. Speaker, you will find diverse views among hon. gentlemen on the other side as well as among supporters of the government. And, if the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is reported correctly in the newspapers—and I have not seen any contradiction—that hon. gentleman has one set of views for Quebec and another set for Ontario.

I have just a few remarks to make upon the speech of the hon. member for North Lanark, and I shall run over the points hurriedly, endeavouring to follow the good example of the hon. gentleman and speak but briefly. In replying to the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) the hon. member for North Lanark sought to justify his position by saying that the corn laws of Great Britain had brought that country to a bad condition by making dear the bread of the common people. The hon. gentleman ignored the fact that the resolution of his leader, which he supports would, if carried out, re-establish a system of corn laws in the old land, make food dear in that country, and so tend to bring back the condition of which he speaks. I do not feel bound to justify everything that has been said in the House by hon. members on this side. It is true that some years ago they said that the expenditure should be kept down, and that the increase of the debt should be kept within reasonable bounds. I believe that their arguments were good, that they were sincere, and yet I believe that increase of expenditure is perfectly justifiable at the present time. I would remind the House that the late leader of the opposition stated on this floor that the expenditure and the debt of the country must inevitably go on growing with the development of the resources of this country. I am sure that the people will find no fault with the government that increases the debt, so long as its increase is legitimate and honourable, and so long as is not disgraced by such transactions as marked the increase of the debt in connection with the record of the previous administration. I had hoped that my hon. friend from North Lanark would speak more in detail on the tariff on woollens. That is an article with which he is, of course, familiar. But I can understand his modesty in not alluding to it at length, because it might be said that he was, as the common expression goes, talking shop. But I wish to take issue with the hon. gentleman on that point. I wish to say, and I say it without mental reservation, that, if the woollen manufacturers are not satisfied with a tariff at 23½ per cent, and the difference of the freight between the old country and here, which, at the lowest rate, would raise the protection of these manufacturers to 25 per cent, if these woollen manufacturers cannot prosper with that protection in a country like Canada, where woollens are a prime necessity and must be bought by the people, then, it is time for these manufacturers to turn their investments and their attention to some other branch of industry. I was going to say it is a woeful admission for hon. gentlemen to make to this House and this country, to convey the impression that the woollen manufacturers cannot carry on a legitimate business unless they are allowed to tax the people more than 25 per cent on their purchases in this line. The statement is made in the press, and made repeatedly, that the woollen industry is suffering. So far as I have been able to learn, I have not found that statement borne out by the facts, and I have grave doubts of the ability of any man to prove it. A short time ago I met within the walls of this House a gentleman who is engaged in the woollen industry. I asked him if he was one of those who objected to the preferential tariff, and if his woollen mill was suffering because of importations. His answer was: No, he was not one of those who were objecting, and he did not believe that the others had good ground for objecting, because they were so busy they could not fill their orders. I myself could name woollen mills that are working overtime to catch up with the demand and fill the orders that they have. If this is the

state of the case, the woollen manufacturers have no grievance which would justify us in giving them greater protection than they have at present.

Reference has been made in the course of this debate to the action of the government in refusing to yield to the delegations that have come down here asking for an increase in the tariff. As one representing the people, as one representing the masses instead of the classes, I want to express my commendation of the government which has had the manliness to stand up against the pressure that has been brought to bear upon them. I am not alone in voicing that sentiment. I want to quote from a paper of Conservative leaning, the Ottawa 'Journal,' which thus speaks of the attitude of the government upon this question:

> This year, the Dominion government holds out against increase of the tariff, to its credit be it said. Manufacturers' hopes were high that from the government would come the squeak, 'Don't shoot, I'll come down.' But there are to be no tariff changes. Some may think that this is a small thing to put to the credit of a party one of whose slogans while in opposition was 'free trade as they have it in Britain,' but to those who have any conception of the pressure which the government has to withstand, any idea of the force, the persistence, the heat, with which the protected interests urge their demands, the government's stand must appear well worthy of credit. The manufacturers, long with the taste of blood in their mouths, and now fully recovered from the terrors of 1896, are in full scent after the prey. To balk them is no light job.

That quotation is from the Ottawa 'Journal' whose editor was formerly connected with the Toronto 'Mail,' and who now takes an independent position. I want to say further that it seems to me that some of the delegations that come to Ottawa asking for assistance have no other idea than that they should be enabled by law to put their hands in the pockets of the consumers and enrich themselves at the expense of the people. If they had no protection, and if they were not enjoying a certain amount of favouritism already, their request might be reasonable; but it seems to me some of them are decidedly unreasonable. I take as an illustration the cement manufacturers. I have no hostility whatever to the cement men, I would be only too glad to see an industry of that kind flourish to the utmost extent, for cement is an article entering into very general use, and will be much more largely used in the future, because it is being used for new purposes every day. The cement manufacturers came down a short time ago and asked the government for an increase of duty. They have a duty at the present time of 12½ cents per 100 pounds, or equal to 42½ cents per barrel of 350 pounds. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, when you add the freight of about 30 cents a barrel on imported cement, the Canadian manufacturer ought to be satisfied with a tariff of about 75 cents a barrel on cement.

The resolution presented by the hon. leader of the opposition proclaims that the present tariff is unsatisfactory. Unsatisfactory to whom? It surely is not unsatisfactory to the manufacturers, who are so busy all over this land that they can scarcely fill their orders. Go into any place in the province of Ontario, at any rate, for which I can speak, and I think I can say the same for Quebec and the other provinces—go into any of the manufacturing towns in Ontario at the present time, and you will find that all our industries are running to their fullest capacity. I am glad indeed to see that the manufacturers are prospering as they are, because I believe it is due in a measure to the reduction of duty on raw materials, and to the advantages they have under the present administration. Therefore the present tariff cannot be unsatisfactory to the manufacturers. It cannot be unsatisfactory to the artisans, who have all the work they can possibly attend to. If you look into the newspapers at the present time you will find that there is a greater demand for artisans of various classes than has existed for a very long time. In all branches of manufacture, or in nearly all, there is a very keen and earnest demand for artisans, and that at very good wages. The present tariff therefore cannot be unsatisfactory to them. Neither can it be unsatisfactory to the farmers, because it has relieved them of certain burdens which formerly rested upon them. One hon. gentleman on the other side, in the course of his argument, alluded to the introduction of free corn as detrimental to the farmers of this country. Well, I am here to take issue with him. The statement was made, I believe, that the introduction of free corn had the effect of reducing the price of coarse grain. I challenge that statement; I defy any hon. member in this House to prove that, as a general rule, the introduction of free corn has lowered the price of coarse grains one iota. I challenge any man to prove from the market reports or otherwise that the introduction of free corn has had any such results. I assert on the other hand that it has been a most decided benefit to the farming classes. In my neighbourhood I have asked cattle raisers, both Conservatives and Liberals, I have asked cattle buyers, both Conservatives and Liberals; I have made considerable investigations along that line, and almost without exception, men of all classes have endorsed and upheld the action of the government in throwing off the duty on corn as an action in the interest of the farming community. It has enabled the farmer to finish his cattle and stock at a less cost, and to put them on the English market in a better condition, than they would have been if fed on coarse grain alone. The Canadian farmer has to compete with

the American farmer in the English market, and by the use of corn he is able to put his stock on the English market in competition with the American farmer more successfully than he could do without free corn.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had a good many figures given us in this debate. I do not want to weary the House with them, but when figures tell certain truths and when they are advantageous, I think they should be put on record. I will give our friends on the opposite side of the House credit for this, that where they find what they believe to be a weak spot in the armour of members on this side of the House, they make the most of it. I believe in that principle, and when we have a certain fact to lay before the people, I think we should bring it forward and not let it be lost sight of. We contend on this side of the House that the present tariff is better than the old one. Our friends opposite are continually saying that the era of prosperity, of progress and advancement we are now enjoying is due entirely to Providence, no credit is due to the government at all; and they say in the very next breath if you accept their policy or if you accept the resolution moved by the leader of the opposition, a still greater measure of prosperity will be the result. Now if the policy of our friends opposite would bring about greater prosperity, then by parity of reasoning this government is entitled to a certain amount of credit because of the prosperity Canada has been enjoying during the past few years. The policy that hon. gentlemen opposite desire us to adopt is practically the policy that was in force for eighteen years, but it is a policy that was rejected by the people. It was tried and found wanting. They are now bringing it forward again, and claim that it will produce the beneficial results which it failed to produce before. I am surprised that, in view of the present state of prosperity, in view of several things that have occurred recently, our friends opposite should endeavour to put before the House the fallacious arguments to which they have resorted.

The present resolution is simply a reiteration of the old national policy. They may claim credit for it if they like, but the old national policy has been condemned by the people at the polls. It was condemned in Lisgar. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was condemned by the independent electors of that riding. It was condemned in Beauharnois and it was condemned by the people in the general elections. The national policy was introduced in 1879, and the trade of the country increased from $135,000,000 in 1879 to $230,000,000 in 1883. In 1884, under the alleged beneficent influences of this policy, it fell to $207,000,000; in 1888 it fell to $198,000,000; in 1889 it dropped still to $189,000,000 and in the year 1895 it increased to $224,000,000, or $6,000,000 less than it was in 1883. If there is any value in the arguments of hon. gentlemen at all, if any reliance can be placed upon them, will they tell me why it was that in the years they had that policy in operation it did not produce the results which they say it will now produce ? In 1896 when the present government took office there was only $9,000,000 of an increase in the trade of the country, as compared with the year 1883, after thirteen years of the national policy. From 1879 to 1896 there was an increase of $85,000,000, while, since 1896 to the present year, the trade of the country has increased by $160,000,000, possibly by $170,000,000, or twice as much in six years as in seventeen years under the old regime. It is no wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite try to minimize the efforts of the present government and the advantages that are accruing to the country from this expansion. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that they want a clearly defined declaration of policy. To my mind they are simply playing upon words. I think when the government have a policy that has stood before the people for a certain period of time they have a clearly defined and clearly declared policy. I fancy that anybody who reads between the lines can easily see that our friends opposite have some view other than getting a clearly defined policy for the present in connection with their arguments. They are simply playing upon words as far as a clearly defined policy is concerned, but what they are endeavouring to do is to persuade the leaders of the government into the declaration of a line of policy that they intend to pursue before they go to the Coronation ceremonies, in order, if they are not successful in securing what they desire, they may be hauled over the coals hereafter. I suppose it would suit some hon. gentlemen opposite to have a fresh declaration of the policy every day and to change that policy to suit the changing circumstances of the times. It has been said, and said with a great deal of truth that cannot be controverted, that you cannot protect the farmers. The resolution provides that you shall protect the labouring class, the farming class and every other class in the community. I am sorry that at this late stage, not of the session, but at this late day we are apparently having to go over all the arguments that have been threshed out in this country for the last twenty years. It is an exploded fallacy to talk of protecting the farming interests. The farmers know this only too well at the present time and our friends on the other side of the House, with all their persuasive eloquence and argumentative ability, will not be able to convince the farmers by any hocus pocus proceeding, that by taxing them for the benefit of the manufacturers they can make them prosperous.

A point that I want to call attention to,

and it is only incidental to this debate, and has not yet been touched upon, is the commendable action of the government in connection with the paper combine. I do not say that as one of those who has derived any benefit therefrom, as I come within the class that do not derive any benefit from the action of the government. But, I want to commend the government for the attitude they have taken towards the paper combine, and I want to say a word in regard to the peculiarity of that action. I believe that the people of this country realize that the judgment delivered by Judge Taschereau is of very far reaching importance and is fraught with important consequences to the consuming community. The peculiar feature of the government's action is that it is endorsed by Conservatives and Liberals alike. There is not a solitary Conservative newspaper but has endorsed the action of the government in reducing the duty on paper. If it is a benefit to the consuming classes to reduce the duty on paper, as I hold it is, because this combine was charging excessive prices, I think a similar reduction of other lines would meet with as large a measure of approval. Our hon. friends opposite talk about securing a preference in the mother country. I have no objection to securing a preference in the market of the mother country provided it can be obtained, but it seems to me that on the part of Canada taking the position that we do, it is a piece of presumption and impertinence on our part to attempt to dictate to Great Britain what shall be her policy as far as the colonies are concerned. If Great Britain chooses to put a moderate duty on grain, that is her own business, and though we would derive a benefit therefrom, I am quite willing to allow Great Britain to pursue her own course and do as she thinks best. But, a very striking thing in connection with the matter is that all the arguments of hon. gentlemen have been that this course would be for the benefit of Great Britain. Pure unselfishness on the part of those who speak for Canada ! No benefit to us at all ; it is all to Great Britain's benefit ! It is the old argument of doing something for some other fellow rather than for the man who is going to derive the benefit. I think that if Great Britain told us that free trade for Canada would be the best policy for us to pursue we would very quickly tell Great Britain to mind her own business. I think Great Britain has the same right to tell us to mind our own business when we interfere in an affair with which we have nothing to do. Our friends opposite dwelt a good deal on patriotism. It seems to me that this protestation of patriotism comes with exceedingly bad grace from hon. gentlemen opposite whose organ, when the national policy was introduced and when it was said it would interfere with British connection, reiterated the statement through the length and breadth of this country : Then so much the worse for British connection. These are the hon. gentlemen who talk about patriotism and about doing something for the mother land and who, when they were told, as they were told, that a policy of that kind would interfere with British connection said : So much the worse for the British nation. In an earlier part of the session one of the hon. members on the other side of the House endeavoured to get the ear of the right hon. the leader of this House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—I suppose, perhaps, due to the fact that he had his own ear to the ground and misunderstood certain sounds that he had heard—and attempted to dictate to him the course he should pursue at the Coronation. He endeavoured to convey to him the idea that he should represent in England that the people of Canada were lying awake at nights hoping that Great Britain would adopt a policy that would be absolutely and entirely for the benefit of the colonies and of Canada in particular. I have sufficient respect for the honoured leader of this House to know that he can gauge public opinion just as well as any man on the other side can gauge it, and I have sufficient respect for the leader of the Liberal party to know that when he goes to the Coronation he will not take the dictum of this member or of that member, but he will do what he believes to be in the interests of Great Britain as well as in the interests of Canada.

If there was one question, Sir, more than another upon which the present administration gained the confidence of the electors in 1900, it was on the question of tariff reform. This was an important issue in that election, and on that issue the people voted for the government. I know that some of our friends opposite say that we have not got tariff reform, but in one breath they tell us that we have tariff reform which is injuring the woollen industry for example, and in the next breath they tell us that this government has not reformed the tariff. They say it is not a tariff such as gives adequate protection to the manufacturer. For my part, I wish to assert that I believe the confidence of the electors of Canada can be maintained by the government standing in the direction of tariff reform. I believe that while the people of Canada are willing to concede to the manufacturers a reasonable amount of protection, they are not willing that that protection shall be unreasonable. I believe that the people of Canada are willing to give to the manufacturers sufficient protection to enable them to compete with outside competition, but they are not willing that the tariff shall be excessively high. If this government wishes to pursue a policy which shall be in the interests of the people and which will be endorsed by the people, then they will pursue the same policy of a moderate tariff and stability that has

characterized their regime. Canada is tired of the tariff that the hon. gentleman opposite seek to reintroduce. This country has tried the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite would endeavour to again saddle upon the country, but the country has shown upon two successive occasions that it has no sympathy with the resolution of the leader of the opposition, and has no desire to again put in practice the extreme principle embodied in that resolution.

I am one of those, Mr. Speaker, who do not believe in the fast Atlantic service—perhaps that is due to the fact that I live far from the sea-board. I believe this country can get along very well without a fast Atlantic service, as I understand it, and I think we have been wise in going slow in that respect. If the time comes when we are able to have a fast Atlantic service without too much cost to the country, perhaps it may be advisable and advantageous, but I believe we have been prudent in not hurrying into a scheme of that kind without very carefully considering what we are doing.

The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) told us that the census was disappointing, and that we have not the population we would have, had we pursued some other policy. Let me point to the hon. gentlemen the fact, that the loss of our population to a very large extent took place during the period when the hon. gentleman's friends were in power. Is it not a fact that the failure of our population to increase as we should expect it would increase, happened during the period when the national policy was in operation; a policy practically identical with that set forth in the resolution of the leader of the opposition? The census was no doubt disappointing to all Canada, but if the policy of the Conservative party failed to create the industries which they say would have increased our population, is it at all reasonable to suppose that the reintroduction of that policy would have any effect? I contend, Sir, that the more you can make this country a cheap country to live in, without seriously interfering with the existing industries, the better it is for the country. Canada would have been infinitely better off if it had confined itself to what we understand to be a revenue tariff, and had never adopted what is known as the national policy. I know that it is difficult to get people to acknowledge a distinction between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff; for 25 per cent or 35 per cent even may be a revenue tariff and yet afford considerable protection. It is only a difference of degree between the two, but however that may be, I believe that our industries would have been just as prosperous; nay more so, if we had never resorted to the extreme features of the national policy. It removed from the people that spirit of self-dependence; that spirit of active energy; that spirit of determination, that spirit of self-assertiveness which would have prevailed had we not depended upon the assistance given us by the government. If our manufacturers had been thrown upon their own resources; if our manufacturers had catered to the wants of the people; if our manufacturers had endeavoured to branch out according to the legitimate demands of the country, I believe that our industries would be more prosperous than they are to-day, and that the country would have been all the better for it.

It is apparent to all who observe, the conditions in this country that for a considerable length of time, if not for all time, Canada must be first and foremost an agricultural country. We have the mining and the lumbering and the fishing industries of course, but with our vast area of fertile territory I repeat that Canada must be first of all an agricultural country. Therefore it is our duty to do all that we can to improve the condition of our agriculturists. When we can make it possible for him to earn more by the labour on his farm; when we can enable him to have more money to spend, that of course would mean an increase in the production of manufactured goods, because the farmer will spend more money on implements and upon clothing and other necessaries. Therefore, the prosperity of the agricultural class of the community means the prosperity of the manufacturers and of every other class of our population. The argument was advanced by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House, that because we did not adopt the policy advocated by the Conservative party, British capital was not being invested here, but during this very debate we have heard gentlemen on the other side declaim in unmeasured terms against the fact that American capitalists were investing money here. They claim that we were being Americanized; that the Americans were buying our railways, our steamship lines, our manufacturing industries, and that we were going to be completely at the mercy of American capital. Well, Sir, I can see no distinction between being at the mercy of American capitalists and being at the mercy of British capitalists, so far as this is concerned. If American capitalists are willing to invest in our railways, surely these railways must remain here and be worked here and so much the better for the welfare of the country. I certainly shall not raise my voice against American capital or British capital being invested in Canada.

Let me say a word or two as to the transportation question. I believe that the government is doing what it can to solve the transportation problem in this country. Gentlemen opposite find fault with the government for not doing as much as they can to increase our transportation facilities, but when the government wisely expends money in improving the Intercolonial Railway or in

improving our water ways, these same gentlemen condemn the government for that expenditure There is no consistency in their arguments on that score. For my part, I shall not find fault with the government even if it increases the present large expenditures for the betterment of our transportation facilities, because I believe that these expenditures are like investments that are wisely and judiciously made, and in the end will redound to the advantage of Canada. I am glad that I am not called on to support the fallacious resolution that was placed before the House by the hon. leader of the opposition. Let me say that in general, I believe that the policy pursued by the present administration is a policy that meets with the cordial approval and support of the people of the Dominion as a whole ; it is a policy which is building up our industries, developing our resources, adding to our wealth and prosperity, and therefore worthy of the confidence of this House and of the country.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 2, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Wm. Power, Esq., member for the electoral district of Quebec West, introduced by the Prime Minister (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick).

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Canadian Northern Telegraph Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Nepigon Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Canadian Northern Express Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—Mr. McColl.

Bill (No. 85) respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 87) respecting the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Scott.

QUESTIONS.

GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPH LINE TO DAWSON.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What is the total length of the government telegraph line from Ashcroft, B.C., to Dawson, by divisions :—(a.) Ashcroft to Quesnell ? (b.) Quesnell to Atlin ? (c.) Atlin to Dawson ?

2. What was the original cost of the line to Quesnell ?

3. What was the cost of the sections from (a.) Quesnell to Atlin, and (b.) Atlin to Dawson ?

4. How many persons are engaged in the operation and maintenance of the line ?

5. What are the rates of pay and allowances, if any, for the different classes of employees ?

6. What are the telegraph rates ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who is not present, has requested me to ask that the hon. member will be good enough to convert that question into a motion.

CHIEF JUSTICE STRONG.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

In the Appropriation Act No. 2, 1901, contained in cap. 2 at p. 17 of Acts of 1901, the following item appears :—

Expenses of Chief Justice Strong in connection with sittings of Judicial Committee of Privy Council, $1,000.

Was the sum paid, and did the Chief Justice attend the sittings of the Judicial Committee in the year 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick). I have to say that the amount in question has not been paid to the Chief Justice, for the very good reason that he did not attend any sitting of the Privy Council in the year 1901.

ABSTRACTION FROM REGISTERED LETTERS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Was the Post Office Department advised of the abstraction of five dollars in the month of May or June last, from a registered letter posted at Seeley's Bay P.O., in the county of Leeds, by a Mrs. Coleman, addressed to Toronto ? Also of the loss of five dollars from a registered letter posted at Morton P.O., in the said county of Leeds, at about the same time, by a Mrs. Manuel ?

2. If so was the matter investigated, and by whom ? Was a report made by the party who made the investigation ?

3. Was the postmaster at Morton removed from office in consequence of an investigation made by the assistant inspector; or was the postmaster exonerated from blame and responsibility?

4. Did the inspector report to the department the result of the investigation?

5. Was the report withdrawn and replaced by another, in which the facts were not fully or properly represented?

6. Was the postmaster and his assistant practically exonerated in the substituted reports?

7. If the postmaster was not removed, was his resignation called for by the Postmaster General or any other person? If so, when and by whom, and for what reason?

8. Did Mr. Judd and other persons of the village of Morton make representations to the department? If so, did their representations agree with the report of the inspector? If not, in what respect did they differ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). The department has no information as to the abstraction of five dollars in the month of May or June last from a registered letter posted at Seeley's Bay by Mrs. Coleman. Perhaps the question has reference to the alleged abstraction of one dollar from a non-registered letter posted by Mrs. Coleman at the office in question. This matter was referred to Inspector Merrick who reported that 'personal inquiry has been made at Seeley's Bay and Morton but no evidence was obtained which would lead me to suppose that the letter was tampered with at either of these offices, and I am of opinion that it left Morton in same condition as posted.'

With reference to the other inquiry, namely, the loss of five dollars from registered letter posted at Morton by Mrs. Manuel, this matter was referred to inspector who investigated and reported thereon. The inspector reported that in his opinion the loss occurred at the Morton post office, but he did not find who was the guilty party. His report showed the existence of more or less laxity which rendered it possible for persons other than those officially connected with the office to abstract a registered letter. The report of the inspector was not withdrawn or replaced by any other report. The postmaster was not removed nor was his resignation called for by the Postmaster General. The department has no knowledge as to whether any other persons called upon him to resign. No representations upon the subject have been made to the department by Mr. Judd or any other persons of the village of Morton.

MAIL CONTRACT, ROUND HILL—ARMSTRONG'S CORNER, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Why was the recent change made in the carrying of the mail from Round Hill, in Greenwich, King's County, N.B., to Armstrong's Corner, Queen's County, N.B.?

2. Upon whose recommendation was the change made, and what reasons were given for the same?

3. Were tenders asked for the new service; and if not, why not?

4. Who is the mail carrier on the route as at present constituted; and what pay does he receive for such service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock):

1. There has been no change made in the mail service between Armstrong's Corner and Round Hill, New Brunswick.

This answers 2 and 3.

4. The present contractor is Francis A. Wood, who is paid at the rate of one hundred and sixty dollars per annum.

RAILWAY LANDS—PATENTS.

Mr. OLIVER—by Mr. Scott—asked:

1. How many acres of land were patented to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company up to the 1st of March, 1902?

2. How many acres were patented to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company up to the 1st of March, 1902?

3. Is it the intention of the government to continue issuing patents to these companies until all their land has been patented to them?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton):

1. The number of acres patented to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, up to 1st of March, 1902, is 9,464,572·51.

2. The number of acres patented to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, up to 1st of March, 1902, is 1,002,003·26.

3. Yes. There is a temporary delay in the case of the Calgary and Edmonton Company, but patentry will, no doubt, be proceeded with in a short time.

N.W.T.—TAXATION OF RAILWAY LANDS—C.P.R. LAND GRANT.

Mr. OLIVER—by Mr. Scott—asked:

What measures, if any, have been taken by the government to submit the question of the termination of the exemption from taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway land grant to the courts?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). A memorandum was submitted to the Deputy Minister of Justice on the 7th of October last, asking that steps should be taken for the purpose of having the question referred to determined by the courts. A variety of detailed information was required by the Department of Justice before the matter could be fully considered, and the method of submitting the question decided upon, and some delay necessarily took place. It was finally concluded that the question could best be settled by bringing about a suit between a local municipality and the railway

company, which would constitute a test case. The land commissioner of the Department of the Interior and the Deputy Minister of Justice are making arrangements to bring this about.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PURCHASE OF HORSES IN NORTH-WESTERN CANADA.

Mr. OLIVER—by Mr. Scott—asked:

Has the government any information as to its being the intention of the War Office to purchase horses in North-western Canada during the coming summer?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The government has no official information in regard to this matter, but it is a matter of public notoriety that the War Office is purchasing horses in Canada at the present time for South Africa through its officer, Col. Dent, and that that officer has expressed the expectation of purchasing horses in the North-west Territories during the coming summer.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed, adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding):

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate. What has surprised me has been the variety of opinions expressed by hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House. The hon. gentleman who spoke last night, the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes), opened his remarks by referring to the inconsistencies that the opposition were led up to. I think it ill-becomes any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House to refer to inconsistencies. Their whole record has been a record of inconsistencies. I am not going over all those old and pretty well threshed out subjects now—commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, continental free trade, free trade as they have it in Great Britain, and all the other fads and policies which these hon. gentlemen advocated for a period of eighteen years. I say that in so far as this side of the House is concerned there has been no inconsistency. We have been twitted with having the old policy of some twenty-five years ago. We are proud to stand by the policy which was advocated twenty-five years ago, and we believe it is the policy which is in the best interests of the Dominion of Canada. The hon. member for West Huron spoke in regard to the woollen industry, following the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond). He stated in regard to that industry that if those engaged in it were not satisfied with a duty of 23 per cent, they should get out of business. He is only reiterating the statements made by members of the government. I say that is not a fair statement, it was not a proper statement, and it is all the more reason why we, on this side of the House, should ask for a declared policy and that the manufacturers should know just what their position is in regard to the tariff. The hon. gentleman went on to say in regard to that industry that he had not as yet had any evidence of the woollen industry being in an unsatisfactory condition. He said that in so far as he could ascertain, the woollen industry was thriving, and that every mill in this country was running on full time. I would like to take him to the town of Cornwall, in the electoral district which I have the honour to represent. I can show him a mill in which there are some $200,000 invested and which is one of the best equipped mills in Canada, but, which, to-day, has closed its doors necessitating the discharge of 170 operators. In regard to these operators, about fifty of them are the heads of families. Each of these families will average about five persons. The closing down of that mill simply means taking the bread out of the mouths of 350 people in the town of Cornwall. It cannot be said that the people behind this mill had not sufficient capital to run it, and make the running of it profitable. The mill is owned, as you know, by Lord Mount Stephen, a very wealthy man who is quite able to operate the mill, if, under existing conditions, there was any object in operating it. Now, I say that the hon. member for West Huron, before he makes a statement of that sort, should inquire and see just what the condition of the woollen industry is in this country. The hon. member for North Lanark has given some very valuable figures in regard to the increased importation of woollens between 1897 and 1901, and it is quite apparent that it has almost doubled within that period, to the injury of the woollen industry of this country. The hon. member for West Huron also stated that it was in the interests of this country that there should be a reduction in the tariff in regard to other lines of articles which are consumed by the people. He is one of the hon. gentlemen who are evidently in favour of a tariff for revenue, or free trade. He has referred to the policy of the Conservative party, and he says that that policy was an anti-British policy. I will just refer him to the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) some time ago when he clearly stated that if the policy which he advocated of unrestricted reciprocity discriminated against Great Britain,

he was quite satisfied that it should do so. The hon. gentleman has said :

I believe this country would have been better off if we never had a national policy.

I shall not go back to the dark days between 1873 and 1878, when owing to the Mackenzie government not meeting the conditions as they arose, Canada was in a most depressed state. We all know that the Conservative tariff, inaugurated in 1879, was really the first Canadian tariff that gave thorough protection to our home industries. We know that the results of that tariff were most satisfactory. Two years after the adoption of protection there was collected $2,900,000 more than was necessary for the expenditure of the country, while prior to that time, year in and year out, there were deficits. The official statistics tell us that within two years after the adoption of protection in 1879, there was an increase of over $20,000,000 in the value of bank stocks; the Canadian labourer got better wages; the Canadian manufacturer made larger profits; the Canadian merchant increased his business, and the Canadian farmer obtained a higher price for his products. It is needless to dwell further on the prosperity which Canada enjoyed as a result of the adoption of the national policy. Any one who looks at the statistics will see the progress which Canada made during the years immediately succeeding 1879.

We have had a good many speeches from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and we have had a good many different theories advanced by them as to our fiscal policy. The hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton); the hon. gentleman from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and other supporters of the government, made strong protectionist speeches, while the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) came out as a straight free trader. At all events the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) is consistent, and he holds to his theory of free trade no matter what policy the government he supports may place before the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) told us that the conditions in Canada are very similar to the conditions which exist in the United States. I agree with that statement to the extent that our natural resources are similar to the resources possessed by the United States. But, the hon. gentleman said further on in his speech :

The proposition that you can protect the labouring man is the greatest absurdity that was ever spoken.

I do not agree with that statement. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) turns to the statistics, he will find that in every protectionist country the rate of wages has increased, while in the free trade countries the rate of wages has diminished. That would indicate that you can protect the labouring man. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) also said :

In my estimation protection is neither more nor less than legalized robbery.

That is the old old story. For years and years the Liberals made that declaration when they were out of power. But if protection is legalized robbery, why did not the party which the member for Russell supports abolish protection when they got into power ? Why did not they institute free trade instead of adopting to a large extent the national policy, which was inaugurated by the Conservative party ? Perhaps the hon. member for Russell can settle that with his political leaders. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) further said :

In the United States every producer of the natural resources of that country is a slave.

With that statement of the hon. gentleman I cannot agree. The producers of the United States would, no doubt, be themselves astonished to hear that. Further, the hon. member said :

I believe our duty is to legislate for the Canadian people without any regard to what the American people or any other people do.

In that statement I absolutely concur, and I say that in the interest of the Canadian people we should have a declared and settled policy of adequate protection in this country. The hon. member for Russell has spoken of the history of the United States, and he told us that the industrial history of that country had not been a record of success. Well, we in Canada are much interested in the history of the United States, and if time permitted I could carry this House back to all the protectionist measures that were adopted by the neighbouring republic. To begin with, I would have to take you back to the second Act which was placed on the statute-books of the Congress of the United States, and which was the foundation stone of the success of the industries of that country. From the date of the passage of that Act until the present time, there have been almost continuous tariff Acts passed by congress, giving protection to the industries of the United States, and whenever that country reduced the tariff and moved in the direction of free trade, there was a financial crisis and trade was depressed. I believe that we in Canada have got to look at this matter largely in the light of experience, and I say that the experience of other nations in dealing with fiscal matters should be a guide to us. Let us remember that it is not only the United States that has adopted a high protective tariff. I think I am safe in saying that every nation under the sun, with the single exception of Great Britain, has adopted protection as its policy. France to-day is one of the richest countries in the world, and France is highly protective. We all know the industrial history of Germany. We know that Germany in years gone by had a protective tariff, and we know that tariff was lowered to the

great disadvantage of Germany. We know that in 1897, Bismarck came down with a manifesto which was acceptable to the German people, and they carried a protective tariff by a large majority, the result of which has been that since that time Germany has gone on increasing in wealth and increasing in prosperity.

Mr. EDWARDS. What are the conditions in Germany to-day ?

Mr. PRINGLE. The conditions in Germany are, I understand, prosperous.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. EDWARDS. Germany is to-day experiencing the greatest depression she has ever known in her existence.

Mr. MACLEAN. Probably because they have not enough protection.

Mr. EDWARDS. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pringle) a question ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would be pleased to answer the hon. member for Russell.

Mr. EDWARDS. Belgium is close to France and Germany, and would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pringle) tell me what are the present conditions in Belgium. Will he also kindly tell us of the conditions of Switzerland, a small country, and also of Holland ?

Mr. MACLEAN. And Ireland.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would like very much to deal with all the countries of the world ; but if I deal with France, Germany, Russia, the United States and one or two more, I think this House will be satisfied. I could quote from a very able author to show that the conditions in the country to which the hon. gentleman refers are better under the system which it has adopted than they were formerly. I might refer, for the benefit of the hon. member for Russell, to the condition of Germany. In 1879 Prince Bismarck came down with this utterance :

> One thing is clear that through the widely open doors of its import trade, the German market has become a mere storage space for the over production of other countries. We must therefore shut our gates and take care that the German market which is now being monopolized by foreign wares shall be reserved for native industry. Countries which are inclosed have become great, and those which have remained open have fallen behind. Were the perils of protection really so great as sometimes painted, France would long ago have been ruined, instead of which she was more prosperous than Germany to-day, and protectionist Russia too. Look at her marvellous prosperity. The question before us is not a political but a financial one, and we should put all personal sensibility aside. The brief experience of the German people with the policy of free trade had afforded examples which proved the error that had been committed by the free trade minister in abandoning the time-honoured policy under which Germany had grown great, and the foundation had been laid for erecting the mightiest empire in central Europe.

The Bill was passed on July 7th, 1879, by a vote of 217 for, and 117 against. The Chancellor in 1885, in referring to the policy of protection said it had freed the country from its poverty of blood. The exports of manufactured articles had increased over 33 per cent. Wages and profits had materially increased, by a report of the German iron and steel manufacturers representing 247 works. It appeared that the number of artisans employed had increased 35 per cent in 1884 over 1879.

We find a similar history in Russia. In extent of domain and in the enjoyment of certain natural and geographical advantages, Russia is probably the grandest empire on the globe, with twice the area of the United States and 160 times that of England and Wales. It embraces one-sixth of the world's habitable land. How much the population exceeds 115,000,000 is not known. It is supposed to be about 120,000,000. In 1819 the protective system was entirely abandoned. A low rate of duty was retained, but it gave such freedom to the importation of goods as seriously to affect all manufactures. On the other hand, England and France had tariffs of a strong protective character, and Russia was at a double disadvantage. It did not take her long to see the necessity of again returning to protection, and in 1822 a new customs tariff was adopted, and the importations of foreign goods were subjected to high duties. Russia has never since returned to free trade. Her tariff systems have changed, but always with more or less protective features. From 1822 till 1849 high duties were maintained ; from 1850 to 1876 more moderate duties prevailed ; while from 1877 to the present time duties have been levied in a series of measures with a view of protecting Russian productions and Russian industries. The effect of a return to a strict protective system in 1876 was accompanied by a marked advance and wonderful strides in industrial progress. A general revision of the tariff was carried out in 1891. The rapid advance made in recent years proves beyond a question that Russia will soon be numbered among the greatest manufacturing nations of the world.

The hon. member for Russell, who unquestionably is a strong free trader, may possibly, like the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), change his mind. I may tell him that men in the United States, though probably not of the ability of the hon. gentleman, have seen fit to change their minds. I remember reading of Daniel Webster, one of the cleverest men ever produced in the United States, who was an ardent free trader until pretty well advanced in life, but who then changed his views on the subject, and came out

frankly and manfully and said : 'I have been a free trader, but I have come to see that free trade is against the interests of this nation, and I am now a protectionist.' The hon. member for Russell may follow the example of Daniel Webster, and we may see him coming forward next session with a confession like that of the hon. member for North Norfolk.

I might quote the language of Sir John Barnard Byles, which I think contains a great deal of truth. He says :

A nation, whether it consumes its own productions or with them purchases from abroad, can have no more to spend than it produces. Therefore the supreme policy of every nation is to develop its own producing forces.

I say the supreme policy of Canada is to develop its own producing forces. There is no reason why the people of this country should import from the United States of America sixty or seventy million dollars worth of manufactured goods. We can make those goods in Canada, and I believe we should make them in Canada ; and notwithstanding what we hear from the opposite side of the House, I believe there are men sitting on the government benches today who are just as strong protectionists as we are, and who will adapt themselves to the conditions existing in this country. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) made a very strong speech along the line of free trade ; but I say that he does not agree with the leaders of the Liberal party to-day. Does he agree with the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who made a very strong protectionist speech in this House a short time ago ? Does he agree with the Hon. George W. Ross, the Premier of Ontario ? That gentleman does not say that the national policy was a curse to this country. What he says is that the Conservative party were the first to discover the benefits of a protective tariff and to introduce it into this country. This is the language of the Hon. George W. Ross, addressed to the legislative assembly of Ontario on the 22nd of January, 1902 :

It was on this continent largely that the idea of fostering trade by a direct intervention of the government, grew up ; and perhaps it is on this continent that it has as strong a hold as it has in any part of the world. The American government sixty or seventy years ago entered upon a policy of fostering its industries by protection. Germany, France, Italy, Russia, and latterly the Australian Commonwealth has followed in the footsteps of the United States. The purpose in every case, whether wisely or unwisely, whether according to the principles of Adam Smith, or the protectionist school, was to add to the wealth of the nation and to develop its raw material, and to increase its resources. The same object has been aimed at in various other ways. Railways have been built by subvention in land and money, for the development of the latent resources of the country. The states of the Union, including the federal government, have given nearly one hundred million acres of land for that purpose, as well as large cash subsidies. The Dominion government did so for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and no doubt that road would never have been built unless so aided. (Opposition members—Hear, hear.) We have done so in Ontario, and the other provinces of the Dominion have followed our example. Bounties have been given for the development of special industries in France and in Germany ; bounties by the Dominion goverament for the development of iron and steel ; bounties by the Ontario government for the development of our iron industry, and latterly the proposed bounty for the encouragement of the beet-root sugar industry.

Then he goes on to deal with the question of bounty, and proceeds to say :

The object of my argument is to show that it seems to be admitted all round that a government in modern times has something more to do than merely discharge administrative functions. It has to be the pioneer, if possible, at all events the foster parent, of manufactures and commerce. It has, if possible, to devise ways and means by which the material wealth of the people it represents for the time being may be promoted. It is supposed to stand upon the financial watch-tower, as well as upon the administrative watch-tower, and wherever any great industry lies dormant which the wealth and means at the disposal of the government can awaken, or where any great enterprise can be encouraged for which private capital is insufficient, it seems to be the rule in modern times for nearly every government to put its hand to these varied means of enriching a nation; and, wisely or unwisely, for good or for evil, tax the whole people, in order that the whole people may be wealthy.

Again he adds :

It would be an easy thing for a government to say : 'Give us so much money and we will administer the affairs of the country, see that officers are appointed for the various duties, see that checks are issued for salaries'—that would be an easy duty. It is another matter for a government to assume the responsibility of leading the nation, or leading and educating the people to apply their minds to the development of industry, and to the fostering of manufactures or to the development of latent resources, or to any other purpose which may be of more immediate advantage to one or more sections of the country than to the whole country. I think the modern view, although it imposed great responsibility upon the government, is the one we were bound to accept. And I am proud to be able to say that in the province of Ontario, as well as at Ottawa—we have addressed ourselves to the solution, or rather to the discharge, of that duty. In fact, I do not know but the Dominion government, the Conservative government at Ottawa years ago, realized more quickly than perhaps some of us did—(Opposition members—Hear, hear)—what seemed to be the direction—of universal opinion, I was going to say—or rather the direction of all civilized governments at that time, and, realizing that view, they struck out a course which in many respects has been followed since, and has been accepted by some other countries since that time.

These views of the Hon. Mr. Ross certainly do not coincide with those of many of the speakers from the government side of the

House. Mr. Ross admits that the Conservative party were the first to adopt that policy of protection which was necessary in Canada, and to which all civilized countries have turned their attention. Let me just refer to another quotation from the Hon. Mr. Ross, and I do so more particularly to show that when the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) says that the Americans have not prospered under protection, he does not agree with his leader in the province of Ontario. The Hon. George W. Ross says :

> The Americans have become strong largely by the dominant strain which has permeated American legislation and commerce for the last thirty years, and they have become self sustaining to a great extent; and the British navy has been dominated by the idea, since Nelson's time, that the British navy is invincible. And so will we Canadians, by being imbued with the same spirit of manufacturing our own goods as far as we can, developing our own resources where we have the means, become self sustaining, applying ourselves with energy and tact to whatever comes to hand.

Then he proceeds to deal with the factory question :

> A factory means not merely the investment of capital but the employment of intelligent men and women.

He adds further :

> We must make special efforts to have the waste places of the country filled up, and its raw materials and products must be manufactured so far as possible, in the country.

To me it seems a good deal of a farce to hear a large number of gentlemen on the government benches make free trade speeches, and then to find another set get up and make protectionist speeches, and to find the government in the position of having adopted, to a great extent, the national policy. But where they have interfered with that policy they have done so to the injury of the people of this country.

A great deal has been said about free trade England. I do not propose to go back into the history of England. We all know that there was a long and interesting period prior to 1846 when England enjoyed the most rigid protection. We know that in 1337—I think in the reign of Edward III—there were passed enactments for the fostering and encouragement of English industries. We know that from 1337 down to 1846 a most rigid system of protection prevailed in that country. And this very industry, which has been so frequently spoken of here, the woollen industry, owes its present position to that protection. There would have been no possibility of England at that time manufacturing woollen goods for her own people had she not enjoyed the most rigid protection. It was under that policy that the woollen industry of England was built up, just as were built up her other manufacturing industries, until in 1846 they were in a position to dispense with protection and to throw down the tariff wall.

I would like to refer just for a moment to the experience of the United States under a low tariff. I find on reference to the New York 'Tribune' of January 15th, that in 1855 the United States were still under their old tariff law of 1846. That was a very low tariff, and here is how Mr. Horace Greeley, in the New York 'Tribune,' describes its effects :

> The cry of hard times reaches us from every part of the country. The making of roads is stopped; factories are closed; and houses and ships are no longer being built; factory hands, road makers, carpenters, bricklayers, and labourers are idle and paralysis is rapidly embracing every pursuit in the country. The cause of all this stoppage of circulation is to be found in the steady overflow of gold to pay foreign labourers for the cloth, the shoes, the iron and other things that could be produced by American labour, but which cannot be so produced under our present revenue system.

Let me also cite the opinion of another authority, Mr. Peter Cooper :

> British iron and cloth came in and gold went out, and with each successive day the dependence of our farmers on foreign markets became more complete ; with 1857 came the culmination of the system. Merchants and manufacturers being ruined, banks being compelled to suspend payment, and the treasury being reduced to a condition of bankruptcy nearly approaching that which had existed at the close of the free trade period of 1817 and 1839.

President Buchanan described the condition of things, in his message of December 14th, 1860, in the following language :—

> Panic and distress of a fearful character prevails throughout the land. Our labouring population is without employment and consequently deprived of the means of earning their bread. Indeed all hope seems to have deserted the minds of men.

These quotations are of course not evidence, and it is wise for us to look at the statistics to find the proofs of the statements made by such men as President Buchanan, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Horace Greeley and the others. We find that in 1846 there were imported into the United States cotton goods to the value of $13,530,625. In 1860, under this low tariff, there were imported of the same goods to the value of $32,559,024. Take the article of clothing. There was imported in 1864 $847,742 worth, and in 1860 $2,102,296 worth. Then take woollens, with the exceptions of carpets, we find that in 1846 the imports amounted to $9,850,307, and in 1860 they had increased to $35,394,422, or an increase of 360 per cent. Fortunately for the United States a higher tariff measure was brought down. From 1860 until 1890 a fairly high tariff was in force, but in 1890 the McKinley tariff came in. What effect had that tariff on the woollen industry of the United States ? The consumption increased some 17 per cent, while the value of woollen goods imported decreased to the extent of $21,000,000. It has often been said that the

McKinley tariff was a hardship on the consumer. I maintain that that was not the case. For while that tariff protected the manufacturers and the other industries of the United States, the American consumer got his goods at a lower price than he did under a low tariff. That whole question was referred to a very competent committee, consisting of the following gentlemen :—Canon D. Wright, Commissioner of the Department of Labour; General Francis A. Walker, Prof. H. C. Adams, Edward Atkinson, Prof. E. J. James and William Grosvenor. The first man on that committee was an independent on the tariff question. The next three were pronounced free traders and the next two were protectionists. What did that committee report ? It reported as follows I only quote a short portion of report :

> During the twenty-eight months from June 1, 1889, to September 1, 1891 (the Act took effect in 1896), the average retail prices of 214 articles of common consumption among the people declined 64 per cent,—wholesale prices of the same article declined 33 per cent, the prices of agricultural products advanced 67 per cent, and wages advanced on the average 75 per cent.

This report was unanimously adopted by the Senate Committee, composed of both Republicans and Democrats. I say that this report is a most important document. It shows that under high protective tariff, under that McKinley tariff, the prices of articles commonly used and consumed by the people decreased, the rate of wages increased and the prices to the agriculturists increased by no less than 18·67 per cent. The history of the United States of America has been simply this—that parties who gave protection to the country gave prosperity to the country and that those who failed to give that protection brought disaster to the United States. May I be allowed to refer to an earlier period in the history of the American Republic. We know that in 1824 the United States passed a protective tariff. They were bound to increase their protection, because the British manufacturer at that time, owing to the United States low tariff had got possession of their markets. And Henry Clay, who was one of the leading lights of that time, in speaking of the results of a protective tariff—and the protection afforded was a great deal higher than we have in Canada to-day —said :

> If a term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which the people have enjoyed since the establishment of this present constitution, it would be exactly that period which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824.

Now, while this government were pledged to a large reduction in our tariff, they have practically maintained the tariff of the Conservative party, except in so far as the preferential feature is concerned. Let me say a word in this connection, concerning the cotton industry. In the town in which I have the honour to live, the town of Cornwall, we are interested in that industry, manufacturing there, very largely, coloured cottons. Under the late government, we had a protective duty of 30 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite and their supporters, when in opposition, attacked the Conservative government on account of that duty of 30 per cent. Those engaged in the manufacture of cottons were spoken of as 'Cotton Barons' and, from one end of the country to the other speeches were made attacking the cotton industry. But when these hon. gentlemen came into power they did not cut down the tariff. As a citizen of Cornwall, I felt very thankful for that. On the other hand, the government increased the duty by 5 per cent, making it 35 per cent, and then they brought in their preferential tariff. But I say that that preferential tariff is an injury to the cotton industry, and it is no wonder that three of the largest cotton manufacturing concerns passed their dividends within the last year. I have only to look at the returns to find that over $4,000,000 worth of cotton goods were imported into this country under the preferential tariff last year. And, of the class of cotton goods manufactured in our town, over $2,000,000 worth were imported. I quote these figures from memory, but I believe they are substantially correct. Now, it must be plain that that is a great injury to the cotton industry of the country. Prior to the preferential tariff coloured cotton goods came largely from the United States of America. Under the preferential tariff these goods are coming in from Great Britain, and they are coming in at prices which make it almost impossible to compete with them. One hon. gentleman on the other side, speaking in this debate, said that the woollen mills were running night and day. Our cotton industry may be running full time, but they may not be making any money, owing to the competition from outside.

We have also the hon. member from West York (Mr. Campbell) who I must say, ought to support this amendment. If he is correctly reported, he made a very strong protectionist speech at a banquet of the Manufacturers' Association in the city of Montreal. Referring to the large importation of agricultural implements, this is what he said :

> If we can have these goods manufactured in the Dominion and the duty were raised, it would mean that this $2,500,000 worth of goods would be made here ; and the actual fact of such manufacture being established would mean an increase of, say, 25,000 to 30,000 in the population. As it is in this line, so would it be in other lines. The tariff is going to be revised before long—I hope this session.

Now this is a very strong utterance, and what does it mean ? Is it a farce ? Are they playing with the people ? One branch

of the government supporters are going out in the country and saying: We are going to have an increase in the tariff. Another branch of the government supporters are going out and saying, where it suits them, we are adhering to our principles, and intend to reduce the tariff gradually. The Minister of Finance says there will be a revision next year, and we cannot assume that he will increase the tariff. The only assumption possible is that he will reduce the tariff in accordance with the pledges made by himself and other members of the government. I say that this is a farce. The people of this country ought to know definitely what the position of the government is in regard to the tariff. Are they going to reduce it, or are they going to increase it? Where the government find an industry is seriously affected by the preferential tariff, are they going to step in and give that industry the protection that it needs, so that it may have a part in the prosperity of this country? I say, Sir, that we require a declared and settled policy in regard to this tariff question.

The government have taken great credit for the increased imports into this country from Great Britain. In 1900, according to the first plank in their platform as laid down in 1893, where they promised to wipe out the national policy, &c., they issued a manifesto to the people saying that this preferential tariff had resulted in largely increased sales of British goods to Canada. Now, Sir, I do not think that it is in the interests of the Canadian workmen that that tariff should have the result of largely increasing the sales of British goods to the people of Canada, especially of that class of goods that we can manufacture ourselves. And this manifesto was issued before the full reduction of 33⅓ per cent had been made in favour of British goods. I would like, Mr. Speaker, for a moment to refer to the woollen industry. I find in the 'Canadian Manufacturer' of January 3rd, an article on this British preference, and after dealing with statistics, and showing the large increase of importations of woollens from Great Britain, it says this:

> As herein shown, notwithstanding the tariff preference, our import trade with Great Britain is, as compared with our whole trade, fallen behind, not only in manufactures of metals but also in textiles, it is fair to enquire why the preference, for which we receive no quid pro quo should be continued. It has no effect whatever upon our imports of metal goods, and is therefore only valuable as a sentiment, which, in trade, does not count for much, but it most seriously and adversely affects our Canadian woollen industry, and for that reason if for no other, it should be cancelled, or very materially modified; and one very important feature of any modification it should include is a reciprocal preference on the part of Great Britain and any other British country with which Canadians desire to do business.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) said there was no progress in this country under the national policy. Without being too local, I would say in regard to the town of Cornwall in the county which I have the honour to represent, that our increase in population from 1881 to 1891 was 2,337, or 52 per cent. That was due almost entirely to the policy of the Conservative party in protecting the industries of this country. People with capital had confidence in the future of Canada, and they invested in large cotton industries in that town. But apart from that case, what do we find throughout the country? We find that from 1881 to 1891 there was an increase in the number of manufacturing establishments in this country of over 51 per cent, find there was an increase in the amount of capital invested in industries of 114 per cent; and we find the number of employees increased 44 per cent. Now it is idle for the Minister of Agriculture to go into constituencies in this country and say that if the woollen industry cannot exist on a 23 per cent protection it should be wiped out. I say the woollen manufacturers have invested over $10,000,000 of capital in Canada, expecting that the government would give them reasonable protection. I think it is the duty of the government to see that these woollen manufacturers have sufficient protection to put them on an equal footing with their foreign competitors.

I do not intend to deal with the financial question, which has been already covered so completely by the numerous speakers who have preceded me. I will, however, say this, that while the members of the present government were very much horrified at an expenditure of $38,000,000 per annum, they seem to be delighted now at an expenditure of $62,000,000 to $63,000,000 per annum. We find that during the last four or five years, from 1897 to 1901, their total expenditure was $250,550,003, and their total revenues during the same period were $228,670,960. There is a total deficit of $21,879,043 during that period of great prosperity, a period of world-wide prosperity. Not only did this country enjoy prosperity, but there was prosperity in every section of the habitable globe. During that period, with such a buoyant revenue, it was the duty of these gentlemen who found so much fault with an expenditure of $38,000,000, at least to have avoided a prodigal expenditure which left them with a deficit of over $21,000,000 during that period of five years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said here from the agriculturist standpoint. Nobody recognizes more clearly than I do that agriculture is the largest and most important industry of this country, and in it are engaged more people than in any other single occupation. I was surprised

to hear the hon. member for West Huron saying that the agriculturist of this country was not benefited by protection. Then if he is not benefited by protection, why do not the government remove all protection from the agriculturist of this country? When I turn to the 'Hansard' for 1890, I find that there were tremendous importations of fresh meats and other meats; I think that year 33,000,000 pounds of American meat came into Canada, notwithstanding that we then had protection in favour of the farmers, and the Conservative party advocated an increased protection on meats coming in from the United States. We find that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce opposed it. He voted against it, and every member of the government voted against it, but, when they came into power they dared not reduce it. They left it just as it was framed by the Conservatives in 1890. If protection in favour of the agriculturists of this country is a curse, why do not hon. gentlemen remove it? They have removed the protection from three or four articles, and they have removed it to the detriment and injury of the agriculturists of this country. We have a number of hon. gentlemen coming from the western portions of this great Dominion. I may say I am always pleased to hear them speak and advocate their views, but, these hon. gentlemen, instead of being sectional, should be guided by broader lines. They should be national. They must not think that they have all the interests in the west. They have great and important interests, they are going to assist in making this a wealthy country, but their history will be largely the history of the United States. We remember the days when Illinois and the western states were all opposed to protection. We find to-day that in the western states the population has changed. We find that the manufacturers have had to remove to the west to be near the agriculturists of those states. Let me just quote a word from a very able author in connection with the agricultural condition of the United States. Before I quote that I would like to say that in looking at the report of the bureau of statistics of the United States, I find this statement from the chief of that bureau:

> Following on the rapid advance in the population of the western states, large and diversified manufacturing enterprises of this country have moved steadily towards the west.

I believe, and I firmly believe, that if the policy advocated by the Conservative party were carried out in this country you would see large manufacturing industries established in Winnipeg to supply the people of that great western country and the articles that they require would be manufactured by Canadians for the Canadians in the west. The statement has been made that the agriculturists of the United States have not prospered under protection. I say that statement is untrue, that statistics show us that the progress of the agriculturists of the United States has been greater than the progress of the agriculturists of any other nation under the sun. Wealth in the United States has increased at an enormous rate. Mulhall, whom I do not think any one will accuse of being a protectionist, in his 'Industries and Wealth of Nations,' in 1896, says:

> The growth of American agriculture in half a century has been unparalleled in any age or nation.

Then he goes on to say:

> In 1840 the United States produced——

And he gives the quantities. He also gives the production in 1850, showing that there had been a marvellous increase. I am not going to detain the House by giving these figures. This promient authority in the United States says:

> While the great manufacturing industries of the United States were in process of creation instead of diverting capital from the development of agriculture there is a consensus of opinion that the artificial system of promoting manufactures has contributed more to the rapid opening up of the fertile land of the western states than any other cause.

The statement has been made that wages are lower in protectionist countries than in free trade countries. I am not going to weary the House by giving statistics in regard to that matter, but I have taken the trouble of going into the tables, and I find that wages have increased in every protectionist country while they have diminished in free trade countries. I find that in the United States the increase has been very large. Take journeymen carpenters, for instance; between 1840 and 1860 they received $1.25 per day, and subsequent to 1860 the price ranged from $1.25 to $1.75 a day. In 1891, when the McKinley Bill came into force, wages ran from $3 to $3.25 per day, and this has been the history of all protectionist countries. I am now going back for a moment to the woollen industry in the United States. I find by looking at the statistics that the imports of woollens during the twelve months ending December, 1894, amounted to $16,809,872. In 1895, under free trade, or rather, under a lower tariff, because it was not free trade, the imports amounted to $60,319,309. We find that when the Gorman-Wilson tariff came into force in the United States that the manufacturers found it was utterly impossible for them to compete with the foreign product. Some mills were built at Bradford, England, solely for the purpose of supplying the people of the United States with woollen goods. Subsequent to the repeal of that law these mills were closed, the machinery was brought to the United States of America and woollen goods were manufactured for the Ameri-

can people. I would like to give a few figures from the industrial census of the United States for 1893, showing under this low tariff the injury to the business and people of the United States. There was a decrease in labour of 60½ per cent, a decrease in wages of 69 per cent, and a decrease in business of 47 per cent. The number of hands out of work was 101,763, and the total loss in the weekly wages was $1,202,000. There was an average decrease in the rate of wages of $2.35 per week. There was a loss in wages of over $300,000,000, in round figures. A very good barometer as to the condition of the country is the number of failures, and in looking up these figures I find that under Cleveland in 1894 there were 12,721 failures and that under Harrison in 1894 there were 10,034, Cleveland's extra industry of the sheriff in that respect being 2,687. I say that, go where we will, under present conditions, there is no market to gain on the face of the globe. Other nations are not only producing for themselves, but are also looking for foreign markets. I am not going into all the figures of our imports except to say roughly that we imported from the United States during last year $119,000,000 worth, a part of which were necessaries and a large portion of which were dutiable goods—I think about $65,000,000 worth—and as I have heard it stated in this House, I believe that $40,000,000 worth of these goods could be manufactured by our own people in this country. I referred a few moments ago to the importation of cotton fabrics, and I find that the correct figures in regard to the importation of printed, dyed and coloured cottons, which were imported in 1901, and which came into direct competition with the product of the Canadian coloured cotton mills, are as follows: We imported from Great Britain $2,494,503 worth, or 24,165,332 yards of coloured cotton fabrics. Our total importation of cotton fabrics from Great Britain in 1901 amounted to $4,841,165. From the United States we imported $1,368,696 worth, so that the total importation into Canada of manufactured cotton goods for the year 1901 amounted to $6,209,861 in value. It is whispered that the large mills at Valleyfield have been promised an increase in the tariff. I hope they will get it, because I believe that it will be very largely in the interest of the country if the tariff on cotton goods could be increased; at all events increased to such an extent as to put Canadian manufacturers on a par with the manufacturers of foreign countries.

The House will pardon me if I say a word or two with regard to the increase of wages in the woollen industries. We in this country want to see our artisans and our factory employees receiving fair wages. We want to see them get reasonable wages, for if they do not they will not stay with us, but will depart for the United States, which is a high protected country and where the wages are high. Look at the relative wages paid in the United States and in England. I now refer to the woollen industry, and I find that in Massachusetts the spinners get $6.00 per week as against $2.43 in England; the wool sorters get $11 per week in Massachusetts as against $7.29 in England; the overlookers get $15 a week in Massachusetts as against $8.26 in England. In the mechanic and repair shops we find that the carpenters get $13.50 a week in Massachusetts as against $6.80 in England, and the machinists get $13.20 in Massachusetts as against $7.29 in England.

The following table will show the relative wages paid in Massachusetts and in England:—

RISE IN WAGES UNDER PROTECTION.

	Massachusetts.	England.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Spinners	6 00	2 43
Wool sorters	11 00	7 29
Overlookers	15 00	8 26
Assistant overlookers	9 00	4 36
Weavers	7 00	3 40
MECHANIC AND REPAIR SHOPS.		
Carpenters	13 50	6 80
Machinists	13 20	7 29
Blacksmiths	12 00	7 29
Stokers	9 00	4 37
Engineers	15 00	7 29
CARDING.		
Overlookers	16 50	9 72
Girders and strippers	9 00	4 37
Carders	6 50	3 04

It will be seen that wages are very much higher in the United States than they are in free trade England. The wages paid in Canada have got to correspond to a large extent with the wages paid in the United States or else we cannot keep our population in Canada. Why, in the little town of Lowell, Massachusetts, I was surprised to find that there are 6,000 Canadians working there in the cotton mills, and manufacturing cottons which are sent back into this country and are purchased by our people here. I believe Sir, that with a proper system of protection we would have these Canadians living in our own country and manufacturing cotton goods for the people of Canada.

The hon. member for Russell said that the United States is not a prosperous country. Let us look at the wealth of the United States as compared with the wealth of other countries and we will see that the statement of the hon, gentleman (Mr. Edwards) is absolutely refuted. The following table

will show the wealth of the United States in the different years from 1850 to 1895 :

Year.	Population.	Amount.	Per Capita.
		£	£
1850.	23,200,000	1,486,000,000	64
1870.	38,600,000	5,010,000,000	130
1890.....	62,600,000	13,550,000,000	216
1895. . ..	69,700,000	16,350,000,000	234

The figures showing the expansion of British wealth presented by Mr. Mulhall do not permit the paralleling of this table but he tells us that in 1850 the wealth of Great Britain was £7,206,000,000, and that in 1895 it had increased to £11,806,000,000. This shows an increase of £4,606,000,000 in thirty-five years, whereas the increase in the United States during the twenty-five years ending in 1895 amounted to £11,340,000,000, the addition being nearly as much as the total of wealth of Great Britain in the last year of the period. According to the same authority the total wealth of the world in 1894 was £69,769,000,000 and the United States stands credited with nearly one fourth of the whole amount. In the face of this, it cannot be said that the United States is not a prosperous country. I say, Sir, that the United States has been immensely prosperous and that its prosperity is due to its protective policy. In this Canada of ours, we have resources that are as great as the resources of the United States, and under proper development I believe that we will go ahead and prosper just as the United States prospered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was a little curious to look into the report of the Industrial Commission which sat in the United States in the year 1900, as I was anxious to see how a low tariff affected the woollen industries in that country. I shall quote from one or two of the witnesses who appeared before that commission. First I will take Mr. Wood, a large manufacturer of woollens in the United States of America, and this is the report of his evidence :

Mr. Wood says that if the tariff were removed from woollen manufactures this country would be inundated with foreign goods. American woollen mills would be obliged to close, and could only resume operations through adjusting labour costs to meet European conditions. Even if they had free wool the manufacturers would be emphatically opposed to the abolition of the tariff on woollens, but woollen manufacturers do not look upon the tariff on woollens as a tax on the consumers ; it is certainly not so to-day. Mr. Wood thinks that the wages of the operatives in the mills of the American Woollen Company average about 100 per cent higher than the wages paid in England.

This is the report of the evidence of Mr. Falwell, another large woollen manufacturer in the United States :

Mr. Falwell testifies that his rate of wages are about the same now as under the McKinley Bill, but that when the Wilson Bill was in force the general rate was about 10 per cent lower and about half his mill was stopped. He attributes the fact that wages are higher in America than in Europe exclusively to the tariff. He understands that while wages in American woollen mills are about double what is paid in France and Germany, they are a little less than double what is paid in England.

Mr. William G. Steele was examined before that commission and he is asked this question :

Q. How did the wages compare ?—A. The wages are much higher here than there. I will give you an instance showing that one department of the business—that is, the weaving department. The weavers over there as a rule are higher skilled weavers; they can only get work as learners, unless they are well skilled and capable ; I just speak of this one instance although it is a good comparison of the great number of workers. There was one woman—and the weavers in England are mostly women, here they are largely men—this woman was a very good weaver, but the highest wages I remember of her making were about $5 a week. She came to our mill and she worked on the same loom and on the same class of goods precisely—not made out of the same wools but the character of the goods was similar—and she made $14 in our mill ; and we have people now —men—that earn as high as $18 a week, but I never knew a man weaver over there making over $7.50.

Under the United States tariff of 1897 on cloths, knit and other fabrics, and all manufactures of every description made wholly or in part of wool, there was a specific duty besides an ad valorem duty of 50 per cent. Under the Act of 1894 the duty was from 35 to 40 per cent ad valorem.

In this country under the preferential tariff there is only about 23 per cent on woollen goods, and it is impossible for our woollen industry to pay the wages which have to be paid in this country and exist under that rate of duty. The American woollen mills could not exist under a tariff of 40 per cent and a small specific duty, and how can it be expected that woollen mills in Canada, situated under similar conditions, can exist under a tariff of 23 per cent ?

Mr. Falwell, a woollen manufacturer, testified that his trade had no more than got established under the McKinley Bill before the Wilson Bill was passed. He only ran half his capacity during the period of the Wilson Bill. The markets were flooded both with goods and with wool, but it is pretty well over now and if we are simply let alone I think everything will work out right.

Another great injury to the woollen trade caused by a low tariff is the importation of

shoddy, which is used in a very low grade of goods. So far as I can learn, our Canadian woollen manufacturers give to the people an honest article, but the low class of goods that came into the country from abroad under a low tariff were largely composed of shoddy, and this was also the experience of the United States under a low tariff.

There is a question, Mr. Speaker, of vital importance to this country, to which the government should turn their immediate attention ; that is, the transportation question. But the government of this country seems to think that all they have to do is to let things alone, while our agriculturists are suffering great hardships from the high rates that not only prevail on the railways, but on the ocean steamers plying between the port of Montreal and the old country. A short time ago I read a very interesting and able speech on this subject delivered by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren), in which that hon. gentleman showed that there has been a loss to the farmers of this country of $10,000,000 in one year. That is equal to more than one-third of our customs taxation. And what is the reason of that loss ? It is caused by the high rates charged by the railway companies in this country. Now, surely this is a matter which our government can control. Surely our government can see that the agriculturists of this country get as low rates as the agriculturists of the United States. If they do, there will be a saving to them, according to the figures I have before me, of over $10,000,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a great deal longer than I had any intention of doing, and I will just say, in closing, that I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition. I am a firm believer in the development of Canada for Canadians. It is our duty as a people to further the interests of Canada, and to protect our labour, our agricultural products, manufactures and industries. Let us legislate in so far as we can to promote the wealth of this country. Let us do all that we can to bring prosperity to this country—to the artisan in the humblest home as well as to those who combine their capital and invest it for the purpose of developing the resources of this country. I am firmly convinced that the policy laid down by the Conservative party is the policy which will accrue to the benefit of the Dominion.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, last year in my maiden speech in this House I used the English language to express my views upon the administration of the public affairs of Canada, and having thus paid a deserved compliment to my English-speaking constituents, I feel it my duty to-day to pay the same compliment to my French Acadian friends, who have opened to me the doors of this parliament.

It is only right that the Acadian people, who number 150,000 souls in the maritime provinces, should attract more and more the attention of parliament and of the country, not only on account of their rapid increase and their attachment to the soil, but also by reason of the intelligent way in which they study every question of public policy, while at the same time, their public men also shine in public life.

French Acadians also deserve the consideration of all Canadians for their energetic and persistent work in developing the resources of this country, as fishermen and as agriculturists ; they also deserve our esteem for the great love they entertain for their native land which they now delight in calling their dear Canada ; and above all, for their sincere and generous loyalty to the great British nation, whose expansion and stability they wish to see maintained, for the greatest good of humanity. The small Acadian people are now one heart and soul with the happy Canadian family extending from ocean to ocean. They play a most creditable part in that harmonious concert of the different races who, in this land of ours, sing the glories of old France, the touching traditions of Ireland, the chivalrous customs of old Scotland, the triumphs of England, and finally join in a most heartfelt expression of gratitude for those acts of kindness which have atoned for past wrongs, and all bear witness to their ardent love for that constitution which guarantees to every one of us the same amount of civil, political and religious liberty, whether we live in the more modest homes of Evangeline's native land or in the great palaces of Westminster and Buckingham.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to tell the House to-day what kind of judgment it should pass upon the administration of the public affairs during the five years this government has been in power. More than a year has elapsed since the people gave their verdict, when the Liberal party were given a new lease of power by an increased majority. Nor do I think it necessary to dwell upon the merits of the present administration. This task I leave to other gentlemen who can bring to bear upon the debate all the resources of their eloquence, supported by a larger experience than mine. Such a speech we did hear from the lips of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce who, the other night, held the House spell-bound while he brought to the support of his thesis an array of most striking facts and uncontrovertible statistics. The government stands in no need of panegyrics. The immense prosperity which the country is now enjoying speaks volumes. And this unbounded prosperity could not have spread over the land except under the beneficent impulse of a master-mind which had first to pave the way for it. That master-mind

it was that first prepared the soil in which that luxuriant growth was to germinate, and then, later on, extended its domain and enriched it by steady and persistent labour. That great mind was, no doubt, conscious of the immensity of the resources of this country, of the different ways of developing them ; it must have had a thorough knowledge of the geographical and climacteric conditions of Canada and of her relations to other nations, so as to take advantage of the good dispositions of some of them and refuse to deal with those who were unwilling to offer us good terms.

That prosperity, which has come here to stay, we owe to the wise and vigorous administration of the Liberal government, under the guidance of our beloved right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and with the assistance of ministers moved by the same patriotic zeal. We are told that this prosperity is due to Divine Providence. In the abstract, it is true. Every thing in this world, I admit, is ruled by an all-wise Providence. But, were it to follow the same line of reasoning I should be forced to the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite will continue to occupy the opposition benches for a long time to come.

When they speak of the immense harvest of last year in Manitoba and the North-west, which was double that of the previous year, I agree with them. In that fact I see the hand of Providence. But when we come to the progress that the country has made by leaps and bounds ; when we have to deal with the increase in our general trade during the last five years, in our exports as well as in our imports ; or when we consider the arrangement under which every up to date invention and all modern improvements have been grouped together, at the conjunction of the two brightest centuries of our civilization, so that we are enabled to carry our agricultural products to the markets of the world in a state of preservation unknown up to this time, then I see there the hand of man, but, you may depend upon it, it is the work of a most skilful, steady and firm hand, the hand of a patriotic man.

When speaking of the interposition of Providence, hon. gentlemen perhaps mean to say—and here again I agree with them—that the people of Canada have been moved by a providential suggestion, when, on the 23rd June, 1896, they selected as their future premier the man who up to then had only been the leader of a party, and a parliamentary debater, but who had revealed himself as the most judicious and patriotic leader that Canadians could desire for Canada, and the empire for its most important self-governing colony.

I contend that our leader has been most fortunate in the choice of his colleagues. Realizing that the happiness of a nation rests upon the progress of agriculture, he has intimated to the country that he wished to enlarge its agricultural area and to find new markets for the products of the fields, then he looked around for a man who knew the different qualities of the soil, its fertility and all the possibilities of the country ; a man who could and really did secure new markets for Canada, and procure to the farmers means of transportation for their products in a perfect state of preservation to the most distant, and the richest markets of the world. That man was the present Minister of Agriculture, who has done more for our farmers during the last five years than any one of his predecessors in the administration of this branch of public administration.

Our leader wanted a man of energy, a man of tact and courage, having a thorough knowledge of the resources of the country and at the same time a man who could grapple with the difficulties which would have to be faced in the development of the resources of those vast territories where the most promising and the richest areas are so remote from the sea ports. He needed for that work a man possessed with an iron will, an energetic and able man who could devise great schemes in order to meet the exigencies created by the nature of the country ; a man who like Richelieu who wished to save Canada to Louis XIV. and to France, could realize that economy does not consist in a cheese-paring policy, but in a judicious expenditure of public money.

And he found that man in the hon. Minister of Public Works, who, during the last five years has won the esteem, the respect, admiration and confidence of everybody, and whose great schemes for the development of the country, and views upon the important question of transportation have elicited the most generous approvals from the opposition as well as from the liberal press.

Knowing that the development of our resources, so vast, so rich and so varied, and that our commerce with England and the other countries would increase to fabulous figures, our leader felt the need of a man who could help these workers and the improvers of our resources ; a man who knew how to keep the treasury well filled, and who would be able to balance the expense with the revenue. Now, such a man he found in the hon. Minister of Finance, who not only fulfilled but exceeded his hopes. For, instead of confining himself to maintaining the equilibrium between the expenditure and the revenue, he took advantage of the prosperous state of our trade, and every year offered the country surpluses of which the greatest financiers of the world might well be proud.

The country was glad to find that the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Public Works have spared no pains in making the improvements required for the transportation of agricultural products. If these two hon. gentlemen would allow me to offer them a suggestion out of pure

friendship, I would tell them to hasten the completion of their schemes and to go ahead fearlessly while they have the good fortune of being associated with the hon. Minister of Finance ; for they may be sure that he will always follow them with a surplus.

I should also like to say that the hon. Prime Minister who had proved so happy in the selection of the members of his cabinet, when he first formed it, was equally successful in the choice of their successors. The appointment of the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the selection of the new Solicitor General (Mr. Carroll) have won approval and praise from more eloquent voices than mine. The whole country has approved of these appointments, and the flattering compliments paid to the new appointees in this House, have been endorsed by the French-speaking as well as by the English-speaking people of this country. We have heard praises coming from every quarter to the address of these new ministers, and I may add that the appointment of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Sutherland) has won the same approval from the people. It is probably because the department which the new Minister of Marine and Fisheries presides over is of greater interest to the members of the maritime provinces than to those of any other province, that I feel it my duty to express here not only my approval of his appointment, but to bear witness to the general feeling of satisfaction that prevails throughout the country as to the able and intelligent manner in which the hon. minister performs the duties of his position. It is true that we, of the maritime provinces, have regretted for a little while, I shall say the appointment of the present minister, but the loss of a representative in the cabinet. This expression of regret all through the maritime provinces was not due to the fact that the hon. gentleman who now presides over this department does not reside in our midst and is not yet perfectly acquainted with our wants; but it was due to the feeling that we had lost a representative for the maritime provinces in the cabinet. But from the relations we have had so far with the new Minister of Marine, we feel that we have the best reasons for congratulating him, and we hope that when he is better acquainted with our wants, he will also be able to realize our needs and to lend us a helping hand in developing our maritime industries.

In his budget speech, the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has referred to the census. He had to confess that the result was disappointing. I shall not speak of the general disappointment about the small increase of the population in the whole country, but I shall once more ask this House to show some gratitude to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who, in addition to the benefits he has conferred upon the farming community, has also rendered great service to our French Acadian people. In the maritime provinces, the Acadians being aware of their numerical weakness, were naturally interested in having a correct statement of their numbers made, showing their standing in this happy community to which I referred a little while ago ; for they do not mean to remain in the background in this country of ours, but they mean to play an active role, in the development of British institutions. They were interested in showing their full numerical strength, in order to give further scope to their patriotism and their loyalty. In 1891, unhappily, the census had proved unsatisfactory to the French population of New Brunswick and specially that of Nova Scotia. This year, thanks to the intelligent, disinterested and truly patriotic efforts of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) the same interest has been extended to the French population of the maritime provinces as to the English population of the other provinces, and French enumerators were appointed in the counties where groups of Acadians were found. In short, whether this result is due to the census bureau in Ottawa, or to the enumerators in the maritime provinces, the Acadians are proud today and also pleased to see that they have been fairly dealt with and that their numerical strength was accurately put before the country, so that in future they will be able to speak in the name of a correctly enumerated population.

I say that the Acadian people wish to stand before the country in their full numerical strength, for they have proved that they have in their make up the stuff of which are made loyal subjects of England. It is important that the Acadian people should be known and judged upon their merits ; and in this connection I hope I shall be allowed to quote an extract from an article published in a great newspaper on the 15th of March, 'La Presse,' of Montreal. I trust that the able director of 'La Presse' when he was penning these lines, did not think of the false position in which he was placing the Acadian people towards the rest of the population of Canada :

> Neither do the Acadians wish to be called Canadians nor do they call themselves Canadians. To their mind, the country they reside in is not exactly Canada, it is Acadia. They are either Acadian or French ; they do not object to call themselves such, but Canadians or French Canadians never. To them Canada is as much a foreign country as Lousiana is. They go to Canada as they go to the United States. And Canada, in their eyes, is confined to the province of Quebec.

If these lines had been written forty years ago or before confederation, when the maritime provinces were no part of the Dominion, I could understand it. But to-day, the Acadians in the province of New Brunswick as in all the other maritime provinces, are happy to call themselves Canadians. They

have become enthusiastic and loyal British subjects in Canada. They heartily joined hands with their brothers of Canada as soon as the isolation in which they had so long lived had ceased. To prove it, I have only to say that, though I was born in the province of Quebec, I have been returned to this House by a county which boasts of the largest Acadian population in the maritime provinces or at least in New Brunswick. This county in the limits of which reside one-third of the 80,000 Acadian souls of the maritime provinces have elected as their representative in parliament a French Canadian, born in the province of Quebec, against one of their own fellow-countrymen, an Acadian, born in that very county. I think we have here one of the most convincing proofs of the generosity of the Acadians towards their kinsmen and co-religionists of the province of Quebec. At the same time I wish to bear witness to the fact that the French Canadians having received since confederation the benefits of education, have grown as progressive as their brothers from the other provinces, and that they work with a perfect harmony for the common good of this great Dominion of ours.

I could further say, Mr. Speaker, that the increase of population, as shown by the census in the maritime provinces, chiefly in the province of New Brunswick, is due to the high birth-rate among Acadian families. In thousands of Acadian homes, children, from the very cradle, imbibe Canadian feelings and are taught by their mothers the love of this land of ours, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I felt, Mr. Speaker, it was my duty to correct the false notions likely to rise from that editorial of 'La Presse,' so as to dispel all doubts as to the intelligence of the French Acadians, and as to their political standing in this great country of ours.

Before offering a few remarks on the figures given us by the hon. Minister of Finance, there is another question to which I should like to call attention for a few moments; I mean the Department of Railways. This is one of the most important public departments mainly for the maritime provinces. Since 1896, that department has been under the control of a man with an iron will; a man than whom there is none more respected and better loved by the members coming from New Brunswick, because we have known him better. The opposition in this House and their political organs, within the last few years, have concentrated all their attacks against that minister, and they think they have a great case in the deficit which has occurred in the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, as if that deficit was going to bring about its ruin and the downfall of the government. It was on that question that the Hon. Joseph Howe delivered one of his most masterful efforts half a century ago, when he spoke in such patriotic accents of the manifold advantages which would accrue to us of closer relations between the lower provinces and Canada, and from the traffic which this railway would develop. In the same national enterprise another statesman who has left such a bright record in the annals of the province of New Brunswick, the late Hon. Peter Mitchell, also found a theme of lofty inspiration. The same railway also found a patriotic champion in another Canadian statesman, one of the greatest men that Canada has ever produced, Sir George Etienne Cartier. This great man spoke most forcibly of the harmony which would be promoted from a closer intercourse between the people of the maritime provinces and the people of Canada. The other night, the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) were eloquent exponents of those same views.

It looks as if the opposition had only one way of proving their patriotism, and that is to bring about the downfall of the government or one of its members. If I had time, it would be an easy matter for me to point out to this House the figures showing the result of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway for the different years elapsed since confederation up to our days; and I believe that I could prove that the final result is all to the advantage of the present administration of the Intercolonial Railway, which has been operated in as efficient a manner as any other department. I shall not give all those figures. I shall content myself with showing the difference existing between the Intercolonial Railway in 1886, when the Liberal party came into power, and the state in which it is now.

The people of the maritime provinces who daily see what is going on and notice the general increase of traffic on that road need not be enlightened on that point; but for the House and for the people of Canada at large, this comparison will serve a useful purpose, as it will show them how efficiently the Intercolonial has been operated since 1896 under Liberal rule, by the hon. Minister of Railways.

Owing to the prosperity which we have been enjoying these last five years, a large share of which the maritime provinces have had, the Intercolonial Railway has been equipped in an up to date fashion along its whole line; and so, the feeling of discouragement which formerly prevailed among the people, has given place to a feeling of satisfaction and of hope in the future. The railway is now equipped in such a way as to be a credit to the whole country.

The Conservative administration, with a view to manufacturing small surpluses, had allowed the road to fall into a dilapidated condition; and had such a state of things continued much longer, it would have resulted in depriving the maritime provinces of the facilities of communication which they are now enjoying, and they would

have found themselves severed as it were from the other provinces; now, I need hardly add that it would have meant the ruin of that great enterprise and the ruin of the maritime provinces themselves. Therefore, I make bold to say, that from that standpoint, we look upon as a happy interposition of divine Providence the change of government that then took place, from which have flowed such beneficial results to the country.

We have heard a good deal of late from hon. gentlemen opposite about the deficit which we had last year; but as I said, a little while ago, these hon. gentlemen take precious good care not to refer to the era of deficits under Conservative rule, and they abstain also from showing the difference between the present condition of the road and what it was five years ago. Now, thanks to the wise administration of the hon. minister, we have a road that is a credit to the country and a sure index to the prosperity of Canada as well as an omen of what the future keeps in store for us. There is no railway on this continent which offers better accommodation to the travelling public then does the Intercolonial, a fact to which several hon. gentlemen have borne witness. I may be allowed to refer here to an incident that occurred at a public meeting in the county of Gloucester, as an instance bearing upon this same subject. I had been telling the electors that the Intercolonial was now one of the best equipped railways on this continent, and one that afforded the best accommodation to the travelling public. Among those who attended the meeting were two reverend gentlemen who had lately returned from an extended trip in England and throughout France, Italy and Germany; and when they heard me stating that our railways were, in the matter of accommodation and comfort to the travelling public, far ahead of the other lines on this continent, one of those reverend gentlemen got up and craved leave to say that, from his own experience, he might further add that our railways were far ahead of all those they had travelled on in Europe.

In order to show, Sir, the nature of this road,—were it for no other purpose than that of advertising it—I dare say that it affords the best accommodation to all travellers from the different parts of America and from Europe, who may come and visit our Canadian sea-ports and our picturesque sites; and that, moreover, it can develop a considerable trade, not only between the provinces themselves but also between America and Canada.

What I have said so far ought to suffice to show that the government and the Minister of Railways deserve full credit for their management of the road. But, in the matter of deficits, I have here a statement which will show the results of the operation of the Intercolonial for the last five years under Liberal rule:

1896-97, deficit	$ 59,940.65
1897-98, deficit	209,978.66
1898-99, surplus	62,645.43
1899-1900, surplus	120,667.02
1900-1901, deficit	488,186.77

It is this last deficit about which hon. gentlemen opposite have made so much fuss. Therefore, we have a total of surpluses for the five years of the Liberal administration, of $183,312.45, against a total of deficits of $758,106.08, which leaves a loss, all earnings deducted, of $575,793.63, or an average of $115,158.72 per annum during the last five years.

While making the most of these deficits, such as stated by the Minister of Railways himself, hon. gentlemen opposite ignore altogether the deficits piled up under the late Conservative government. Allow me, Sir, briefly to refer to those figures, not so much in a spirit of disparagement or criticism as to the management of the former administration, as to place those facts in their proper light and to show what the present administration have done. From a mere comparison of the results achieved under both regimes, we shall be enabled to realize what the Minister of Railways has done to improve the road and put it in good working order. I ask the House to bear with me for a few minutes, while I enter into those somewhat tedious details. Let us take the results of the operation of the road, under Conservative rule, during the seventeen years for which they are fully responsible:

	Surplus.	Deficits.
1879-80	.....	$ 97,131 23
1880-81	$ 542 65	.....
1881-82	9,605 18	.....
1882-83	10,547 83	.....
1883-84	6,981 30	.....
1884-85	.....	78,547 90
1885-86	.....	133,905 79
1886-87	.....	262,252 69
1887-88	.....	383,445 69
1888-89	.....	276,846 73
1889-90	.....	547,835 87
1890-91	.....	684,946 56
1891-92	.....	493,935 03
1892-93	20,181 59	.....
1893-94	5,838 29	.....
1894-95	3,815 21	.....
1895-96	.....	55,187 52
	$57,512 05	$3,014,035 01

The deficits under the Conservative administration, during that period, amounted to $3,014,035.01. If we deduct from that total the amount of surpluses, or $57,512.05, we find that there was for that period a deficit of $2,956,522.96. Now, if we take the average for that period under Conservative rule, we shall find that, for the seventeen years referred to, the yearly average of deficits was $173,913.11.

The Conservative government having succeeded in showing small surpluses in the last years of their administration, it may perhaps have occurred to them that it entered into the views of divine Providence to maintain them in power ; but we know beyond a doubt that, even had they succeeded in having a small surplus, after piling up deficits for so many years, that result was due not to a policy of economy—for implies a wise and judicious expenditure of the public moneys—but to a cheese-paring policy by which the public service was starved and stinted ; a policy by which they put off from year to year equipping the road and repairing the rolling stock. As a consequence, the road went on losing in value and in power. But, as I said, when the present government came into power, a change came over the country.

Now, if we compare the five years, under Liberal rule, with the last five years of the last decade under Conservative rule, we shall find that during those last five years, there was a deficit of $2,155,327.54, or an average yearly deficit of $431,065.50.

The Intercolonial, as I said, occupies a most conspicuous position among American and European railways. It is true that, last year, through unforeseen and uncontrollable circumstances, there was a considerable deficit. But before entering into a review of the causes which brought about that deficit, let me call attention to the fact that, if we take the last five years, under Liberal rule, and compare the deficits with the total revenues of the road, so as to find the percentage of the loss to the country in each year, we find an average of $115,158.72 out of a total of $19,246,336.89 of gross earnings, or the equivalent of 1·67 per cent, whereas, for the first five years of the last decade under Conservative rule, out of a total of $17,566,831.20 of gross earnings, we find a deficit of $2,155,327.54, or a difference of 8·14 per cent. These figures show a difference of 7 per cent in favour of the present administration, notwithstanding those extraordinary and unlooked for deficits which, later on, I shall try to explain, to the best of my ability. But though I may not be able to do full justice to the subject I am handling, I may say that the figures speak for themselves and are, as it were, self-explanatory ; and so, the French-speaking members of this House will give due credit to the hon. Minister of Railways for his management of the railway.

I may say that this deficit was brought about through a combine of the coal dealers who suddenly raised the price of coal by $2.10 ; coal, in previous years, having always sold at $3.20 a ton, after tenders had been called. So, the government had to pay $1.10 a ton more for coal than in former years. That change in the price of coal involved an additional expenditure of $350,000. The hon. Minister of Railways could not stop operating the railway, and had to pay the price asked for coal. Even had the price been $4 a ton, he would have had to operate the railway all the same. This accounts largely for the deficit which the Conservative papers have so bitterly criticised of late.

There is also the increase of wages paid to the workingmen on the Intercolonial by the hon. Minister of Railways and I must say that, upon that occasion, he has shown great generosity towards the workingmen. At the very moment when that increase in the price of coal was being brought about by the combine of coal dealers, which created such a sensation all through the country, the hon. Minister of Railways did not hesitate to grant to the employees on the Intercolonial an increase of wages amounting to $200,000. Could not the hon. Minister of Railways have said, when the increase in the price of coal was known : "I am now confronted by a state of things which was altogether unexpected, and which will create a deficit in the operation of the Intercolonial. In order to make up for it, I am going to cancel the increase of wages of from 10 to 20 cents a day I had decided to give those poor operatives on the railway.' Is there a man in this House, having at heart the interests of the working classes, who would have been lacking in patriotism to the point of suggesting to the hon. Minister of Railways to cancel the increase of pay granted to those poor workingmen and employees ? I do not believe, Sir, that there could have been found a man willing to offer such a suggestion, and had there been found one, he would have been unworthy of the confidence of his constituents. So those two additional expenditures of $390,000 caused by the raise in the price of coal, and the expenditure of $200,000 resulting from the increase of the pay of the workingmen who theretofore received only from $1 to $1.10 a day and from the general raise of the wages of the employees, those I say, are the two causes which account for the deficit.

As I said a little while ago, the hon. Minister of Railways has kept steadily developing and improving the equipment of the government railways, and not from day to day, as was the case under the former management who neglected their repairs and kept their rolling stock in an inefficient condition.

He knew that if he could not meet his expenditure one year, he was bound all the same to go on with the task of making the road the safest for the passengers and the most favourable for the transportation of goods.

Moreover, there was this year an overcharge for coal. The minister had just ordered repairs to the road bed to the amount of $200,000. Following in the steps of his predecessors, he could have made an apparent saving in striking out these $200,000 ; but he does not intend to run the road from day to day ; he is building for the future, and he will be ready, at a given

time, to carry all the traffic that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec will be able to send, and also all the traffic that may come to Cape Breton and Nova Scotia from Great Britain.

Then taking into account the increase of $200,000 in the wages of the staff, a further amount of $200,000 expended on the roadbed and an extra sum of $1.10 on every ton of coal consumed by the railway, we arrive to the total amount of $750,000, which is more than required to wipe out the apparent deficit, and which has been expended wholly for the benefit of the trade and the advantage of the employees of the road.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THE SPRAGUE'S FALLS MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Company (Limited).—Mr. Emmerson.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is the Bill for which the Minister of Justice was to prepare an amendment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). I understand that some agreement was made across the House in regard to this Bill. I think the committee had better rise and let the Bill stand until the promoter is present. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

THE CROWN BANK OF CANADA.

Mr. McCREARY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Crown Bank of Canada.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to the general question of incorporation of banks in this country. We have a general Act regarding banking, but the law is still in such a condition that parties who wish to go into the banking business in Canada must apply for an Act of this parliament to authorize them to do so. I think the time has come when the general banking Act should be so amended that any corporation, or syndicate of persons who wish to engage in banking might embark in that enterprise without applying for an Act of parliament. We have three of these applications before us this session, and we have some every session, If there is anything this country requires to-day it is increased banking facilities. It is for that reason that I make the suggestion to the Minister of Finance that he should have the General Banking Act so amended that parties who wish to go into banking could do so on filing the necessary papers, showing that they have the necessary capital and giving proper undertakings to abide by the law in every respect. During the last year, in one way and another, I have had occasion to discuss, to a considerable extent, the question of banking. So far as I can gather, apparently everybody who has any authority or interest in banking says we have the best banking system in the world. It certainly is the best system in the world for those engaged in banking. Our bank shares to-day are, on the average, worth double their face value, and banking is found to be a very profitable business. Our banks are all branching out, and, as the country is growing—as we are all glad to know it is—there is a necessity for increased banking accommodation. That being the case, I think the banks ought to be allowed to increase their capital stock without application to parliament, and financial men who wish to start a new bank ought to be free to do so by complying with the necessary forms, as I have suggested. As it is these banks have to make application for a special Act and they have also to comply with the law by filing certain statements with the department. I think this all ought to be embraced in one Act, and that, by filing letters of incorporation with the Department of Finance, and going through the necessary forms, they should be able to take out a license to carry on a banking business. As I have said, there is room for any amount of increased banking accommodation in this country. It seems to me that if the law were what it should be, instead of having three or four new banks projected, we would have a dozen started in various parts of the country within the next twelve months.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). If any practical difficulty had arisen in the experience of the department in connection with the matters to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) has referred, or if any practical inconvenience had been felt, I should be disposed to sympathize with him. But up to this time, I have not heard any complaint whatever of inconvenience arising from the present system. As to the fact the hon. gentleman mentions, that the bank stocks stand at a high figure, I take it that we all feel that general business is in a better condition when bank stocks stand at a high than at a low figure. As between the two, the present condition of things is to be preferred. I do not wish, however, to discuss the general question of the banking

system. But I might point out that the hon. gentleman is mistaken in supposing, as he apparently does, that it is necessary for a bank to come to parliament for power to increase its capital. The Banking Act makes provision for the increase of a bank's capital in a very simple way. A form is prescribed and regulations provided under which, on application to the Treasury Board, in a very summary way, a bank may obtain leave to increase its capital. It is necessary, however, for new banks to come to this parliament for their charters. But the lines of those charters are so clearly laid down that it amounts to a merely formal application. If the applicants comply with the conditions, practically, the application is never refused. The hon. gentleman may say that, in that case, it would be as well to give the charter by executive as by parliamentary action. But, on the other hand, the banking system is a very important part of the business of the country, and I think parliament would like to feel that it reserved to itself control of this matter rather than that it had handed it over to the control of the government. At any rate, I am satisfied that no practical inconvenience has arisen through the present system; and while, theoretically, what the hon. gentleman says seems right enough, I think this is one of those cases where we should be wise to let well enough alone.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I agree with what the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has said. It seems to me we give greater stability to our chartered banks by having each of them incorporated by a special Act of parliament than if we adopted any method that, to the general public, might seem more loose. In no instance is a new bank organized in a month or two. It generally takes a full year at any rate. Therefore, it causes no loss of time for men who desire to engage in banking to be obliged to come to parliament and get a charter in the regular way. To my mind, the proposal of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) would take away a great deal of the stability that we think belongs to our banking institutions. I think our banks will have better standing if they are required to come to parliament to get their charters.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Board of the Presbyterian College of Halifax.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Sovereign Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Campbell.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 65) to incorporate the Yukon Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 66) respecting La Compagnie du chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord.—Mr. Lemieux.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Edwards.

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Ross Rifle Company.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Dominion Cotton Mills Company, Limited.—Mr. Prefontaine.

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

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

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Knapp Tubular Steamship Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding):

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. TURGEON. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the House to bear with me a few minutes more while I conclude my remarks. I think I have fairly done with the administration of the Intercolonial Railway and I shall come now to the financial situation of this country. Like most other people, Canadians are proud to know the financial standing of their country, and like from time to time to be enlightened on public affairs. The people pay great attention of the national debt and naturally fear to see it increase. They are also much pleased to see new millions added from year to year to our imports and exports, more so when the agricultural products of the country are at stake. More than anywhere else perhaps, the public expenditure is

closely scrutinized. The electors are always anxious to know if the fiscal year will close with a welcome surplus or an unwelcome deficit. That national turn of mind might be called a social virtue, a kind of patriotism which is not without its wholesome influence upon the business of the country, the minds of members of parliament and the general administration. The Americans do not watch so closely the doings of their congressmen, but the paramount question in the neighbouring republic is the scale of wages. If wages are high, they say that the administration is to be commended. If, on the contrary, wages are low, they say it is time for a change. Not so with us. The Canadian people are not satisfied to know if there is a surplus or a deficit in the public chest. Critical and inquisitive as they are, they will not be satisfied with the mere existence of a surplus or a deficit. A surplus of 3, 5 or $8,000,000 is always welcome, but the people want to know something more. They will inquire by what process that result was reached, and to what circumstances the surplus was due. There are different ways of piling up a surplus. A surplus is a sure sign of the prosperity of the country. If the trade of the country is prosperous, if the balance is in our favour, the people will look favourably upon the government. If, on the other hand, the business of the country is depressed, even if there is a surplus, the people are anxious to know the cause thereof.

Under these circumstances, I may be permitted to give to the House a few figures from the financial statement so ably delivered a few days ago by the hon. Minister of Finance. He told us then that the revenue had increased to the unprecedented sum of $52,514,701. This result was reached by an increase in different sources of revenue, amongst which are to be noted the excise duties, with an increase of $450,170. The next increase is to be found in the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway, which amounted to $439,219. The receipts of the Post Office Department have been of $235,969 over those of the preceding year, notwithstanding the reduction in the postage dues. The actual receipts are already larger than they were before the reduction took place.

The above statement affords me the occasion of commending the wise administration of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). He has given us increased postal facilities, as well as a reduction of 23 per cent in the postage dues and a further reduction from 5 cents to 2 cents for all postal communications within the empire. Is it not a wonderful achievement ? The expenditure on consolidated fund has been of $46,866,367, an increase of $3,891,088 over 1890. We are then left with a surplus of $5,700,000. But the expenditure on capital account has been exceptionally high during the year, and that has resulted in a net increase in the public debt of nearly $3,000,000. This is practically the first large increase of the public debt under the Liberal government.

Let us come now to that question of the increase of the public debt. When the Liberal government came into power, in 1896, the net debt, on the 30th June of that year, was $258,497,432.77, having increased during the same fiscal year by $5,422,505.68, for which the preceding government was partly responsible.

Now, what have been the increases in the public debt under the present government ?

1897, increase of	$3,041,163.60
1898, "	2,417,802.45
1899, "	2,317,047.69
1900, decrease of	779,639.71
1901, increase of	2,986,196.80

giving a total increase during the five years of $9,982,570.92, which total divided by five gives an average yearly increase of the public debt of $1,996,514.18.

We are told that the Liberal government has increased the public debt. Nobody in this House will deny such a statement. But we are in a position to show by comparison, that under the Liberal government the public debt has not increased in the same ratio as it did under the former government, and the showing is all in favour of the hon. Minister of Finance under the Liberal government.

The official records will show for the last seventeen or eighteen years of the Conservative administration an average increase of $6,563,075. Let us come now to the deficits and surpluses of the Liberal administration. In coming into office the hon. Minister of Finance had to acknowledge a deficit of $519,981.41 for the first year. Although comparatively small, part of this deficit must be credited to the old government. For that fiscal year, specially the first part of it, the hon. Minister of Finance had to comply with the obligations contracted by his predecessors in office. But the very next year, under the influence and magnetism of his genius and of his patriotic inspirations the tables were turned and the hon. minister was in a position to present the country with a surplus of $1,722,712.33.

In 1898-99, of	$4,837,749 00
In 1899-1900	8,054,714 51
In 1900-1901	5,648,333 29
Total for five years	$20,263,509.13

Deducting the deficit of $519,981.44 from the first year, we stand with a net surplus of $19,743,527.69. If we divide this last amount by 5, the number of years, we have an average surplus under the Liberal administration of $3,948,705.58.

Under what circumstances has the Minister of Finance been enabled to achieve such results ? All the public documents will tell. New industries have been established, old industries have been galvanized into life under the patriotic influence of the

Minister of Finance, and our trade has forged along by leaps and bounds.

Our total imports and exports aggregated the amount of $239,025,360 in 1895-96, and have crept to $386,903,157 in 1900-01, being an increase of $157,877,797.

Let us compare the development of our export trade during the last five years of the Conservative government and we have the following figures :

1891-92	$241,369,443
1892-93	247,638,620
1893-94	240,999,889
1894-95	224,420,485
1895-96	239,025,360
Total for the five years	$1,193,453,797

How slow, to say the least, has been the trade development during these years ! Let us see now what have been our imports and exports during the five years of the Liberal administration :

1896-97	$257,168,862
1897-98	304,475,736
1898-99	321,661,123
1899-1900	381,517,236
1900-1901	386,903,157
Total for five years	$1,651,726,204

The total trade of the country during the five years of administration of the present government has exceeded by five hundred million dollars the total trade of the last five years of the Conservative regime. I leave it to the House and the country to draw the conclusion.

A great cause of rejoicing is the fact that this large increase in our exports has been most marked in the agricultural products. The agriculturist has a fair share in the marvellous expansion of our exports during the last five years. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has bent all his energies towards promoting the agricultural prosperity of Canada. To him we must give credit for those transportation facilities and the establishment of a complete system of cold storage by which the farmers of the country have been greatly benefited. No wonder they are grateful for what he has done.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to give the House and the country a few more figures that are interesting to those of us who are representing rural constituencies. Let us look at the butter exports, so largely increased by the perfected system of cold storage established by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and let us compare these exports with those of the last five years of the Conservative administration.

Butter exports for the last five years under the Conservative regime :

1891-92	$1,273,094
1892-93	1,300,199
1893-94	1,114,712
1894-95	709,126
1895-96	1,118,768
Total	$5,515,899

Butter exports for the first five years of the Laurier regime :

1896-97	$2,253,481
1897-98	2,523,664
1898-99	4,025,405
1899-1900	5,429,563
1900-1901	3,355,197
Total	$17,587,310

Under the wise administration of the Laurier government in the short period of five years, from the butter exports alone, twelve million dollars more found their way into the pockets of the farmers of this country.

Let us look now into the cheese industry.

Exports of cheese for the last five years of the Tory regime :

1891-92	$12,554,286
1892-93	14,157,555
1893-94	16,267,309
1894-95	15,118,894
1895-96	14,283,825
	$62,381,869

Exports of cheese for the last five years of the Laurier regime :

1896-97	$15,262,750
1897-98	18,486,168
1898-99	17,401,436
1899-1900	20,483,981
1900-1901	21,123,251
	$92,757,586

There is a difference of thirty millions in favour of the Laurier régime.

We have an increase of thirty million dollars for cheese ; and an increase of twelve million dollars for butter.

It was during a period of such great business activity and progress that the government piled up surpluses to the tune of $19,743,527.69, or an average yearly surplus of $3,948,705.58.

But we are reminded that the Conservatives also had their surpluses. True, but as I have just shown, those surpluses were piled up while our import and export trade went on declining, and those results were brought about through violent means, and by protection which kept increasing from year to year, and to such a point that Sir Leonard Tilley, the then Minister of Finance, a truly patriotic statesman, foresaw that the moment could come when the country could no longer bear a greater load of taxation. The trouble then was that manufacturers would always look to the government for an increase of duties and a further measure of protection, instead of relying upon their own strength and spirit of enterprise, and equipping themselves so as to meet foreign competition.

Before resuming my seat—for I see that I have spoken at greater length than I intended—I crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments more, while I say a few words of comment upon the motion of the hon. leader of the opposition. It reads :

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

This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries, as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians. And, while thus firmly maintaining the necessity of such protection to Canadian interests, this House affirms its belief in a policy of reciprocial trade preferences within the empire.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the hon. leader of the opposition, I may remark that I am reminded here of the fact that, ever since the Liberal party came into power, the opposition members and their organs have kept repeating that the Liberals, after their advent to office, had stolen their clothes, by adopting the Conservative policy. Now, with such a resolution as this on record, they will no longer be able to say that the Liberals have stolen their policy.

It is stated in the motion that the time is come for us to adopt a policy of adequate protection to the labouring classes and to the farming interests. I think it is always the duty of the government to follow a policy aiming at the protection of the agricultural community, for agriculture lies at the base of our social system.

It is always time for the government enforcing a policy of protection to the fishermen who prosecute such a hard and interesting calling.

We are told that we must adopt a national policy. I think the policy of any country should always be a national policy. France, when framing her tariff, adopted a national policy, adjusted to her geographical position and to the nature of the products of her soil. So did the United States, when they framed a national policy with a view to protecting their home industries. That protective policy they have maintained for forty or fifty years, although they have a very rich soil and vast natural resources, to which advantages should be added a large influx of immigrants, from all countries in the world, who by thousands come in every day and swell the army of workingmen, which means a considerable addition to the consumers of home products.

Great Britain herself also framed a national policy of her own, when adopting free trade with a view to protecting her industries, and when seeking new markets for the over-production of those industries, and for the relief of her own market, which was already glutted.

When the present government framed a policy which I might call a policy of discrimination between extreme protection such as is advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite and free-trade which could not be suddenly introduced into this country without jeopardizing the very existence of our home industries, thereby depriving our workingmen employed in those industries, which had grown under the fostering care of a protective tariff, of their daily bread and labour, the government, I say, did also, under those circumstances, adopt a national policy. The hon. leader of the opposition and his friends took to the past for examples. They like to look backwards and to see how their predecessors have acted. I am also a student of history and I like to learn the lessons of experience. But we must also look to the future and not content ourselves with referring to past records, to see what our predecessors have done or how they have acted. We must adopt a policy of our own and one that is best calculated to develop our trade, our material resources, our industries and our agriculture. The methods that suited our country fifty or sixty years ago may not suit the present conditions of the country.

A government should learn the lessons taught by history, and look to the fathers of confederation as their guides in framing a national policy ; but they should adjust that policy to the conditions of the country and to her needs. This the present government have done, and they have succeeded in developing our national trade and in bringing about an unprecedented prosperity. The people of this country have full confidence in the policy so far pursued by the government, because they realize that it is a policy calculated to promote the prosperity of the country.

On these several grounds, I cannot vote in favour of the motion of the hon. leader of the opposition. As I said a little while ago, we should not content ourselves with looking backwards to our past achievements, but we must look forward and entertain the brightest hopes for the future that is in store for us.

Mr. J. R. LAVELL (Leeds and Grenville). I regret exceedingly I was not able to follow very closely the long address to which the House has just listened. I was, however, able to comprehend a reference which the hon. member (Mr. Turgeon) made at an earlier stage of his address, when, though willing to admit that Providence probably had had something to do with the present favourable condition of affairs in Canada, he thought that the way Providence had helped Canada was by putting the present government into power. I notice that he disagrees with the principle laid down by a prominent fellow countryman of his, a member of the government, who apparently flatly denied that Providence had any part in the change of government when he declared that elections are not won by prayers. If I remember correctly the election address of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) himself, I would suggest that Providence had done very little towards placing him on the government side of the

House. However, apart from that, I think it will not be difficult to show that possibly Providence had done more than the hon. member was willing to admit.

In proceeding to debate to-night the fiscal policy of the country and the management of its finances, I do not feel that I need to apologize for speaking either at this hour or at this period of the debate. The question is an exceedingly important one, and involves many great interests. We must remember that we are still an extremely young country. There are parts of our country yet unexplored, and even those parts that have been explored by the surveyor are still, many of them, entirely undeveloped. Our natural resources have hardly been touched. We cannot in any sense of the word be said to have fully developed any of the great resources that Providence has given into our charge. This fact was recognized at an early stage in our political history, and as a result the national policy was born, over twenty-five years ago. That national policy has been reviled, that national policy has been abused, that policy of protection, with which I am glad to say I heartily concur, has been spoken of as an old story. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce seemed to think he had dealt with the whole question when, in referring to the amendment and to the address of the leader of the opposition, he said he could almost picture to himself the former leader of the opposition moving a similar amendment to an address some twenty-six years ago. I submit, Sir, that the need of a national policy is just as great now as it ever has been in the history of this country. The history even of these later years of prosperity—for I am glad to say we are enjoying a period of great prosperity—our history, I say, only adds to the conviction that a national policy involving protection to Canadian industries, to Canadian labour and to Canadian agriculture, is just as necessary now as ever it was. We have to develop this country in face of the keenest opposition of our great neighbours to the south. I think I may say of them that they show a knowledge of Canada greater than that shown by many Canadians. I think we see in the conduct and attitude of the United States a lively recognition of the resources that Canada possesses.

I do not propose to discuss the question as to how far protection is necessary for this country, because that is practically admitted, even by a free trade supporter of the government such as the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). The party supporting the government have practically recognized the need of protection by adopting it, notwithstanding that the policy of the former government has been changed in some respects. I submit, however, that where those changes have been made they have been in the direction of increased taxation, and have wrought injury to the country, having done more harm than good. But where the items of the old tariff have been retained the country has benefited in consequence. The present government have actually been putting in force a policy of protection, though not as well administered as that put in force by the Conservative government. It has, however, been put in force under better conditions, and to one of those conditions I wish now to refer.

When the policy of protection was introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald, it was inaugurated in face of keen opposition on the part of a number of the most prominent men in this country. One of those men who had occupied, and yet occupies, a prominent position, and who had been a Minister of Finance in one of the governments of Canada, was an avowed apostle of free trade. At the very time that industries were being started under the influence of that national policy, that ex-Minister of Finance and his friends became apostles of free trade in the fullest sense of the word, and went up and down the country denouncing the new national policy and threatening to overturn it at the first available opportunity, thereby frightening away capitalists ready to embark in manufacturing enterprises in Canada. Moreover, I do not think it requires much effort of memory on the part of members of this House, or of a majority of the citizens of Canada, to recall the fact that in those years the United States was held up before us as the Mecca of all those who desired prosperity. The United States was held up as the one great country, the one great example we were to follow. Indeed they almost paraphrased an expression of the late Oliver Wendall Holmes, who, you will remember, said that good Americans, when they died, went to Paris, and so the prominent members of the Liberal party in those early days used practically to say that good Canadians, while they lived, should go to the United States. Unfortunately many young Canadians listened to their advice and left their native land. Not only was an effort made by the opposition of that day to prevent money being put into manufacturing enterprises, but an effort was made to discredit Canada, to prevent its development, and to hold up a foreign land as being the best spot to which ambitious young Canadians could go.

I would call attention to the different circumstances under which the fiscal policy of the present government is administered. As I have said, the fiscal policy of the present government differs only in a few respects from the old one. The present government is not confronted with an opposition preaching blue ruin; the opposition of to-day have done all in their power to encourage manufacturing in this country. Instead of the present opposition holding up the United States as a model to follow, and as

offering the greatest inducements to ambitious Canadians, it has never thrown the slightest difficulty in the way of the development of Canadian industries, but has given every possible encouragement to the government to continue protection to Canadian industries—has always preached that Canada was the best country in which young Canadians could hope to gain wealth and distinction, that Canada was a country of magnificent resources, and required only energy and hope on the part of her people to become one of the greatest countries in the world. I submit, Sir, the attitude of the opposition has been a very important factor in making the fiscal policy of the present government as successful as it has been. It would be useless, it would be wrong, to deny that it is impossible for public men, whether they be members of the government or members of the opposition, to go through this country preaching blue ruin without producing a bad effect. Fortunately, however, the policy preached by the Liberals in opposition was not put in practice by the Liberals in power. In fact, I do not think it is too much to say, after looking back over the past seven years, that when the Liberals came into power the old Liberal party died. The doctrines preached by the present government and their supporters are so different from the doctrines they used to preach, that we can truthfully say that the old Liberalism passed into history in the year 1896. The result of the change is that, save in a few spots, and save a few spasmodic utterances of men in the House who speak louder by their words than their actions, the old free trade policy has almost disappeared; though I regret to say that in some respects and in some matters sufficient of its influence remains to prevent Canada reaping the full benefit of these years of plenty.

I want to dwell rather on the present than on the past, but before dealing with the present conditions, I want to refer to some remarks made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In reviving old times, possibly he revived them in a way he did not intend. I well remember in my early political life that the name of the ex-Minister of Finance was always associated with the phrase 'blue ruin.' I could not help feeling the other night in listening to his vigorous speech, that it was largely inspired by a brilliant effort of his imagination regarding his favourite theme of blue ruin and corruption. His speech was filled with figures, and how he did handle them! They reminded me of that prominent public man to whom the Toronto 'Globe' referred as a 'mixer and muddler of figures.'

I do not propose to go fully into these figures in reference to the census. I will leave that to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), who has already promised to deal not only with them, but with the explanation given by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). But, I think it is unfortunate that the government, which is supposed to be a unit, cannot be a little more in accord in the figures that it gives to the country. We heard from the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in his budget speech, referring to the census, while regretting the very small increase in the population, that there was no doubt that the large increase had taken place since 1896, and we heard a vigorous, lengthy and complicated speech by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce on exactly the same lines. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce started from 1891, as indeed the hon. Minister of Finance must have done, in order to make such a calculation as that. It is rather unfortunate that they had to wait for eleven years before attempting to make a calculation of that kind, and it is almost as unfortunate that they could not have persuaded the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to foresee that they were going to make a statement of that kind. I admit that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he probably is fully aware of the facts, cast doubt on the truth of the figures given to us by the government, and so, possibly, we should not lay too great stress on the figures given to us by the hon. Minister of Customs, but, he has been accustomed to give a statement of the duties collected, and a statement showing the amount of these duties per head of population. I notice that this year he has left that calculation out of his report, but, he kept it up until last year, and in that report he shows a continually increasing population. Indeed he shows that according to his calculation the population increased more from 1891 to 1896 than from 1896 to 1900. I am not going to lay any stress upon these figures. I merely have pointed to them to express my regret that such a great difference of opinion between the various members of the government in reference to these figures should exist. In the case of the hon. Minister of Customs the figures are practically incorporated in his report, which is laid on the Table of the House and published by order of the government. In the case of the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce the figures as yet remain simply statements, or possibly, visions of the imagination. Surely, all the figures given to us by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce show very little more than imagination on the part of that hon. gentleman. His argument respecting the Ontario end of the census has been contradicted by the Ontario municipal census, and as to his argument respecting the figures from the province of Quebec, I do not think that those of us who were in the House when he made it, will easily forget the impressive, dignified and dramatic manner in which he

handed out return after return from the various counties of that province. He told us that in Ontario and in other parts of the Dominion save in Quebec, it was a matter of argument, but that in Quebec he had positive proof, and he did not allow us to doubt the fact at all. He knew it. I feel sure that a large number of the members of the House came to the conclusion that in 1891 the hon. gentleman had a census of his own prepared, and that he kept it as evidence to give to the House now. But, now, he explains himself. He accounted for his statement by saying that three months before the census of 1891, and three or four months before the census of 1901, a parochial census had been taken, and taking for granted that the parochial census must be much more correct than the census taken with all the authority and all the machinery of the government of Canada, he laid these returns on the Table of the House and said that they proved conclusively that the census had been stuffed to the extent of some 50,000 names in the province of Quebec. Referring to the statement made by Mr. Côté, in which that gentleman gives us the difference between the parochial census taken in 1891 and the government census of that year, he says :

> The above statement shows that the enumerators in 1891 raised in twenty-one counties 40,615 more names than were recorded three months previous to the census by the parish priest.

You will notice that he bases his whole argument on the census taken by the parish priests of the province of Quebec, and shows us that the parish priests in these twenty-one counties had enumerated some 40,000 people less. He places these returns, one of which, and only one of which, I have read, and which is now in my hands, on the Table of the House. I do not know how many of the hon. members of this House have read these returns, and if they had not disappeared from the Table within about half an hour after I read this one, I would have had the pleasure of hunting up a few more, because, even although they are written in French, it is not such an unknown tongue, I believe, as not to be understood by the majority of the members of this House. I am now going to read one or two paragraphs from this return, which is the return for the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska, in which reference is made to this parochial census. Apparently some letters had been written, which letters have not been returned to the House. I do not know what questions were asked, but I gather from this that the principal question was in reference to a comparison between the parochial census and the census of 1891. In answer to that question this return, placed on the Table of the House by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and under his authority, says distinctly in words that cannot be mistaken :

> It is not possible to compare the parochial statistics of 1891 with the official census of that year.

The writer gives one reason that the subdivisions are not quite the same. However, he gives another reason and it is that in each municipality the Protestant families were not registered in the annual statistics by the priest of the parish. In other words, this boasted parochial census on which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has based a charge of fraud and perjury against 2,500 Canadian officials is a census not of the whole population of the province of Quebec, but a census only of those who are in full communion with the Roman Catholic Church of that province.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce pretend that it was a census of the whole population ?

Mr. LAVELL. I have already read from the speech of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in which he based his whole charge on the discrepancy between the parochial census and the official census taken by the Dominion of Canada, and here, in his own return, laid on the Table of the House, is the statement that the parochial census is simply a census of those in full communion with the Roman Catholic Church in the province of Quebec. I cannot presume for a single moment that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce takes it for granted that no person should be included, if he lives in the province of Quebec, in the census, unless he is in full communion with the Roman Catholic Church. I might better trust that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has not adopted the advice which he gave to the members of this House that they should procure some French member of this House to translate these returns for them, and I can only conclude that from his own imagination of what they contain, he has made that argument to the House and based his charge against the officials of this country. I do not know how far the other returns refer to this matter, but surely, when one of his officials makes such a distinct statement, I think it must be convincing to the House as being correct that this parochial census only contained the figures to which I have referred, and I believe the House will agree with me that it entirely disposes of his argument and that a retraction and almost an apology is due from the hon. gentleman to the people of Canada for making any such charge.

I am not going more fully into his figures save to refer to one point in that address where he exulted in a denunciation of his former opponents and where he laid particular stress on the fiscal policy of the Mackenzie government and compared it very favourably with the fiscal policy pursued

by the Conservative government between 1878 and 1896. He made the distinct statement that the policy of the Mackenzie administration enabled the country to tide over the period of depression between 1875 and 1879 better, than did the policy of the Conservative party enable the country to tide over the period of depression immediately preceding the advent of the present government to power. That was a mere assertion. It is incapable of proof. The majority of the members of this House are able to remember those two periods of depression, and I question if there is a man on the government side who is bold enough to say, from his own experience, that the depression between 1892 and 1896 was as severely felt as the depression between 1875 and 1879. That is more especially the case when we compare the conditions existing in Canada with the conditions existing in the United States during these two periods. We have figures to strengthen our memories as to this fact. In the first period of depression under the Liberal government, there was on an average 4½ per cent of the paper at the banks overdue, while during the period of depression between 1892 and 1896, there was only 1½ per cent of the paper at the banks overdue, and that very slightly differed from the amount of overdue paper in the years immediately preceeding and succeeding. We know also that periods of depression are unfortunately marked by business failures, and we find from the official returns that between the years 1875 and 1879, the total liabilities involved in the failures amounted to $133,138,000, while during the second period of depression under the Conservative government—when the business of the country was far and away wider and more extensive—the total amount involved in the failures was only $75,603,000; very considerably less it will be noticed than during the former period to which I have referred. In order that it may not be said that that was because of reasons peculiar to Canada, I may say that in the United States which was practically under the same fiscal policy during these two periods, the total liabilities of the failures between 1892 and 1896 were far in excess of the total sum involved in the period between 1875 and 1879. The fact of the matter is that the fiscal policy introduced and maintained by Sir John Macdonald and his successors—the fiscal policy which is practically identical with that now advocated by the Conservative party in Canada—created business interests within Canada, and rendered us less dependent on foreign countries. While of necessity, we were affected possibly inductively by the currents of trade in other countries, yet we were not affected to the same extent as when we were so entirely dependent on our neighbours to the south as we were during the regime of the Mackenzie government.

But, Sir, notwithstanding the statements that were made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), we find that the more the situation under the national policy is analyzed, the more does the national policy prove to have been beneficial to Canada. One would imagine from the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the foreign trade of a country is the only index to its prosperity. A very slight consideration of the question will show how utterly fallacious that argument is. When the national policy was first introduced, it was, so to speak, the development period of trade in this country. The home trade was far more important to us than the foreign trade. We had been importing large quantities of goods, and one of the reasons for the creation and development of the national policy was that these goods might be made within our own country, so that our home market might be supplied by Canadians; so that Canadian produce might be sold to Canadians; so that Canadian manufactures might be sold to Canadians, and so that the wants of Canada might be supplied within ourselves. It was not foreign trade, but development of the home trade that Canadians were seeking, and that was the principal object of the national policy. It may be worth our while then to look at the conditions of the trade of Canada in the early seventies. All admit that in 1873 and 1874 we were commencing to get well into the hard times, but still our foreign trade in 1874—which was distinctly a more disastrous year than 1873—our foreign trade in 1874 was in excess to our foreign trade in 1873, while at the same time the balances in the post office savings banks were going down rapidly. The foreign trade of Canada in 1874 amounted to $204,146,000, but the balances in the savings banks went down until in 1877 they reached the low figure of $2,639,000. Four years after that, when the benefits of the national policy were just beginning to be felt, the deposits in the post office savings banks had risen to $6,208,000, but our foreign trade was only $175,000,000; or, $28,000,000 less than it was in the disastrous year of 1874. I cite these figures to show, not that the foreign trade of a country is no index to its prosperity, but to show that taken alone it cannot be relied upon as proof in that connection. It is a good thing to have an increased foreign trade when the home trade is healthy, and in some lines, yes, in many lines the home trade of Canada is now healthy and progressive. But I will ask hon. members of this House to examine carefully into this matter. The hon. member for Guysborough in his speech lauded the policy of this government with respect to the iron and steel industry. We may safely take that as a good example of a healthy industry; and why is it healthy? It is because the policy inaugurated by the Conservative govern-

ment with relation to iron and steel was maintained and continued by the present government; and continued in a way that it could not be affected by the preferential tariff; because the protection to the iron and steel industries is through bounties which are not at all affected by that preferential tariff, which I might almost call the thin end of the wedge of free trade. The same thing might be said of the other industries of the country that are in a healthy condition. They are in a healthy condition, because simply of the fact that the present government in their tariff tinkering did not interfere with the protection that had been given these industries by the Conservative government.

But there are some industries in Canada that are not in a healthy condition now, and one of these about which we hear so much, is the woollen industry, which is I may say essentially a home trade. The iron and steel trade is partially a foreign trade and the exports of iron and steel add considerably to the increase of our foreign trade. The iron and steel trade is not affected by the preferential tariff, but the woollen trade which is essentially a home trade is affected by it. Not only is the woollen manufacturer injuriously affected by the preferential tariff, but the Canadian farmer is also injuriously affected by it, and it is with that phase of the question which I propose to deal. I call attention to the fact that the importation of cheap shoddy goods is rendered possible by the preferential tariff. These goods come into this country with a nice finish, and they come into direct competition with goods made from Canadian wool which are better in quality, but which have not as fine a finish. What is perhaps more important is, that these goods come into competition with the goods made by the mills which handle Canadian wools. The natural result of this is that these mills have been injured, and the price of Canadian wool has steadily declined ever since 1896 until now when it is almost a drug on the market. That is a straight example of the interdependence of one industry in Canada on another. It is all very well to talk about protecting the classes, but protection to Canadian industries is a thing that affects the whole country. Protection to our Canadian woollen industries, is just as much protection to the Canadian wool grower as it is protection to the Canadian woollen manufacturer. The farmers of Canada lose by the reduction in the price of wool which is due to the preferential tariff, just as much, and indeed more possibly, than do the manufacturers whose business is interfered with by it.

Let me deal for a few minutes with this preferential tariff. If I am not mistaken, it was the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) who said that no man on this side of the House dare oppose the preferential tariff. I do not know why he gave utterance to that statement so dramatically and with such vigour, because I was under the impression that many members on this side of the House have expressed their opposition to that very same preferential tariff. Indeed, I was under the impression that speaking last year in the House I said so myself; at all events I say so now, and I do not think it will take long to give what might be considered quite convincing reasons for my opinion. This, apart from the fact that the preferential tariff is only in name a preference to British goods. That very rule which permits goods to be imported under the preferential tariff in which there enters one-third of British work, practically gives the advantage of the preference to a country like Germany, which is as hostile to us in its tariff as it is possible for it under its laws to be.

Now, I know that there is and has been a good deal of sentiment connected with this question of the preferential tariff. So far as sympathy with and interest in Imperial questions are shown by it, I most certainly sympathize with it; for I think Canada should do her share towards bearing the burdens of the empire. I speak of that because it was very intimately associated with this question of the preference and with the different arguments on which it has been based. There is no doubt in my mind that Canada should bear her share of the expenses of Imperial defence, and there is equally no doubt in my mind that Canada's duty to the empire demands two things: first, self-development; and, next, to take her part in Imperial defence. That self-development is extremely important, and the preferential tariff as at present managed injures self-development, and is simply an excuse for not doing anything towards Imperial defence. I go further, and say that the returns provided by the government show that it does not help to increase Canadian and British trade. Let us look at the figures for a moment. If it helped to increase trade between Canada and Great Britain, that trade in the last four or five years ought to have increased at a greater ratio than the trade between the United States and Great Britain. Tremendous emphasis is laid upon the fact that the trade between Canada and Great Britain has increased. Of course it has increased. It would be a tremendous indictment of this government and of the legislation of Canada if in such a revival of trade as has been witnessed in the last four or five years the trade between Canada and Great Britain had not increased. The trade between the United States and Great Britain, as well as the trade between Great Britain and every other country in the world has greatly increased. What we have to do is to make a comparison between the trade of Canada with Great Britain and the trade of other countries similarly placed; and we cannot get a better country with which to make the compari-

son than the United States. We have in the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce the figures of the trade with Great Britain since the preferential tariff came into force, taken from the English returns; and these figures show the exports from Canada to Great Britain in 1897 and 1900 to have been as follows :

In 1897....	£19,217,918
In 1900....	21,764,021
Increase....	£ 2,546,103

Or an increase of 13⅓ per cent—satisfactory possibly in itself, undoubtedly satisfactory to many hon. gentlemen opposite, who have harped on that increase; but let us look at the returns given by the same authority of the exports from the United States to Great Britain :

In 1897....	£113,041,627
In 1900....	138,789,261
Increase....	£ 25,747,634

Or an increase of 22¾ per cent. In other words, while under this boasted preferential tariff which was going so largely to increase our trade with Great Britain, the trade of Canada increased 13⅓ per cent, in another country more highly protected by far than Canada and having no preferential tariff with Great Britain, and whose volume of trade was vastly greater than ours, the trade in the same period increased 22¾ per cent, nearly double the extent of our increase. This is not a result on which we ought to congratulate ourselves, and while I desire to emphasize these figures as showing the fallacy of the arguments on which this preferential tariff was based, they ought surely to furnish a lesson and a warning to us, and to cause this government and this House to look seriously into this question of trade, and see why it is that under these circumstances the trade of the United States with Great Britain could increase so much more rapidly than the trade of Canada with Great Britain.

But there is another thing that is worthy of examination. That preferential tariff was supposed to improve our trade with Great Britain not only in the matter of exports, but also in the matter of imports. Now, Canada buys very largely from the two great English-speaking countries, Great Britain and the United States. Let us see whether the preferential tariff has increased our import trade with Great Britain compared with our import trade with the United States. Taking the figures from the government blue-books, we find that Canada imported from Great Britain for home consumption as follows :

In 1897..	$29,401,188
In 1901....	42,819,995
Increase....	$13,418,813

Or an increase of 45⅝ per cent. In the same years Canada imported for home consumption from the United States, without any preferential tariff, as follows :

In 1897....	$ 57,023,342
In 1901	107,149,325
Increase....	$ 50,125,983

Or an increase of 87 9-10 per cent. In other words, while under the preferential tariff our imports from Great Britain increased 45⅝ per cent, our imports from the United States under our regular tariff rates increased 87 9-10 per cent. If any figures could possibly show that the preferential tariff has not done what it was alleged it would do, namely, increase our trade with Great Britain, these figures, taken from the government blue-book, surely show it.

There is one item which shows us that the preferential tariff was after all a huge piece of irony. I have already said that in many respects the tariff whch we now have is a protectionist tariff, as the old one was; but changes were made in it, and as I believe changes for the worse. We are often told that in one breath we accuse the government of stealing the clothes of the opposition, and the next moment we say that their tariff is very insufficient, and does not at all compare with the old one. The reason can be readily seen by any person who compares the two tariffs. In all the good points of their tariff the government have stolen the clothes of the opposition, but they have not got them on right. In 1901, the full benefit of the preferential tariff was expected to be felt. We were going to do such great things for Great Britain ; we were going to bring Canada much more close than ever to the mother country ; we were going to pave the way for practically a commercial union with her; but what has been the result ? According to the returns of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, given on page 15, of his last report, we find that in 1901, under the preferential tariff the average rate of duty collected on goods from Great Britain was 18·322 per cent, while the average rate of duty collected on goods from the United States without any preference was 12·424 per cent, just two-thirds of the duty that was collected on British goods under the preferential tariff. I can imagine the zeal with which some of those members of the present government who had been so strongly advocating commercial union with the United States, and who still believed in it though they no longer dared say so, carefully conned the importations from the United States, and judged wherein they might most benefit our American neighbours, and made the changes in the tariff accordingly. And realizing also the fact that, in the case of Great Britain, they were going to bring in a preferential tariff, they carefully increased the duties on the most important lines, so that their preferential tariff would be preferential in name only. Unfortun-

ately—and I say this advisedly—they did not do that with sufficient completeness; and the result is that their tariff, while not benefiting Canada or Great Britain in the slightest degree, has, in certain lines, worked a great injury to Canada. These figures show, if any figures can,—I will not vouch for them after the reflection thrown upon official figures by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, from whose returns I have taken them, but I give them for what they may be worth, and, probably they are approximately correct—that so far as encouraging trade between Canada and Great Britain is concerned, the present tariff, with its preferential feature added is absolutely worthless. And it is more than worthless in the other lines I have mentioned. I have said that, so far as it is based upon Imperial sentiment, I sympathize with it; but, as an expression of Imperial sentiment it is fallacious. We have seen what that sentiment demands, but this preferential tariff is used as a mere excuse for refusing to bear our clear responsibility as citizens of the empire. We claim Imperial citizenship, and that claim is one of the reasons alleged for the introduction of this preferential tariff. But it is a paltry thing on the part of Canada as a whole to consider that, by passing a bogus preferential tariff, we have done our duty to the empire. It is interesting to note that in a recent report to the United States government as to its military establishment, it is shown that the people of the United States are spending upon that service over $90,000,000. I notice that, according to the estimates of the Minister of Militia and Defence, our total expense under this head is something like $2,000,000. And, even last year when the Halifax provisional garrison and the special services in South Africa took up something over $900,000, our expenditure was a little over $3,000,000. The population of Canada is, at the very least, one-fifteenth as large as that of the United States, while even this unusually large expenditure to which I have referred on our part is only about one-thirtieth of the expenditure of the United States on military service. I mention this to show that those hon. members of this House who have spoken of our getting no benefit through British connection are a long way out in their figures. If we compare our expense with the expense for the defence of the empire as borne by the people of Great Britain, instead of comparing with the military establishment of the United States, I think we are compelled to recognize that Britain is bearing a very great burden which ought to be shared by all those who benefit by Imperial connection. And we do benefit by it. Most certainly, in the matter of militia and defence expenditure we do not bear nearly the burdens that fall upon the people of the United States, whereas, considering that we cover an enormous territory with a small population, we might reasonably expect to bear a much greater expense, per head. Thus, in the matter of dollars and cents, Imperial connection has meant very much for us. It has meant very much more in other ways. I admit that, while we have great and serious difficulties to face, it would be wrong and improper to burden ourselves with too heavy a task financially. I admit further that, in sudden emergency and under popular pressure, we have done something—and I am glad we have done something—to contribute to the defence of the empire, and to take part in the wars of the empire. But we seem to consider that so far as financial burdens are concerned, we have done our duty. I infer from the estimates as they are now before us this year that the present government believes that no further expense should be borne by Canada in connection with Imperial defence, save only, so far as our own shores are concerned, and that only partly. I do not think that the citizens of Canada as a whole heard with any pride that we were still willing to offer our citizens to Great Britain for service in South Africa, but we cannot afford to spend a cent to send them to the country in which they are to serve. We can spend money on wharfs to improve the property of some members of parliament, or we can go on building post offices in friendly villages, but we cannot spend a cent on the defence of the empire. We can squander hundreds of thousands of dollars on an elevator to add to party strength, but we cannot spend a cent to add to the strength of the empire. I would like to have analysed some of our expenditures, just to show that we could succeed in getting a very large fund, without placing additional burdens upon the people of the country, to go towards Imperial defence. I think that an analysis of the expenditure might be an object lesson to some of the supporters of the present government regarding their former expressions of economy. However, the Big Ontario Policeman has been lost in the Department of Trade and Commerce, and our friend Mr. James McMullen has gone to what he himself called the home for incurables. Apparently, there does not seem to be any hon. gentleman on that side able to criticise the expenditure. I have already spoken longer than I intended to and I shall not attempt to do it now. But I submit that, while, undoubtedly, provision must be made for the public service, vastly greater economy should be shown. It is one of the difficulties of the opposition that, in criticising the proposed expenditure of the government as foreshadowed in the estimates, they feel that they are in danger of criticising items that must benefit the country generally. Criticism must, in nearly all cases, be devoted to the methods and details of expenditure after that expenditure has been made. I submit that an analysis of the Auditor General's Report, and an analysis of the expenditure generally in nearly all

departments—not in all I am glad to say—would show that there is what might perhaps be very mildly called recklessness and extravagance which in a business house would bring financial ruin very soon. I submit that the enormously increased expenditure cannot be justified by public needs, and we can well afford to restrict that expenditure and do our work as citizens of the empire fairly, and not make a jug-handled preferential tariff an excuse for not doing our full duty. A little while ago, I referred to the unfounded attack—for it was an unfounded attack—made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce for party purposes upon the honesty of the census officers of 1891. But surely it was even a worse insult to the people of Canada as a whole that the government should proceed upon the assumption that Canada will give freely her sons for the empire, but cannot give one cent to feed them, or one cent to carry them to the scene of war, or one cent to look after them after they leave her shores and are engaged in fighting, not the battles of the motherland so much as the battles of the colonies of the motherland, simply because of the avaricious grasp that some of her citizens have on all the money that even prosperous years can pour into her treasury. This is a point upon which one could easily grow warm. Canada will show the true Imperial spirit that she ought to show by following the lines proposed by the opposition in regard to fiscal matters and contributing towards Imperial defence. Let her use her resources carefully. Let her see to it that her development is not interfered with from outside. And let her spend her revenues in a way to benefit the country rather than individuals. Let her see to it that her own producers are carefully and well protected by legislation, and this done, let her bend her energy to trade within the empire. And lastly, when she has that growing strength which comes from self development, let her contribute towards Imperial defence in a manner commensurate with her resources, and let her no longer consider the giving of a jug-handled preference as a fulfilment of her duty. I submit that the present policy of the opposition is really an Imperial policy. It represents the development of one of the greater parts of the empire, it proposes that we should develop our own strength, our own resources; and then, it is perfectly consistent with this that we should show our Imperial interests in a legitimate way by properly sharing the burdens of the empire.

Mr. W. S. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). Mr. Speaker, I do not feel quite so cool over this matter as the hon. member (Mr. Lavell), who has just taken his seat. I feel that it requires considerable nerve to get up at this stage of the debate and add another speech to it. When I remember that this debate has been going on for eight days, and that thirty-six or thirty-seven members have already spoken, I feel as if I were coming in pretty late in the day. I observe that on this occasion the House is very thin and apparently apathetic, and it was under similiar circumstances that I addressed the House last year. I mentioned at that time that it was rather discouraging to a new member to get up and speak before gentlemen who did not pay much attention to what he was saying. I do not pretend to know all about these fiscal matters. When I reflect that some of the greatest minds in the world have written whole libraries of books on this question, and still cannot agree about it, it can hardly be expected that the newer members of the House who lack their knowledge and education can speak very fluently upon the same question. I am in principle a free trader, and that is the basis of my support of the fiscal policy of the present government. That party and that policy which come nearest to my views are the party and the policy that I support.

I have listened with a great deal of respect to the remarks made by hon. members on both sides of this House. You know a man may be quite a politician in his own county, and yet not know very much about the intricacies of a fiscal policy. I have for a number of years taken a good deal of interest in political matters in the county of Huntingdon, but my chief interest was awakened about election time in my anxiety to get the candidate of my party elected. In that respect, I presume, I am like many others in the Dominion of Canada. I must admit that I have not studied this question as fully as I would like to have done before I came to the House. But what are we to do?

There are many hon. members in this House who have been here much longer than I have, who speak and act as if they knew all that was to be known of this matter.

I do not pretend to, and I think probably I show my common sense in frankly saying that I do not pretend to know everything about it. Now, what are we going to do under these circumstances? Take the Minister of Finance, for instance, a gentleman who enjoys the greatest respect on this side of the House, and who has presided over the fiscal affairs of this country for the last five or six years. We look upon the Minister of Finance as a gentleman of ability, as a fair average man in this House. I might put him a little higher, I might say more about him if he were not present. Well, the Minister of Finance has given his whole attention to this matter; he has studied the question of the best fiscal policy for Canada to pursue, he has studied the fiscal systems of the United States, of Great Britain, Germany, and other countries. Now is it not reasonable that we should pay a good deal of attention to what he says regarding these matters? I think so.

Then there is the Minister of Trade and Commerce, whose whole life time has been devoted to financial matters. He gave us an admirable speech the other evening, of some three hours length, a speech that I listened to with the greatest interest and attention. I am prepared to say it is the best speech I ever heard on this matter, though I cannot agree with some of the things he said. Now are we not to be influenced by the opinions and statements of gentlemen like these? There are few of us who have had time to get down to first principles, and to build up a theory for ourselves, and probably if we did build up one it would not stand. So our opinions are to a considerable extent moulded by those with whom we come in contact. But after I have heard all these wise men who have been a long time in parliament, I get bewildered. Such was the effect upon me of the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He is a gentleman who, his friends say, has had a great many different kinds of fiscal policies, and he announces the one he holds to-day. I do not exactly understand what it is, it is a kind of quasi protection, I think. He has hardly sat down before up pops the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), who says that the ideas of the hon. member for North Norfolk are the veriest nonsense, that he does'nt know what he is talking about. Then the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) announces his policy, which I suppose is the policy of the independent party of which he poses as leader. Then the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has a little theory of his own. You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, the position we poor unfortunate fellows occupy in coming into the House at the eleventh hour—there having been some 80 new members who came into the House last year—after hearing the diverse views of all these wise men, no wonder we get a little bewildered.

I propose to make a refeence to the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think a fair test of the importance of a speech is the attention that is paid to it by those who are opposed to the principles enunciated by a speaker. I have sat here listening from day to day, and I notice that nearly every member who has spoken from the opposition side has had something to say about the speeech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That fact proves to me that it was a speech of considerable importance. There was one part of it that interested me particularly, and that was a reference to my own county as one of those in which there had been a great increase in industries between 1881 and 1891, due to the national policy. I was a little astonished at first by the statement that there were forty new industries in the county of Huntingdon, but I began to get a little light when he stated subsequently that there were forty basket factories. I remembered that there was an Indian reserve at the western part of the county of Huntingdon called St. Regis, and that the Indian ladies, commonly called squaws, are in the habit of making baskets, and selling these baskets on the boats and cars, and taking them around the country and disposing of them among the farmers. Those were the forty basket factories that were established in the county of Huntingdon under the national policy. One thing that pleased me was to learn that in those forty basket factories there were forty-five people working; whereas in the county of Antigonish, there were seventy carpet factories that only employed sixty-nine persons. So I thought we were ahead of Antigonish. Now speaking seriously, it seems to me that where a thing of that kind occurs in a census I could believe almost anything else regarding it. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Lavell) has been quite fair to the Minister of Trade and Commerce in referring to his remarks on the census. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said this with regard to the stuffing of the census in the province of Quebec:

> Every hon. gentleman who knows anything of the customs of the people of Quebec is aware that in that province the parochial clergy every year make a very accurate census of all their parishioners, and I am informed of all the people within their particular cure.

Now the fact is that when the cure goes round to take the census of the parish, he not only takes the Roman Catholic people, but he takes Protestants as well.

Mr. LAVELL. Then the returns are false, are they? I read from the returns.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). The hon. member spoke of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I am speaking of him also. But we have another test. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, after stating that 40,615 more names were found on the census than were recorded three months previous by the parish priests, says:

> I am willing to admit that there will always be a slight discrepancy between such a census and the census taken by the government enumerators. I believe the parish priests do not enumerate those who are absent at the time, and there are some other slight differences; but our census of 1901 corresponds with these parochial censuses within 8,000 souls.

Now they took the government census in 1891, and they took the parochial census of three months previous, and they found there were over 40,000 more on the government census than on the parochial census. They took the government census of 1901 and the parochial census of 1901, and they found there was a difference of 8,000. The parochial census was taken in the same way in 1891 as in 1901; and there is where the Minister of Trade and Commerce found a difference of 32,000, as between 8,000 and 40,000. I

think it is fair to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that I should make this explanation.

Now, as I said before, I get somewhat bewildered by hearing so many contradictory statements from each side of the House. So I think the best thing for me to do is to follow my own opinions. One thing I cannot understand is how the increase of duty is going to cheapen articles to those who have to purchase. That has always troubled me. I was talking the other day to a manufacturer down at the Russell House, and I put him this question: What about those who have to purchase? He said: The increase in duty does not necessarily increase the price of the article. Well, we are all human, we like to get all we can for what we have to sell, and buy as cheaply as possible. And I have not that confidence in the philanthropy of the manufacturers of this country to believe that they are going to give us goods any cheaper than they can afford to, and whatever duty is put on they will add to the price of their goods. Their idea seems to be that if you can put the tariff high enough to keep the goods out of the country the internal competition, as they say, will regulate the price of the articles. The government had to pass a Bill to regulate the matter and we had a little experience last summer in connection with the paper combine. I think we will find some combines existing in regard to other things, and that if they have a chance they will charge their own price for the goods. I think that argument is fallacious. I do not think it will hold water at all and I think that what we want in Canada is a cheap country to live in. I live in a purely agricultural constituency. We have no manufactures of any kind of our own, but, when I say that I will also say that I do not believe in parish politics. I do not believe in taking the view merely of our own counties, and when the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), in his speech, was pleading for the woollen manufacturers, I could not help believing that that hon. gentleman being largely interested in woollen manufactures was probably not thinking so much of the general good of the Dominion as of the dividends which would come to him from the industries in which he is interested.

With 23⅓ per cent of protection on woollen goods, I cannot see why the manufacturers cannot make a fair living. And here I would just like to say that there seems to be an idea abroad that it is only those people who are engaged in manufacturing that have capital invested in anything. Is not the farmer a capitalist in the same sense? Has not the farmer his capital invested in his stock, his farm and his implements, and should the farmer not get a fair return from his investments the same as the manufacturer of goods? We have a newspaper in the county of Huntingdon. It is quoted a great deal by the organs of our friends opposite as a Liberal organ which is not satisfied with the action of this government. I refer to the Huntingdon 'Gleaner.' While I do not agree with everything the 'Gleaner' says, there is no question at all but that the editor of the 'Gleaner' is a man of great ability and one who gives a great deal of attention to these matters. He issues an almanac each year instead of a holiday number in which he gives a resume of what has happened during the year. He has a good deal to say of the extravagant way in which the government of the Dominion is carried on, and although he says a good deal about the extravagance of the Liberal party, the only consolation we have is that he said far worse things about the extravagance of the Conservative party when they were in power. He gave us an estimate of the return farmers get from their investment, and I think Huntingdon is about equal to any other county in the Dominion. I think we have fairly good farmers in the district of Beauharnois, which includes Huntingdon, Chateauguay and Beauharnois. His estimate was that the return farmers get from their investment is about 2 or 2½ per cent. I was staggered a little at that statement. I made some inquiry among the farmers of that locality and verified the figures he had given us. He gave the average produce of the farm, specifying what the farmer had to sell, what it cost to work the farm, and so on, and he reduced it to the fact that the return the farmer gets is not more than 2 or 2½ per cent on his investment. Would the manufacturers of woollen goods be prepared to accept a dividend of that kind? Or, would the manufacturers of cotton goods be prepared to accept that, or would they want more? I was reading in a paper a few days ago, on this particular question, a paragraph, and I was wondering if there was any truth in it. Dealing with the statement that factories were not able to make a fair dividend, the reason was given that the owners did not keep their factories up to date in the way of machinery, and it was said that they found it much cheaper to run their factories with old machines which are obsolete and out of date, and to come to the government and get more protection, thus enabling them to pay dividends with old machines which are out of date and not equal to those in use in Great Britain and the United States. That paragraph said:

> Grandsons inherit factories originally representing investments of millions of dollars and instead of throwing on the junk pile the machinery installed by their grandfathers they continue to operate them by the old antiquated method.

It was to me rather a staggering statement, and yet, in conversation with a man who is

interested in a woollen factory, I had this statement made to me : Some new blood had been brought into the directorate of a woollen mill and amongst the directors was a man who had had a good deal to do with machinery in other lines. He found a certain machine in operation in this mill, and he thought it would be better to replace it with another machine. After some difficulty he got the directors to consent to put this old machine out and to put another machine in. The machine that was put out was as good as it ever was but it was out of date. The new machine that was put in cost $6,000, and this gentleman told me that it earned $7 a day more than the old machine, which hon. gentlemen will admit is a pretty fair return for an investment of $6,000. Our manufacturers should equip their factories with machinery as good as that employed in the United States, Great Britain and other countries. The great industry of this country is agriculture. There is no question about that. The census of 1901 was certainly disappointing to us all. I have talked to a great many people on that subject. A good many people expected a population of at least 6,000,000, but I have not found any person who expected a population of less than 5,500,000 ; yet, we fell short of that. What we want in this country is population. We have the great wheat fields of the North-west Territories waiting for the people to till. We have western Ontario as well as new portions of the other provinces being opened up, and after all what we want is more population. What would be an inducement to offer people to come to Canada ? A number of immigrants are coming from the United States. These people have some means, and they are coming in and settling in the North-west Territories. But, the large mass of the people who come are from the congested parts of Europe. Some of them come because of religious or civil persecution, but the great majority of them are poor men who come in the hope of bettering themselves. One of the things we ought to do, and it would be an inducement to immigration, is to make this country a cheap place to live in. I cannot for the life of me see how, if you are going to protect these manufacturers and enable them to charge the highest price of their goods, how you are thereby making it a cheap country for the consuming masses of the people. Although there is a large amount invested in manufactures there is an infinitely larger amount invested in other pursuits, and I think the people ought to have the advantage of being able to secure cheap goods. I am in favour of a vigorous immigration policy. I am just as loyal as the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Lavell). I served 26 years in the militia, I was out in the Fenian raid and I got my medal. I am just as loyal as loyal can be. There is no question about that. I think if the government have any money to spend they should devote it to the prosecution of a vigorous immigration policy. I have heard the statement made that the immigrants brought into Canada have cost the country $8.40 apiece. I think if we can get good immigrants to come and settle in Canada even if it costs us $8.40, or $10 apiece, we should get them. I am in perfect sympathy with the mother country in the trouble which she is having in South Africa, and whether it is our duty to pay for the men that we are sending to help her, I am not going to express an opinion at the present moment, but, I would like to see this government engage in a more vigorous immigration policy and make an effort to fill up this country. It is not my intention to quote any figures. You know it has been said that figures never lie, but it is also said that some people who are not very veracious sometimes figure. The figures are all of the same class, they are all taken from the blue-books, but different conclusions are arrived at from these figures. It depends largely which side of the House the member sits who is quoting them. A great deal has been said about the imports and the exports to and from the United States and Great Britain and other countries, and as to whether the imports or the exports are greater or less, but hon. gentlemen do not seem to be able to agree. One hon. gentleman says that because the imports exceed the exports it is a good sign, while another hon. gentleman says that it is a bad sign. They go jumbling things all around, and I made up my mind that I was not going to quote figures at all.

Let us look for a moment at the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), because the hon. the Speaker told us a few days ago that we were to talk about the amendment. I notice that very few hon. members have had much to say about that amendment. They have wandered very far afield and have talked about almost everything but the amendment. Some hon. members, however, did speak about it and one thing they seemed to stumble on is that they want adequate protection. I notice that in the amendment hon. gentlemen propose to protect everything. I think the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) came very near the mark when he told us the other day that there was no way in which to protect the farmer. The only way I know of in which to protect the farmer is to make this a cheap country to live in. I observe that the amendment proposes that we shall protect the labourer. If we increase the tariff, for instance, on woollen goods, how much of it will the manufacturers give to the labourer ? Although I am a free trader, I would like to make a bargain with these people. I would like to ask them if they would give half of the increased price they get for their goods to the men who are working for them.

If they will not give half, I would be willing to make it 25 per cent, and try to strike a bargain with them at that figure. I am afraid the labourer would not get any of the increase. I am afraid it would be taken out of the pockets of the purchasers and that it would go directly into the pockets of the manufacturers. I say here, that so far as the policy of the present government is concerned it does not come near enough to free trade for me; but it comes a great deal nearer to it than the policy proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and therefore I am prepared to support the government in their policy as it is, and to hope for better things. However, I will speak a word of warning. If there is any revision of the tariff it must be down and not up, or otherwise the government will find that there are a great many members on this side of the House who are not at all satisfied, and who will speak their minds out if they have occasion to, notwithstanding that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and others seem to veer around in the direction of protection. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always twitting us on this side of the House with not being united, and that sort of thing. Do they think we are mere machines who come here to vote in a certain way? Are we to lose our individuality, and our independence, because we are members of this parliament? I hope I will never come to that stage. I am prepared at any time to express my individual views with regard to any matter that comes before us. Whether it is entirely in accord with the party with which I am identified or not, I am prepared at all times to express my views on public matters. I may err in judgment, but at all events I will be independent while I am in this House, and state my views as to what I believe to be in the best interests of this country.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). It was not my intention to say anything on the budget, but the gentleman who was to follow the hon. member for Huntingdon is not in his seat, and as the Minister of Finance has made up his mind that the House must sit until eleven o'clock, I will try to interest him until that hour, unless he consents to my moving the adjournment of the debate and making my speech to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The threat of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) that he will go on with his speech is one that we should seriously consider. If I am correctly informed, an agreement has been come to, so far as these things are possible, that this debate will be brought to an end on Tuesday next. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is aware of that.

Mr. TAYLOR. The arrangement is that the division will be taken at the Tuesday sitting of the House, but of course that may run into Wednesday morning.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, of course. That being understood, there is no object in sitting to an unreasonable hour now, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) wishes to adjourn the debate, I will offer no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then I will move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, the House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 3, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Canada Central Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

THE MONTREAL BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. R. BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence) moved:

That that portion of the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines which refers to Bill (No. 38) respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, be referred back to the said committee for further consideration.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). When this Bill came before the committee the other morning it was defeated by a large majority. I would like some explanation from the hon. gentleman of the reason he is asking to have it reinstated on the Order Paper.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The only explanation I have to give is that the gentleman from Montreal who was promoting the Bill is anxious to be heard before the committee. It was one o'clock when the vote was taken in the committee, and there was not sufficient time to discuss it fairly; and the people in Montreal whom he represents would like an opportunity of being heard.

Mr. W. S. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). I was present in the Railway Committee when the Bill came up. I do not know anything about the merits of the several schemes for bridges proposed to be built between Montreal and the south shore; but I did think we had not got sufficient information with regard to the matter. There seemed to be an inclination on the part of the members of the committee to hurry matters through, and I think it would be only fair that the promoters of that company should have an opportunity of at least fairly laying their case before the committee before the committee makes its decision. There were very few members present at the time, it was near the close of the sitting; other matters of importance had come up, and

after each member got through with the matter he was particularly interested in, he left the committee, as is usually the case in that committee, and only a few of those who are in the habit of waiting until the committee rises were left to look after the remaining part of the business. The consequence was that when the Bill came before the committee I do not think it was fairly considered, and I am in favour of the motion to refer it back to the Railway Committee to be dealt with again.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I happened to be present in the committee when this Bill was discussed yesterday morning, and the vote which was taken there shows that a great deal of attention was given to the explanations of Mr. Buchan, the representative of the Montreal Bridge Company. The vote taken stood 41 to 11 or 12, so a large number of the members of the committee were present and listened to the discussion. I do not want to discuss the merits of the Bill now, but it is well known in Montreal, and in the Montreal district especially, that it is nothing else but another Armstrong scheme. It has not the confidence of the people of Montreal, and should be defeated.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I am happy to support the motion of the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division of Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), whom we are very glad to see back in this House after his severe illness. I do not think this Bill received due consideration at the hands of the committee, and I am surprised that my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), whose name I think appears on the Bill, should now be opposed to the motion to give it further consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I refused positively. I was asked to introduce the Bill in the House. I asked who the promoters were. I wanted to know if Mr. Armstrong had anything to do with it. I was not given any satisfactory explanation, and now I know that Mr. Armstrong is the backbone of the Bill.

Mr. MONK. I understood my hon. friend was the mover of the Bill. Who is the mover of the Bill ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think the hon. member for Ottawa is (Mr. Belcourt).

Mr. MONK. At any rate what struck me was this ; this company was incorporated in 1890, but for various reasons it has not proceeded with the work. It was alleged before the committee that the present promoters were serious men. The name of one of them is well known throughout this country, Mr. Henry Hogan, of Montreal. Another of the promoters is the Hon. Mr. Berthiaume, proprietor of 'La Presse.' I am sure that these are names which will commend themselves to the House. We were told that the project had the very strongest possible backing from some wealthy American capitalists. We were given no occasion to find out who these men were, but it was alleged by a most respectable lawyer from Montreal who was there to speak in favour of the Bill that not less than $50,000 had been spent in preliminary surveys. An offer was made to present the proof of that allegation. Plans have been completed. They are not on their way to completion. I am now taking the statement that was made before the committee. The question of a bridge below Montreal is one which interests in a very high degree not only the population of Montreal but the population of the surrounding counties and particularly the population of the county which lies immediately to the south of Montreal. My hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Geoffrion) supported us in the desire we evinced to have that measure fully discussed. There were two reasons why the Bill was disposed of in this summary manner and no opportunity given, in a matter of this kind where a most desirable expenditure of $10,000,000 was contemplated in Montreal, to the party who was defending the Bill to adduce proof of his allegation. The reasons given were most futile, I submit. We were told there was another project, that there was on the Order Paper lower down a Bill to incorporate a company having for its object the construction of a similar bridge. Into the merits of the allegation we had no occasion to go at all, and there was no reason for the statement that Mr. Armstrong was connected with this company or this enterprise. I submit to this House, that whatever may be the shortcomings of Mr. Armstrong, what we are concerned with is not Mr. Armstrong, who may have personal enemies on either side of the House, but the seriousness of the enterprise, and whether Mr. Armstrong is connected with it or not does not matter to us provided there are men interested in it who are capable of carrying out the enterprise. This allegation of Mr. Armstrong's interest in the enterprise, Mr. Buchan, the lawyer from Montreal, who is promoting the Bill, offered to refute ; in fact, if I remember rightly, he stated before the committee that any interest that Mr. Armstrong might have had in the company had now disappeared, that he was no more a shareholder and I have been informed that there is proof of that. Well, if Mr. Armstrong, objectionable or not, has no interest in the Bill, if it can be established before the committee that he is no more a shareholder in that company and if the parties whom I have already named are really willing to go on with the enterprise, why should we throw out this Bill without giving it any study when the promoters are merely asking for an extension of time, a favour which is asked from this House and granted every day ? In fact, I believe that this morning the committee granted that favour reporting favourably on a Bill extending the time for beginning operations when the time had actually

lapsed, whereas, in this instance, it had not. As I have already stated this is a project which interests to a very high degree the people of Montreal and all we ask is that the different Bills may be considered at the same time, so that the committee may judge of the merits of these different Bills. I think this is a fair request and should be granted.

Mr. C. S. HYMAN (London). Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the committee which had the consideration of this Bill, I have only to say that I think it was a very fair representation of the committee that was present when this Bill was taken up and that it was fully discussed. There were over sixty members of the committee present and the vote on the Bill was something like 41 to 17. Mr. Buchan who was promoting the Bill had every opportunity of addressing the committee. The committee extended to him the courtesy of allowing him to address it and he did so most fully. It is quite true that just before one o'clock there was some question as to Mr. Buchan's again addressing the committee. I did not refuse Mr. Buchan permission but the committee had the matter fully before it and by a vote it was decided not to hear Mr. Buchan further. There was still an other reason for the action of the committee. There was a member of the committee present who addressed the committee against the Bill and who, I understand, is the owner of 1,700 shares out of something like 2,500 shares in the undertaking. He spoke very strongly against the Bill, and I think in a case of that kind a gentleman holding such an interest in the company as that ought to have very good reasons for not desiring the Bill to be further considered. It does seem to me that there should be a fair rule laid down in regard to a matter of this kind. If an hon. member makes a motion of this kind and has nothing new to lay before the House, a Bill should not be sent back to a committee for reconsideration. The Bill has been most fully considered. I am not speaking against the Bill ; I am merely stating what occurred. I think it would be a fair rule for the House to carry out that unless there is something new to be laid before the House, a Bill should not be sent back to a committee simply on the request of a member. I trust the hon. members of the House will take into consideration the fact that the committee fully discussed the Bill before arriving at the decision at which it did arrive.

Mr. MONK. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) if he is aware that there was no opportunity given to Mr. Buchan to establish, what he alleged, that Mr. Armstrong had no more interest in that company ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have only to say that that fact was referred to a number of times. Mr. Buchan had an opportunity of referring to it and of refuting the statement, but he did not have it at the particular time he asked for. That is all. He had every opportunity before one o'clock but at the last moment he wanted to discuss the matter again.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). I think that possibly a matter which was referred to a committee and voted upon will bear a little further explanation to give those hon. members of the House who were not present in the committee an opportunity of understanding the exact position. I may say for myself that I knew nothing of the merits of this Bill. It was an ordinary Bill for a renewal of time. This happens to be a bridge. I think there have been three or four bridge charters renewed already during this session under the same circumstances but the bridges were not across the same river. Further than that there has been a number of railway charters extended, and it was rather a surprise to myself when it came up in the committee that an ordinary application for a renewal of a charter of this sort should meet with such strong opposition. The only opposition to this Bill mentioned in the committee, was that there was another application for a charter lower down on the list, covering precisely the same project. Then it was mentioned that a gentleman named Armstrong was connected with this scheme. The members from Montreal and the neighbourhood seem to know Mr. Armstrong better than I do, and I take it for granted from what they said, that there might be objections to him. However, that may be, I moved, as I thought it was only fair to do, that this Bill be deferred and be considered with the second Bill of a similar kind so that the committee could have the advantage of hearing the particulars regarding both of the projects. For the first time in my memory which extends over a long connection with the Railway Committee, that proposition was opposed, and to my surprise it was rejected by a vote of forty against seventeen. I submit that that was not fair consideration of the Bill. Most of us were entirely ignorant of the merits of either of the Bills, but never the less, without one tittle of explanation the Bill was thrown out. Surely the Railway Committee will not subscribe to the proposition that they should kill a charter simply on the statement that there is another charter to be considered later covering the same project. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has mentioned three very good names who are backing this Bill, and I regret that the gentlemen behind the other charter would not allow us to hear any explanation about this one. It should be remembered that the committee declined to allow a gentleman by the name of Buchan, who was a complete stranger to me, to answer statements made in the committee. It is true that he explained the scheme, but he ex-

plained it very moderately and very briefly, and when I moved that he should be heard in reply to statements made by the other side, the committee absolutely refused to allow Mr. Buchan to speak. Much as I dislike to oppose any finding of the Railway Committee, yet after an experience of fifteen years, I can say that this is a very peculiar case and that the entire circumstances surrounding it warrant us in asking that the Bill be referred back to the committee, because there undoubtedly was not a full consideration of it.

Mr. J. A. C. MADORE (Hochelaga). I rise to endorse what has been stated by the chairman of the Railway Committee (Mr. Hyman). I made the motion in the committee which killed this Bill, and I see no reason in the world why it should be sent back for further consideration. Speaking for myself personally, as well as for those whom I represent, we have no objection that the Bill should be sent back, because we know very well that when the committee have heard full explanations from both sides they would not for a moment think of passing this charter of the Montreal Bridge Company to extend the time for the building of that bridge. But the question arises: Is there any reason why the Railway Committee of this House should waste its time in reconsidering that Bill which has already been killed? Mr. Buchan was heard in support of his Bill. Every member of the committee who was present knows that Mr. Buchan spoke twice on the subject, and it was only when he rose to ask leave to speak a third time, and after one o'clock, that the members of the committee expressed the opinion that they were fully informed on the subject, and that they did not need any more information. Mr. Buchan has no reason to complain. He has been very well treated, and every reason he could give has been given by him. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has stated that the only reason why the Bill was killed was because the name of Mr. Armstrong was mentioned in connection with it. That is not exactly the case. It is not Mr. Armstrong alone who has made application for this charter, but it is the Montreal Bridge Company, which is composed of a number of gentlemen. They were granted their charter in 1890, and since that time they have made no serious effort to begin the work. Under the charter of 1890, they bound themselves to commence to build the bridge within three years, and to have it completed within seven years. The three years elapsed and they did not move. They even waited until the expiration of the seven years for the completion of the bridge, and then they came back to this parliament asking for an extension of time. I claim that when in 1897, they got that extension of time their charter had actually lapsed, because they had not complied with the provisions in the charter which required them to commence the bridge within three years. However that may be, this parliament in 1897 granted an extension of five years to the Montreal Bridge Company to complete the bridge. Since that time they have never moved. There is not an inch of work done to-day. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) stated that they have spent about $50,000, but the fact is that there has not been a cent spent since 1890. Before 1890, plans were prepared and these were the very plans that were produced before the committee. There is not a word of proof that they have incurred one dollar of expense since 1890. In view of the fact that parliament has already granted the Montreal Bridge Company two extensions of time, is it reasonable that parliament should again extend their charter to have it there as an embarrassment in the way of another company who seriously undertake to build the bridge? We know very well in Montreal the reason why this application has now been made to parliament. We know very well that it is because certain difficulties have arisen between the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the South Shore Railway Company, and the New York Central Railway Company with regard to running rights over the Victoria bridge. These companies do no longer agree with the Grand Trunk Railway as regards the terms on which the Victoria bridge should be used by them, and so the American capitalists interested in these companies have decided to build a bridge of their own. When Mr. Armstrong heard this, then he made an application to have the charter renewed so that he might perpetuate the embarrassment to others which his charter has caused ever since 1890. Had that charter not been extended in 1897, the bridge between Longeuil and Montreal would have been completed long ago by responsible people who are willing and able to build it. But so long as the other charter was in existence the people on both sides of the river expected that the bridge would be constructed, and men who really desired to build a bridge did not like to embark in the enterprise. Now that Mr. Armstrong and some others connected with him see that enterprising people are ready to construct a bridge, they want purely and simply to blackmail them in order to compel them to buy that charter. That is the reason why parliament is asked now to grant a further extension of the charter. I do not believe that this House will be a party to that deal, and that the Bill which has been killed will remain killed.

Mr. MONK. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? If the facts are so much against this company as he states, what objection has he to this Bill being considered at the same time as his own Bill?

Mr. MADORE. That is exactly what I have stated, that, as far as I am concerned and the people I represent, we have no

objection; but it is a question for this House, whether we are going to lose the time of the committee for the pleasure of Mr. Armstrong and company.

Mr. GEORGE BALL (Nicolet). I have no interest whatever in this charter. I was not here when it passed through the committee; but the reason given for throwing it out is so poor that I think I should say a few words in favour of having the Bill sent back to the committee. The single interest which I have in the Bill is that I represent a county on the south shore, through which the Quebec Southern Railway is going to pass. It is said that this charter was granted a long time ago, and that the gentlemen controlling it have not done much. Well, there was no opportunity to do much, because up to this time there has not been much progress made with the railroad; but now that the railroad is going to be built, other speculators come forward and want to have another charter. Why did they not present their Bill at the same time as the other ? But no, they present it now because there is a good prospect of having the bridge built, and there will be encouragement not only for the government but for Montreal and other places to give it assistance. An hon. gentleman on the other side said he was going to support the Bill, but after investigation he found that the name of Mr. Armstrong was connected with it yet. Well, I think that is a poor excuse. Why should I refuse to live in the city of Montreal because Mr. Armstrong lives there ? It is the same thing. You will not go into a certain business because another man you do not like is interested in it. I remember that last year the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) opposed the Bill because Mr. Armstrong was interested in it. I think that is a very poor reason. It is said that there is no opportunity of passing it, that it will take up the time of the House. It will not take much time, as the two Bills are going to be discussed together. I do not suppose it will take an hour of the time of the committee to discuss this matter. You see that a representative from the district of Montreal presented the Bill, and when he found out that Mr. Armstrong had something to do with it, he took the opportunity of presenting the Bill when he knew there was not one present to support it, and he got it killed. I do not suppose I need say that I am going to vote for the motion.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). As this Bill stands in my name, I think I owe it to the House to explain why I am taking no interest in the matter, and doing nothing to support it. All I desire to say is that when the petition for the Bill was to be presented, some of the gentlemen interested in it asked me if I would present the petition to the House in the absence of the member who was going to take charge of the Bill; and, as any member of the House would do, I presented the petition, but did nothing further in regard to the Bill, and have no interest in it.

Mr. MONK. May I ask the hon. member who had charge of the Bill ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I cannot remember what name was stated to me; but the gentleman who asked me to present the petition said that the member was going to take charge of the Bill, and asked me if I would present the petition, which I did.

Mr. V. GEOFFRION (Chambly and Vercheres). I am perhaps more interested in this Bill than any other member of the House, as the bridge in question is to be built in my county. The question is not, as I understand, whether this charter should be granted, but whether we are to send this Bill back to the Railway Committee. The members of the committee will remember that when the parties interested in the Bill were before the committee, I rose and asked that the two Bills be taken up together; but the promoters of the Bill unfortunately would not listen to my proposition, and decided to go on with this Bill. Therefore, I am now in a good position to say that if they chose to take that position, and preferred to take chances with this Bill, they should abide by the result. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was not satisfied with the explanations given in the committee, the different members who voted said by their votes that they were satisfied with them. I voted before the committee to give an opportunity for more explanations, but the committee seemed to be satisfied with the explanations given, and voted nay. Therefore, I am now in a good position to say that I do not think that this Bill should be sent back to the Railway Committee. It was fully discussed; all the members of the committee were in a position to judge it on its merits, and they did judge; and I think it is a very dangerous practice to send back to the committee Bills which have been fully discussed before it and disposed of.

Mr. MONK. I think my hon. friend and I both voted to have both Bills considered at the same time.

Mr. GEOFFRION. We did not vote that at all. We voted to have more explanations from Mr. Buchan, the promoter of the Bill, and I was prepared to give all the time and opportunity necessary to the different promoters of the Bill; but I think it was unfair for the promoters of the Bill to refuse to take up the two Bills together, and that was the position I took at the time.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I shall have to support the amendment to refer the Bill back to the committee—not because I am interested in the Bill at all, for I am not, but because I was in the Railway Committee yesterday morning when this matter was disposed of. I know nothing whatever

of the merits of the Bill. No opportunity was given me or any member in my position to form an intelligent opinion as to whether that charter should be granted or not. I was not favourably disposed to the Bill, but I think that it should be given a fair hearing in the committee.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I was in the committee yesterday when this Bill was thrown out. It was approaching one o'clock when the matter came before the committee, and a very large number of the members were absent. The Bill was simply to extend the time, and as a bill of that nature usually receives the endorsement of the Railway Committee, it was quite natural that a large number of the members of the committee, considering that the passing of the Bill was only a matter of form, should have left the room and a comparatively small number remained to deal with this important measure. I feel that the promoters did not receive very kind treatment at the hands of those present. It would appear that it was understood among a certain number that no opposition would be offered to this Bill, and that the larger portion of the committee had no hint given them that it would be opposed. It was apparently understood that it would receive the ordinary treatment accorded measures of that character. The result was that largely those who were opposed to the Bill remained in the committee room and a very small number were there to support it. The promoter was not present and there was no member present to speak in its behalf. I regard the whole proceedings as one of considerable hardship. Looking at the matter in a general way—and that is the only way in which I can look at it—I must say that I knew nothing at all of the merits of the scheme until yesterday, but to my mind this is a case in which the House can well afford to refer the report back to the committee and have the mistake corrected rather than treat the measure in an unceremonious way and possibly do considerable injury. I shall vote with pleasure for the resolution to refer that portion of the report back which deals with this Bill.

House divided on motion of Mr. Bickerdike.

YEAS :

Messieurs.

Alcorn,	Kendrey,
Angers,	Kidd,
Avery,	Lancaster,
Ball,	LaRivière,
Baker,	Lavell,
Bennett,	Lefurgey,
Birkett,	Léonard,
Blain,	Lovell,
Borden (Halifax),	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Brock,	McCormick,
Broder,	McIntosh,
Brown,	McLennan,
Bruce,	McLeod,
Cargill,	Monk,
Carscallen,	Morin,
Clare,	Northrup,
Clarke,	Pope,
Cochrane,	Porter
Culbert,	Puttee,
Earle,	Robinson (Elgin),
Fisher,	Roche (Marquette),
Fowler,	Rosamond,
Gourley,	Schell,
Haggart,	Simmons,
Halliday,	Smith (Vancouver),
Henderson,	Stephens,
Hughes (Victoria),	Taylor,
Ingram,	Tisdale,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Tolton,
Kaulbach,	Vrooman,
Kemp,	Wilmot.—62.

NAYS :

Messieurs.

Bazinet,	LeBlanc,
Beith,	Legris,
Béland,	Lemieux,
Bernier,	Logan,
Blair,	Macdonald,
Borden (King's, N.S.),	Mackie,
Bourassa,	McCarthy,
Bourbonnais,	McColl,
Bruneau,	McIsaac,
Brunet,	Madore,
Bureau,	Malouin,
Calvert,	Marcil (Bagot),
Campbell,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Carbonneau,	Matheson,
Carroll,	Meigs,
Christie,	Mignault,
Delisle,	Mulock,
Demers (Lévis),	Murray,
Demers (St. John),	Oliver,
Douglas,	Parmelee,
Dugas,	Paterson,
Erb,	Power,
Ethier,	Proulx,
Farquharson,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fielding,	Riley,
Flint,	Roche (Halifax),
Fortier,	Ross (Ontario),
Fraser,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Geoffrion,	Rousseau,
Gibson,	Russell,
Girard,	Scott,
Guthrie,	Sifton,
Harwood,	Stewart,
Heyd,	Sutherland (Essex),
Holmes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Hyman,	Thompson,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tobin,
Johnston (Lambton),	Turcot,
Lang,	Turgeon,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wade,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Wright.—85.
Lavergne,	

Motion negatived.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 90) to incorporate the British American Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Stephens.

Bill (No. 91) respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 92) to amend the Railway Act so as to promote the safety of railway employees.—Mr. Smith (Vancouver).

QUESTIONS.

I.C.R.—PURCHASES OF TIES AND SLEEPERS.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. How many railway ties or sleepers were purchased for the Intercolonial Railway in the autumn of 1900 and in the winter of 1901, between Metapedia and Moncton?

2. What proportion of such ties or sleepers were spruce, fir and poplar, respectively?

3. What prices were paid for each such description of tie or sleeper?

4. Were such ties or sleepers required to be in accordance with any and what specifications as to size, quality or otherwise?

5. Were tenders called for, if so, what notice by advertisement or otherwise was given to the public with respect thereto?

6. What amount was paid out by Inspector McMannus or other persons on behalf of the government or of the Intercolonial Railway for railway ties or sleepers during the month preceding the 7th day of November, 1900?

7. (a.) Who were the contractors who supplied the railway ties or sleepers in the autumn of 1900 and the winter of 1901 between the points above mentioned?

(b.) Did each of them have the privilege of delivering a percentage of spruce, fir and poplar, and if so, what percentage? or was this privilege given to some only, and if so, to whom?

(c.) If this privilege was given to some only, and was not general, why was it not granted to all contractors?

8. (a.) Were such railway ties or sleepers paid for in cash or by cheque?

(b.) What proportion was paid for by cheque and what proportion was paid for in cash?

(c.) Is it the usual custom to pay for such supplies by cheque upon voucher, and if so, why was this custom departed from?

9. (a.) What special privileges, if any, were given to Mr. F. Curran in connection with contracts for supplying railway ties and sleepers in 1900 and 1901?

(b.) Were the same privileges extended to all other persons tendering for the supplying of railway ties or sleepers?

10. What amount of railway ties or sleepers purchased in 1900 and 1901, respectively, still remain on hand, and what proportion of each respectively, have been used?

11. Of the ties and sleepers so purchased in the autumn of 1900 and the winter of 1901, what proportion were fir, spruce and poplar, respectively, and what proportion of each have been used, and what proportion still remain on hand?

12. Has the Department of Railways and Canals a report on the quality and durability or value of spruce, fir and poplar ties, respectively; if so, by whom was such report made, and when was it made?

13. Has any allegation or charge been made against contractor McMannus in connection with the surveying of such ties or sleepers or any of them, and if so, has the same been investigated, and with what result?

14. Has any reinspection or examination of the said railway ties or sleepers been made during the summer of 1901, or at any other time, and if so, by whom and with what result, and have any and what proportion of such ties and sleepers been found to be under-sized or otherwise unsuitable?

15. If any such reinspection has been made, when and by whom was it made, and at what cost has it been completed, and if it has not been completed, is it still in progress, and if it is not in progress, why has it been discontinued?

16. If any of such ties or sleepers have been found to be below the required size or otherwise unsuitable, or not in accordance with the specifications, if any, what steps have been taken to recover the value thereof from the contractor?

17. Has any track foreman between Newcastle and Moncton reported that railway ties or sleepers delivered to him for use on the Intercolonial Railway were under size or otherwise unsuitable, and has he sent any specimen thereof to the chief engineer at Moncton for inspection?

18. What is the usual practice of the department with respect to the paying for ties or sleepers, and was this practice in any way departed from by payment in cash instead of by cheque or otherwise during the autumn of 1900 and the winter of 1901?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. 553,210.

2. 289,805 spruce. Fir and poplar not ordered.

3. 183,053 spruce, eight feet at twenty cents; 186 spruce, eight feet at twenty-two cents; 96 spruce, eight feet at twenty-four cents; 107 spruce, eight feet at twenty-six cents; 106,363 spruce, nine feet at twenty-five nine-tenth cents.

4. They were to be in accordance with Intercolonial Railway specifications.

5. Tenders were called for by advertising poster, dated the 24th of September, 1900, and exhibited at all stations of the railway. The poster called for tenders to be sent in by the 15th of October, 1900.

6. The treasurer of the Intercolonial Railway issued railway cheques to the amount of $34,988.99 in payment for railway ties during the month preceding the 7th day of November, 1900. Neither Inspector McMannus nor any other persons paid any amount on behalf of the government or of the Intercolonial Railway.

7. (a) Frank Curran, Humphrey & Trites, F. T. B. Young, J. D. Buckley, Patrick Ultican, D. J. Buckley, John Culligan, John Maloney, Jas. O. Fish, A. Dunn, P. Hennessy, Patrick Tobin, C. A. Murray, J. J. Fournier, Summer & Co., J. S. Hachey.

(b) None of them had the privilege of delivering fir or poplar ties. In consequence of the large number which F. Curran, contracted to furnish, the railway agreed not to order spruce ties from others till his contract was completed.

(c) See answer to 'b.'

8. (a) They were paid for by cheque.

(b) All were paid for by cheque.

(c) It is the usual custom to pay for such supplies by cheque upon voucher, and the custom was not departed from.

9. (a) In consequence of the large number of ties of different kinds of wood which he contracted to supply, the railway agreed

not to order spruce ties from others till his contract for spruce ties was completed.

(b) All persons tendering for ties had the same privilege as F. Curran, with the exception named in No. 9 'a.'

10. The number of ties on hand, June 30, 1901, was 800,424. From July 1, 1901, to February 28, 1902, 461,734 ties have been used.

11. The number of spruce ties purchased in the autumn of 1900, and winter of 1901, was 289,805. Fir and poplar were not ordered.

12. Mr. T. C. Burpee, C.E., made a report on March 7, 1901, and Mr. W. B. MacKenzie, C.E., made a report on the 4th of April, 1901.

13. Yes, and it has been under investigation, but the investigation is not completed.

14. Yes, the investigation was suspended in November, on account of the lateness of the season. The inspection was made by W. H. Williams and C. E. Morton.

15. This was made in September, October and November. It was made by W. H. Williams and C. E. Morton. The work was suspended on account of the lateness of the season.

16. When the reinspection is completed, such steps will be taken if the facts ascertained show them to be necessary.

17. No report has been received from any track foreman between Newcastle and Moncton, that railway ties or sleepers delivered to him for use on the Intercolonial Railway were undersize or otherwise unsuitable, and the chief engineer has not received any specimen thereof for inspection.

18. The usual practice of the department with respect to the paying for ties or sleepers is to pay by cheque upon voucher and this practice was not departed from during the autumn of 1900, or the winter of 1901.

TAY CANAL—PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEES AND COLLECTIONS.

Mr. LEGRIS asked :

1. What amount was expended in paying the employees of the Tay Canal during the years 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1901, respectively ?

2. What amount was collected by the government on that canal during the said years ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The amount paid to employees on the Tay canal during the years 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1901, was as follows :

1896	$2,065 50
1897	990 00
1898	1,262 25
1899	1,301 62
1901	1,322 00

2. The amount of tolls collected on the Tay canal during the said years is as follows :

1896	$122 35
1897	108 82
1898	77 33
1899	121 07
1901	76 33

Hon. Mr. BLAIR.

POSTMASTER AT JOLIETTE, QUE.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. Has the government dismissed, or is it about to dismiss John James Sheppard from his position of postmaster of Joliette ?

2. If so, for what cause, and at whose request ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). At the Dominion elections of 1896, the postmaster at Joliette took an active part in support of one of the candidates. It was hoped that he would discontinue such action, and notice was not taken of it. But, at the elections of 1900, he again took an active part on behalf of one of the candidates. He also, during the elections of 1900, illegally detained in his office letters addressed to leading Liberals, such letters having to do with the work of organization, announcement of meetings, &c. In this way he was able to interfere with the calling of meetings for the discussion of public questions. Being engaged in the practice of medicine, he neglected the duties of the office, leaving its management to young girls wholly incompetent for the work. For these reasons he was removed from office. The department has fully satisfied itself as to the correctness of these charges and assumes full responsibility for the action taken.

I.C.R.—MR. HORNE'S ENGAGEMENT.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART asked :

1. What are the terms of Mr. R. T. Horne's engagement as manager's assistant on the Intercolonial Railway, and what salary is he now in receipt of ?

2. Has he been absent from his office in Moncton for some weeks ? If so, who is performing his duties ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Mr E. T. Horne's engagement is a temporary one. He is engaged as an expert having special knowledge and experience in the laying out and arranging of station terminals and yards. His salary is $300 a month. He has been absent four weeks, and is now on his way to Moncton. His duties have been performed by the manager during his absence.

CHAMBLY CANAL—CONDITION OF UPPER PORTION.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville) asked :

1. Has the government been informed that that upper portion of the Chambly Canal, granted by letters patent to the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada on the condition of a wharf being there maintained, is, to-day, nothing more than a foul mud-hole where even the shadow of a wharf is not to be seen ?

2. Is it the government's intention to recall those letters patent, as it has reserved to itself the right to do ?

3. Is it the government's intention to prevent individuals from making use of that locality as a refuse depository ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Bair) :

1. The government has received complaints that the property owned by the Grand Trunk Railway at the head of the Chambly canal is not being properly maintained according to the requirements of the grant from the Quebec government.

2. The letters patent were granted by the Quebec government, who it is assumed would have the right to take action thereunder.

3. The government will take action, when necessary, to prevent a refuse deposit being made to interfere with the navigation of the Chambly canal.

CENSUS—PAYMENTS FOR HORSE OR LIVERY HIRE.

Mr. BRODER asked :

What amount has been paid for horse or livery hire on account of the census of 1891 and 1901, respectively ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I must ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Broder) to make a motion for a return, as this information will involve the giving of a good many figures.

YUKON TERRITORY—REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to introduce a Bill during the present session providing for representation of the Yukon territory in Parliament ?

2. If not, when will such legislation be introduced ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I expect to introduce a Bill dealing with a number of matters in connection with the Yukon territory this session, and, in all probability, the question of representation of the territory in the House of Commons will be dealt with in that Bill. The matter, at the present time, is under consideration.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—CONDUCT OF CANADIAN SOLDIERS.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay before the House an item reflecting upon Canadians in service in South Africa. I find it in the London 'Daily News' of Tuesday, March 18, 1902. It speaks of an engagement fought in 1900, and refers to the conduct of the Canadians in the battle. The correspondent states :

What struck me as a pretty horrible incident was that some Canadians who were too far off to join in the fight afterwards came in and stripped off the boots and socks of the dead Boers—a thing I should not like to do even in the case of a living Boer—and pulled out their toe-nails to carry away as mementoes.

I need not say that this item is entirely untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria), wishes to conclude with a motion ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am ready to do so, yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that it would be better to wait until the debate is reached.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) moved the adjournment of the debate yesterday, he is first entitled to the floor.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). I informed you last night, Mr. Speaker, that it was not my intention to occupy any time in discussing the motion or the amendment now before the House. But the hon. member who was to reply to the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Maclaren) is not in his place, and I feel it my duty to make a few observations in reply to him. I would have done so last night, but the Minister of Finance was kind enough to say that owing to an arrangement having been made to take a vote on Tuesday night he would consent to an adjournment, and let me make my observations to-day. The hon. member for Huntingdon, in his speech, made use of the following language :

I am in principle a free trader, and that is the basis of my support of the fiscal policy of the present government. That party and that policy which come nearest to my views are the party and the policy that I support.

Further on he says :

One thing I cannot understand is how the increase of duty is going to cheapen articles to those who have to purchase. That has always troubled me. I was talking the other day to a manufacturer down at the Russel House, and I put him this question: 'What about us who have to purchase ?' He said, 'The increase in duty does not necessarily increase the price of the article.' Well, we are all human, we like to get all we can for what we have to sell and buy as cheaply as possible. And I have not that confidence of the philanthropy, of the manufacturers of this country to believe that they are going to give us goods any cheaper than they can afford to, and whatever duty is put on they will add to the price of their goods.

Further on he says :

I notice that in the amendment the hon. gentlemen propose to protect everything. I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) came very near the mark when he told us the other day that there was no way in which to protect the farmer. The only way I know of in which to protect the farmer is to make this a cheap country to live in.

Then he concluded his remarks by sounding a note of warning to the Prime Minister and the government, saying :

I say here, that so far as the policy of the present government is concerned it does not come near enough to free trade for me ; but it comes a great deal nearer to it than the policy proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and therefore I am prepared to support the government in their policy as it is, and to hope for better things. However, I will speak a word of warning. If there is any revision of the tariff it must be down and not up, or otherwise the government will find that there are a great many people on this side of the House who are not at all satisfied, and who will speak their minds out if they have occasion to, notwithstanding that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and others seem to veer around in the direction of protection.

These are a few of the statements made by the hon. member for Huntingdon. He declared first that he was a free trader, yet supporting a protectionist government, and he asked the question of a manufacturer whether protection does not increase the cost. The manufacturer answered him, in my opinion, fairly and honestly, and I will put the question reversed to the hon. member for Huntingdon : Does the duty given to protect the industries of the farmers of this country and to the cost of living of the workingmen and consumers ? If an affirmative answer is correct in respect to the manufacturer, it must also be correct in respect to the farmers of this country. If the argument is good in the one case it must be good in the other. But he says we cannot protect the farmers. Let me ask my hon. friend from Huntingdon, who says he represents one of the largest agriculturist constituencies in the Dominion, if the farmer is not fairly protected by this tariff that is in existence to-day, that was brought into existence by the Conservative government, and that this government dare not interfere with in respect to one of the articles named in that tariff designed to protect the farmer. Let me mention some of the articles which bear a duty in order to protect the farmers of this country, and I would like to know if he would have these duties renewed :

Animals, living, not elsewhere specified, 20 per cent ; live hogs, 1½c. per pound ; apples, 40c. a barrel ; apples, dried, 25 per cent ; apple trees, cherry trees, all kinds of fruit trees, 3c. each ; bacon and ham, 2c. per pound ; barley, 30 per cent ; beans, 15c. per bushel ; beef, salted in barrels, 2c. per pound; blackberries, raspberries, gooseberries, strawberries, cherries and currants, 2c. per pound, the weight of box or basket to be included for duty ; butter, 4c. per pound ; buckwheat, 10c. a bushel ; buckwheat meal or flour, 1¼c. per pound ; oleomargarine, butterine or other substitutes for butter are prohibited.

I would like to ask my hon. friend if he would have that prohibition removed. Some years ago, I think in 1886, I had the honour of introducing into this House a Bill to prohibit the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine as a substitute for butter. I urged that a duty of 10 cents per pound, which would actually amount to prohibition, be placed on the oleomargarine manufactured in Canada or imported. It was ruining the dairying industry of the country, as I proved by statistics. The proposition was opposed by some hon. gentlemen of the opposition. One said he had purchased oleomargarine in the United States, brought it into this country, and fed it to his lumbermen in camp. Another hon. gentleman of standing in the House then, and of standing in the House to-day, made a speech from which I propose to quote a few words. During my speech I had read from the report of Commissioner Coleman of the United States Agricultural Department, in which he says :

The manufacture of injurious compounds of fat, which are being shipped as genuine butter, threatens the legitimate dairy interests of America.

Further on in my speech I announced what the government proposed doing. I said :

I asked, at the same time, that an excise and customs duty of 10 cents per pound be placed on all oleomargarine, either imported or manufactured in the country ; and I am glad to say that the government, true to its protective policy—the national policy—came down with a resolution placing a customs duty of 10 cents and an excise duty of 8 cents per pound on all these substitutes.

The government accepted the proposition I made, and came down with a specific and an excise duty on oleomargarine, either manufactured or imported. Had that been inforced it would practically amount to prohibition. But, as the matter was discussed further, the present Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) rose in his place and suggested to the then Minister of Customs (Sir Mackenzie Bowell), that in place of putting on an import and excise duty, it was better to prohibit the article, and the then Minister of Customs accepted the proposition and placed the article on the prohibited list. The hon. Minister of Customs had the audacity to state to the people that he was the party who was instrumental in having the importation of that article prohibited. But, we have one hon. gentleman high in the counsels of the party then in opposition and high in the counsels of the cabinet of to-day, and here is the speech that he made :

But, Mr. Speaker, anxious as I am to see the agricultural interests, and especially the dairy interest of the country carefully guarded—and I say this as representing one of the greatest dairy counties in this Dominion, the county, according to the last census, which made the second greatest amount of butter of any county in the Dominion—still I do not wish to see the dairy interest guarded at the expense of any other interest in the Dominion. If any person chooses to put upon the market an article which is not hurtful in itself, and which is properly stamped and shown to be such an article, if it does compete with the producers of butter it will be merely an extra stimulus to them to make a better article with which this spurious article cannot compete. But I do not believe it would be right or wise for this parliament absolutely to prevent all the people in this country from producing an article which in itself is not hurtful, and which, at the same time, would be stamped so as to show its true nature. I am quite at one with any gentleman in this House who wishes to see that the butterine or oleomargarine are not sold as butter, and do not take the place of butter, because that would be injurious, not only to the dairy interests of the country, but also to the consumers who might be led into buying the spurious article under the impression that it was the genuine article they wanted. But if these articles are stamped so that the public know what they are buying, and if the oleomargarine or the butterine are composed of materials which are not injurious to the health of the consumer, I do not see why the production of these articles should be forbidden in this country.

This hon. gentleman got up and advocated the manufacture and importation into Canada of an article which then had practically ruined the dairying industry of the United States. Whom do you think that gentleman was? It was the present hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who made that speech in this House advocating the manufacture of a substitute for butter which, if it had gone into the tariff then as an article to be imported, would have ruined the dairying interests of this country. I would like to ask the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Maclaren) if he would like to have that prohibition wiped out and permit the importation of oleomargarine and butterine? Then, we have the following duties on agricultural products:

Candles, tallow	25 per cent.
Cheese	3 cts. per lb.
Cider	5 and 10 cts. per gall.
Cornmeal	25 cts. per brl.
Cracked corn and wheat	25 per cent.
Cranberries, plums and quinces	25 "
Cucumbers	25 "
Cut flowers	20 "
Dried flowers	20 "
Dried vegetables	25 "
Eggs	3 cts. per doz.
Fish, fresh and smoked	½ to 1 ct. per lb.
Flour of corn	1½ cts. per lb.
" rye	50 cts. per brl.
" wheat	60 "
Fowls, other than pure bred, pigeons	20 per cent.
Fruits, dried	25 "
Green grapes	2 cts. per lb.
Hay	$2 per ton.
Honey	3 cts. per lb.
Hops	6 "
Jams, jellies and preserves	3½ "
Lard	2 "
Maple sugar	20 per cent.
Meats, fresh, n.e.s	3 cts. per lb.
Meats in barrels, n.e.s	2 "
Mutton and lamb, fresh	35 per cent.
Oats	10 cts. per bush.
Oat flour	20 per cent.
Oatmeal	20 "
Potatoes	15 cts. per bush.
Pork in barrels	2 cts. per lb.
Rye	10 cts. per bush.
Tobacco, raw leaf	10 cts. per lb.
Tomatoes	20 cts. per bush.
Vegetables, n.o.p	25 per cent.
Wool, such as grown in Canada	3 cts. per lb.

Would the hon. member for Huntingdon who is a free trader like to put the farmers of this country into the position that the Americans could bring into this country all of their surplus goods such as those which I have named without any duty being collected upon them? Would he like to have no protection against the introduction of these articles and allow the American farmers to bring these articles into this country when the farmers of Canada would not be allowed to send one of these articles to the United States without paying nearly double the duties which we impose against them. Would the farmers say that they would like to have free trade in these articles and allow the workingmen of Canada to purchase supplies of this kind across the line and bring them in free of duty? Take the one item of pork, for instance; some years ago, I think previous to the time I brought in the Bill for regulating the importation into or the manufacture in this country of oleomargarine, I brought to the attention of the government the fact that the year preceding we had bought from the United States $13,000,000 worth of pork and pork products and beef and beef products with which to feed the people of Canada. I said to the government: You place 3 cents a pound on pork and beef and the farmers of this country will soon grow pork and beef enough to feed the people and have a large quantity left over to export. I said to the government: Last year we bought, according to the trade and navigation returns, $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 worth of beef and pork from the people of the United States with which to feed the people of Canada. While we have sent our money over there to get that $13,000,000 worth of goods, we can put it in barrels, ship it out of the country again and get our money back. But, we did not do that. We fed it to the people of Canada and when it was eaten the Americans had our money and we had nothing left except the bone and muscle which it produced, whereas, if this meat had been produced by the farmers of this country we would have had the bone and muscle and the money besides.

The Conservative government saw the force of my argument and they put a duty of 2 cents a pound on pork and pork products and on beef and beef products. And what is the result ? We are growing enough to feed the people of this country and we are sending millions of dollars worth away to feed the people across the sea. Would the hon. member for Huntingdon be willing to allow the corn and rattlesnake fed pork of the United States to come in here and compete with the pea, oat and rye fed pork we produce in this country which is commanding the best price in the market ? I am not surprised that he gave a note of warning to the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We have had a dozen hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House giving notes of warning to the government, saying that they are free traders, and telling the government that if they advance the tariff they will withdraw their support. How can the farmers, the workingmen and the manufacturers of Canada expect any more protection from this government when hon. gentlemen behind them are standing up here and there and warning the government to make no change in the tariff in an upward direction, threatening them that if they do they will withdraw their support ? We have not heard from the ministers yet on this question, excepting from the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in presenting his budget and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Why have the ministers of the government not sprung to their feet to defend the position they have taken ? They are allowing the members behind them to get up and tell their experience and they are ascertaining how many of them would vote against them in case they attempted to give any increased protection to the industries of this country. The last note of warning that we heard was from the hon. member for Huntingdon. He said : Do not touch the tariff. If you do, I will vote against you. But the ministers of this government care more for their seats in office than for their words or for any help they can give to the farmers, the workingmen, or the manufacturers of Canada. I have just stated that these hon. gentlemen care more for their seats in office than for the solemn promises they gave to the people of this country.

Mr. BENNETT. And the salary ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, the salary ! That is only a small item to some of them. I wonder that there is an hon. gentleman sitting on the treasury benches to-day who can go to sleep and sleep soundly. I do not think it is possible. These hon. gentlemen must have the nightmare of broken promises to disturb their slumber. We can all remember that in 1896 the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, the hon. Minister of Customs and the right hon. Prime Minister sang one tune to the farmers, and I could read a record as long as my arm of the promises they made to the people. They have not redeemed one of them. The Prime Minister himself went to the temperance people. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) was the temperance apostle of the party. The Prime Minister said : You put me in and you can depend on that hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fisher). You put me in and I will submit a plebiscite to the people ; if the people carry that plebiscite I will give effect to the will of the people. He submitted the question to the people. Did he carry it ? He directed two or three of his ministers to go into the province of Quebec and say to the people : If the plebiscite is carried it is going to put Sir Wilfrid in a hole. Vote against it. If you carry the plebiscite it means $2 a head for every man, woman and child. The average family in Quebec is from fifteen to twenty and it means to the poor farmer down there who is a temperance man a direct tax of $30 or $40 in most cases to make up the deficiency of revenue that will be lost by the introduction of a prohibitory law. What was the result ? Quebec went nearly solid against the plebiscite, and upon the advice of the Prime Minister and three other ministers who stumped that province.

Mr. CLARKE. Satellites.

Mr. TAYLOR. No; they were cabinet ministers. But notwithstanding their efforts, the plebiscite carried by a substantial majority, and did the Prime Minister give effect to the will of the people ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly not. Ask the Rev. Mr. Huxtable, who was chairman of the delegation that waited on him at Carleton Place, and who said : I never gave a Conservative vote in my life, but I will never vote for the Liberals again until they redeem their pledge. That is one of the nightmares that haunts the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), who said that if the express will of the people were not carried out he would leave the cabinet. Well, the Minister of Agriculture has not left the cabinet yet. He thinks more of his salary than he does of his word. Then, the Prime Minister told the people in London, Ont., that he would get a preference in England for the produce of the farmers of Canada, and he pointed out to the farmers what a nice thing it would be for them to be able to sell their oats, and their wheat, and their meat, and their hay, on the English market at an advantage over the products of the United States. The Prime Minister went to England, and did he ask for a preference ? On the contrary, he said in England : We will give you a preference in our markets and

we will not take anything in return. That is the way he redeemed that pledge. Again the Prime Minister told the people that if they put him in power he would get them reciprocity with the United States, and the people along the frontier, particularly around my place, took Sir Wilfrid Laurier at his word and they brought their produce over to the United States when the Liberals got into power, but they had their goods seized because they forgot to enter them at the custom-house. The right hon. gentleman sent a commission to Washington. There is only one of the commissioners present in the House to-day, I am sorry to see. They went for a jaunt to Washington in their private cars, well padded and well lined, and they spent the money of the people of Canada, but they got no reciprocity.

There was a troublesome question before the people of Canada known as the Manitoba school question, and the Prime Minister said : I will settle that question if you put me in power; I will send a commission to Manitoba headed by Sir Oliver Mowat to ascertain the facts, and we will settle the question. Did he send Sir Oliver Mowat to Manitoba ? Not at all. He sent up his handy man who sits up behind him, the man who says elections are not carried by prayers, the man who thinks that every man in this country has his price; he sent him up to Manitoba in a special car to have a good time. This gentleman interviewed Mr. Greenway, and on the authority of a gentleman who is satisfied that the facts I will relate are true, this is what occurred. Mr. Greenway said : There are three men here, namely, Mr. Sifton, Mr. Martin and Mr. Prendergast, who will have to be removed before I can settle the school question. An arrangement was made as a basis of settlement which included the provision that if these three men were satisfied and gotten out of the way, a certain amendment to the school law would be proposed if the government at Ottawa would give to Mr. Greenway a slice out of the school land funds to help his depleted treasury. Remember that the federal government was the trustee of these funds for the benefit of the schools of Manitoba for all time to come. However, the bargain was made and legislation was introduced here to give Mr. Greenway the money belonging to that sacred trust fund, and the Bill passed through this House, but thank God we had a Senate that defeated it. Now, that the Liberals have control of the Senate, I expect that when the proper time comes there will be a Bill passed to give Mr. Greenway the $300,000. Then Mr. Sifton had to be settled with, and Mr. Tarte said to him : You withdraw your opposition to the settlement of the Manitoba school question ; come to Ottawa and join the government as Minister of the Interior ; you will have control of all the lands of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and the gold lands of the Yukon. Mr. Sifton, who is a pretty shrewd fellow when there is anything affecting himself up, replied : I will go down provided I have control over the department without being subject to Council. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) yielded, and Mr. Sifton came down and was made Minister of the Interior, and the Prime Minister announced to the people of Canada that he gave Mr. Sifton absolute control of his department. The proof of that exists, because Mr. Sifton was not long in office until he gave the gold lands of that country to his friends to build a few miles of tramway. Thank God we had a Senate to stop that. I expect to see this year a Bill go through the Senate to recoup the gentlemen who got the contract for that work. Then there was Mr. Martin left. The Minister of Public Works could not handle Mr. Martin alone, and so he had a consultation with the Canadian Pacific Railway people about it. He went to the Canadian Pacific Railway people and said : We want Martin out of the way; you hire him to be your solicitor in British Columbia for a few years; give him a large salary of $8,000 or $10,000 a year, and we will recoup you by increasing the subsidies which the Conservative government agreed to give for the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway sent Mr. Martin to British Columbia as their solicitor with a large salary, and this government carried out the corrupt bargain and recouped the Canadian Pacific Railway by increasing the subsidies to build the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Then they went to Mr. Prendergast and said : You are working here for $400 or $500 a year as a common member of parliament, fighting the battles of your people, why not take the chief justiceship with a large salary, and withdraw your opposition and we will get the school question settled. Mr. Prendergast agreed and they appointed him chief justice of Manitoba at a big salary, and then Mr. Greenway amended the School Act. The Prime Minister now tells us he has settled the Manitoba school question. It is true that he resorted to the corrupt means I have referred to, but ask His Grace Archbishop Langevin, and he will tell you that the Manitoba school question is not settled, and that it is a burning issue to-day in Manitoba.

He promised to abolish private cars. I see in the paper the other day that they had to build a new siding at the station to accommodate the private cars of the ministers. Each one has a private car. The Prime Minister said that if he were elected, he would ride with the common people in their common cars. I want to see the Prime Minister ride in a special car, but I think one special car should do for this government, as one special car did for the gov-

ernment of the late lamented Sir John A. Macdonald. He promised to abolish protection. Did he do it? He promised to remove the duty on coal oil. He lowered the duty a cent a gallon, and then the wells were sold out to the Standard Oil Company; and to quiet the late Judge Lister on this subject, they took him out of this House and put him on the bench, and then gave the legislation which they had bargained for to the Standard Oil Company, and that great monopoly has now control of this country.

Mr. HUGHES. Is coal oil cheaper?

Mr. TAYLOR. The government is paying 32 cents a gallon for it, besides $1.25 for the barrels. He promised the people of the North-west that he would remove the duty on agricultural implements. Did he do it? Ask the representatives of the North-west. But they are not going to vote against the government. They are getting a share of the plunder, and they will put up with it. He promised the workingmen of British Columbia that he would stop the importation of Chinese into this country. Has he done it? We see them in rebellion on that question, asking the Prime Minister to carry out the pledge he made to them. He promised that he would reform the Senate. Has he done that? Ask Mr. H. H. Cook or read the evidence which he gave. When they went selling seats in the Senate, that was a reformation. I suppose they will thank Providence that the Senate has been reformed because a number of Conservative members have died, and they have appointed some of their partisans for a price to fill their places. They promised to reduce the debt. The Prime Minister said 'Put me in, and I will surround myself with a cabinet of business men.' Where are the business men in this cabinet to-day? We have a cabinet of lawyers, with one business man in it—the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), who takes care that he has good protection on biscuits and everything that comes out of his factories. I like to see it, because it gives the farmers better protection on their flour. The Prime Minister promised that he would reduce the national debt. Has he done it? No. Instead of that, he has increased it in about six years by some $12,000,000. He promised to reduce the taxation. Has he reduced it any? The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) stated the other night that the government had reduced the cost of goods to the people 10 per cent, and the Minister of Customs gave the people to understand that their goods were now costing 10 per cent less than they had cost under the old tariff. The hon. member for Guysborough said that the average duty had been reduced from 20 per cent to 18 per cent, or a reduction in the cost of goods of 10 per cent. How does that affect the farmers of this country? Take a farmer who lives in the part of the country that I do, where he can throw a stone into the United States. He goes over and buys a dollar's worth of goods, and brings them home. Under the old tariff he would pay 20 per cent duty, so that that dollar's worth would cost him $1.20. To-day he goes and buys a dollar's worth of goods and brings them home, and pays 18 cents duty on them, so that the dollar's worth cost him $1.18. Therefore he pays two cents less on the transaction; and this the hon. member for Guysborough says is a reduction of 10 per cent to the people on their purchases. The Prime Minister said: 'Put me in, and I will surround myself with a cabinet of business men, who will run the country on business principles, and we will save two millions, three millions, four millions'; and Mr. Justice Mills said, 'Yes, we can save five millions of dollars a year.'

Mr. BENNETT. Where is he now?

Mr. TAYLOR. He is transplanted to the bench. He was first translated to the Senate, and from there he was elevated to the bench. How has the government carried out that promise? The Conservative government ran the country, and ran it better, and made more permanent improvements, on $36,000,000 or $37,000,000 a year than these people are doing on $47,845,000, which is the figure of their main estimates for this year. They have had prosperous times and large revenues; and the people of this country expected that the Prime Minister and his cabinet, being business men, would do what any practical business man would do in times of prosperity, when more money was coming in than he required to run his business. They expected that the government would use the surplus to reduce the national debt. Have they done it? No; they have simply spent all they got, and in six years they have mortgaged the country to the extent of $12,000,000 more. Take a practical farmer who has a mortgage of $10,000 on his farm. He prospers, and his farm yields good returns. Would he say to his family, 'We will spend it all, and if at the end of the year it is not quite enough to pay running expenses, we will put another mortgage of $500 on the farm.' Would that farmer be a prudent business man? That is just what this government have done; they have spent all their revenue and mortgaged this country in the last six years to the extent of $12,000,000 more. I will just give one illustration to show the extravagant manner in which they are transacting the public business—and this applies more particularly to the practical, honest farmer who is in this cabinet, in the person of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), though the government as a whole is responsible. The late Conservative government, who were corrupt and everything that was bad, judging by statements of the members of the

present government when they sat on this side of the House, took the census for three terms—in 1871, in 1881 and in 1891. The census of 1871 cost $511,000, that of 1881 cost $552,000, and that of 1891 cost $549,000, or an average of $540,000. Now, what little bill has this practical business man, the Minister of Agriculture, contracted? A question was put to him on the 3rd of March: How much has been expended on the census up to date? And the answer was $948,000 up to the 3rd of March. But there is about two years work yet to be done. I have a question yet on the paper asking how much has been expended up to date, and how much the minister anticipates it will take to complete the work. I am prepared to say, that added to that $948,000 it will take another sum of $250,000 to complete the census. That makes an increase in 1901 over 1891 of $649,000. Is that the way a business government should conduct the business of the country? Take my own town. By the census of 1891, it had a population of 3,869. The town has been growing considerably since, and yet by the present census that number is reduced to 3,526. Now, our municipal assessor was at work at the same time that the census enumerators were making their count, and took down the heads of families and the number of each family. I have here a note from the Town Clerk's office with regard to that enumeration.

Gananoque, Oct. 17, 1901.

Dear Sir,—The assessment roll for the town of Gananaoque for the year 1901 shows a population of 3,718. I regret that I cannot give the other particulars asked for as they are not on the roll.

Yours, &c.,

S. McCAMMON.

Thus the municipal assessor, who was at work at the same time as the Dominion census enumerators, gives the town 192 more persons than do the enumerators of this government. I got the assessors returns from every municipality in my county, and these show an increase of over 1,000 in population as compared with a reduction of the 1,000 in the census returns. That is a fair sample of how the censuses were taken in Ontario at least. And for this imperfect census we are paying $650,000 more than was paid by the late Conservative government for the census taken by it in 1871, 1881 or 1891. The Minister of Trade and Commerce pretends to be disappointed, but he must know that so far as Ontario is concerned the figures are altogether wrong. He has frequently expressed his confidence in the government at Toronto, and that government compiles a census every year from the municipal returns, and he has always argued by that the censuses compiled by the bureau of statistics at Toronto were correct, yet see the difference between them and the figures given by the enumerators of this government.

I have here the last estimates which the late Conservative government laid before the House in 1895-6 and the main estimates of the present government now before the House. I find that there are increases in the expenditure of every department under the present government as compared with 1895-6. In that year, the late government had a public debt, including sinking fund, of $12,732,706.14, which has risen under the present administration to $13,967,312.65, or an increase of $1,234,606.51.

In charges of management the late government asked for an expenditure of $164,180 in 1895-6, whereas the present government wants $181,743 or $7,000 of an increase.

In civil government the late administration spent in 1895-6 $1,449,000 against $1,575,000 asked for by this government, or an increase of $125,800.

Administration of Justice cost us in 1895-6 $769,800. This year, according to the main estimates, it is costing us $976,000 or an increase of $206,000.

On penitentaries the expenditure of $467,000 in 1895-6 has been increased to $491,000 or an increase of $24,000.

On legislation we are spending $931,000 as against $853,000 in 1895-6, showing an increase of $78,000 under the present administration.

Then take arts, agriculture and statistics, at the head of which department is this great business man, the Minister of Agriculture, the expenditure to-day is $502,000 as against $208,000 by the late government in 1895-6, or an increase of $294,000.

On quarantine the late government expended $70,000, and we are now asked for $193,000, an increase of $123,000.

Immigration cost us in 1895-6 $130,000, to-day it is costing us $445,000, or an increase of $315,000.

In pensions there is a decrease of $1,021. Then take superannuation. The expenditure on that branch has increased from $273,000 under the late government to $328,000, or an increase of $55,000, caused by superannuations which have taken place since this administration has taken office despite their pledge to the people that they would abolish the superannuation system. I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce to explain a flagrant abuse in his own city of the superannuation system. There we had a postmaster, competent and efficient, and what did this government do? They wrote out an order-in-council which they got His Excellency the Governor General to sign, believing no doubt it was true, superannuating the former postmaster because he was too old, and to-day that gentleman is drawing a big pension for doing nothing although he is a much abler

man that the one put in his place. The late incumbent at Kingston was 68 years of age when superannuated by these gentlemen, and they appointed in his place Mr. Gunn, a defeated candidate, who was seventy years of age when they appointed him. And these are the people who promised to abolish the abuse of superannuation. You cannot walk down the streets of this city without stumbling over young men in the prime of life, who were superannuated by these gentlemen to make positions for their party heelers.

The militia, under the late government, cost $1,098,000 and to-day it costs $1,773,000, being an increase of $674,000.

Railways and canals chargeable to income cost $96,000 in 1895-6, and to-day is costing $344,000, an increase of $248,000.

Public works chargeable to income cost $1,300,000 in 1895-6 against $3,200,000 this year, or an increase of $1,957,000.

The expenditure of mail subsidies has jumped from $383,000 to $724,000, or an increase of $340,000, and yet we have no fast line.

Ocean and river service has increased from $166,000 to $243,000, or $76,000 increase.

The expenditure on ocean and river service has risen from $166,000 to $243,000, showing an increase of $183,000.

Scientific institutions has increased from $85,000 to $110,000, or $25,000.

The item of marine hospitals shows an increase of $2,000.

The item of steamboat inspection shows an increase of $4,000.

Our fisheries cost us $417,000 in 1895-6 and to-day the expenditure on that item is $467,000—an increase of $49,000.

Superintendence of insurance cost us $11,200 in 1895-6 and is now costing us $15,500, being an increase of $4,300.

Subsidies to provinces have increased from $4,236,000 to $4,366,000. That increase is the carrying out of the promise of these gentlemen that if they were put in they would give the provinces larger subsidies, but Ontario has not benefited in that respect.

The geological survey costs us $19,000 more than it did in 1895-6.

The expenditure on Indians has jumped from $894,000 in 1895-6 to $1,079,000 this year, being an increase of $184,000. The late Sir John Macdonald assured us that these Indians were gradually becoming self-sustaining and that the charge for taking care of them would grow gradually less, and so it did under the late Conservative administration. But although we have no more Indians than we had then and no more treaties, we find the Indian Department asking this year for $184,000 more than did the late Conservative government for that purpose.

Then take the item of miscellaneous—comprising the little items of envelopes, sealing wax, etc. Under the late Conservative government the expenditure was $142,000. but that has now risen to $327,000, an increase of $184,000. No doubt the travelling expense of the ministers is comprised in this item for we do not see any trace of them anywhere else.

In the Department of Customs the expenditure has increased from $874,000 to $1,892,000, or the business man who is now at the head of that department is now spending $318,000 more than his predecessors.

Culling timber under the late government cost $2,950, but to-day it is costing $18,000, an increase of $15,400, and there is no timber to cull.

The item of weights and measures cost us in 1895-6 $99,000 and to-day it is costing us $110,000, or an increase of $12,000.

The inspection of weights and measures cost us $99,800 in 1895-6, and it now costs us $112,050, or an increase of $47,000.

Railways and canals collecting revenue, the late government did this work for $4,061,000, but to-day it is costing $6,666,000, or an increase of $2,600,000.

Public works cost us in 1895-6 $174,600 and that expenditure is to-day increased to $316,400, or an increase of $141,800.

I now come to the item of post offices which the Postmaster General promised us would be self-sustaining and revenue producing. What do we find ? The late government asked about $3,500,000, and this government asked $4,000,000, an increase of $528,000 over what was asked by the Conservative government to do the post office business of this country.

And for the Department of Trade and Commerce, which my hon. friend said ought to be abolished because it was not needed, the late government asked $19,100, and in his estimate of this year the hon. gentleman asks $27,100—an increase of $8,000 for this department, over which he presides, and which he said was useless.

In Dominion lands the estimate of the late Conservative government was $117,022, against $157,532 this year, an increase of $40,000.

This makes a total of $36,800,000 asked by the Conservative government, and this year we are asked $47,800,000, an increase of $11,000,000. This is for current expenditure.

Now we come to capital account. For reduction of debt, Railways and Canals, Public Works, and Dominion Lands, the late Conservative government asked, in 1895-6, $4,408,000, and this government asks, $5,516,000, an increase of $1,107,000.

The grand total on account of consolidated revenue and capital is $41,243,000 under the late Conservative government, and $53,361,000 under this government, or an increase of $12,118,000. For the sake of convenience, and in order that the exact figures may be given, I give the comparison in full :

COMPARISON OF ESTIMATES.

—	1895-6.	1902-3.	Increase.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Interest on Public Debt	New—Yukon...	250,000 00	250,000 00
Public Debt (including Sinking Funds)	12,732,706 14	13,967,312 65	1,234,606 51
Charges of Management	164,150 00	181,743 80	17,539 80
Civil Government	1,449,434 16	1,575,225 66	125,791 50
Administration of Justice	769,812 50	976,365 00	206,552 50
Police	22,000 00	30,000 00	8,000 00
Penitentiaries	467,460 30	491,490 00	24,029 70
Legislation	853,255 50	931,296 00	78,040 50
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics	208,200 00	502,400 00	294,200 00
Quarantine	70,000 00	193,500 00	123,500 00
Immigration	130,000 00	445,000 00	315,000 00
Pensions	(Decrease, $1,011 02) 86,664 37	85,643 35	
Superannuation	273,240 00	328,240 00	55,000 00
Militia	1,098,884 00	1,773,003 00	674,119 00
Railways and Canals (Income)	96,157 33	344,387 33	248,230 00
Public Works (Income)	1,313,730 00	3,270,850 00	1,957,120 00
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions	383,733 33	724,566 67	340,833 34
Ocean and River Service	166,400 00	243,300 00	76,900 00
Lighthouse and Coast Service	457,870 00	641,770 00	183,900 00
Scientific Institutions	85,150 00	110,653 00	25,503 00
Marine Hospitals	39,000 00	41,000 00	2,000 00
Steamboat Inspection	26,000 00	30,300 00	4,300 00
Fisheries	417,900 00	467,000 00	49,100 00
Superintendence of Insurance	11,200 00	15,500 00	4,300 00
Subsidies to Provinces	4,236,000 00	4,366,334 68	130,334 68
Geological Survey	45,000 00	64,430 00	19,430 00
Indians	894,588 00	1,079,064 00	184,476 00
North-west Mounted Police	500,000 00	850,000 00	350,000 00
Government North-west	315,009 00	425,359 00	110,350 00
Miscellaneous	142,600 00	327,195 00	184,595 00
Customs	874,285 00	1,192,365 00	318,080 00
Excise	472,953 75	490,129 37	17,175 62
Culling Timber	2,950 00	18,350 00	15,400 00
Weights, Measures, Gas and Electric Light Inspection	99,800 00	112,050 00	12,250 00
Inspection of Staples	3,000 00	50,000 00	47,000 00
Adulteration of Food	25,000 00	25,000 00	
Minor Revenues	(Decrease, $1,505 00) 2,505 00	2,000 00	
Railways and Canals (Collection of Revenue)	4,061,413 00	6,666,853 00	2,605,440 00
Public Works (Collection of Revenue)	174,650 00	316,450 00	141,800 00
Post Office	3,525,635 00	4,054,280 00	528,645 00
Trade and Commerce	19,100 00	27,100 00	8,000 00
Dominion Lands	117,022 00	157,532 00	40,510 00
Total to Consolidated Fund	36,834,458 38	47,845,038 51	11,010,580 13
Capital Account.			
Redemption of Debt	1,721,539 61	75,000 00	
Railways and Canals (Capital)	2,527,420 00	3,861,600 00	1,334,180 00
Public Works (Capital)	85,000 00	1 320,000 00	1,235,000 00
Dominion Lands (Capital)	75,000 00	260,000 00	185,000 00
Total to Capital	4,408,959 61	5,516,600 00	1,107,640 39
Grand Total	41,243,417 99	53,361,638 51	12,118,220 42

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). My attention was drawn away for a moment. I desire to follow the hon. gentleman's argument and would like to ask a question. The comparison he is making, as I understand, is between estimates and not between actual expenditures.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not between expenditures, but between the main estimates brought down by the Conservative government in 1895-6, and the main estimates that are now before us. When the supplementary estimates come down—those supplementaries which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance intimated would be so very large—I shall be ready to analyse them and make a comparison with the supplementaries under the Conservative government. I expect to see, in these coming supplementary estimates, attempts made to cover up some of

the jobs—for instance, the grant to the Yukon Railway, and also the money granted to settle the Manitoba school question with Greenway, and, no doubt, many others. We can deal with these supplementary estimates when we see them, but, in the meantime, I am making a comparison on the basis of the main estimates.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) a comparative statement of the actual expenditure ?

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. and respected friend the leader of the opposition gave a comparison of the actual expenditure. And, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) will read the speech of my leader on this point, he will find that his estimate, his comparison on the basis of expenditure and mine on the basis of the main estimates, come to practically the same thing.

Some hon. gentlemen on the other side have said that the speakers on this side have not said much about the amendment. I am strongly in favour of that amendment, and so is every member on this side. But hon. gentlemen opposite are at sixes and sevens as to the policy they favour. Here we stand as one man declaring in favour of increased and adequate protection to the manufacturing, agriculture, fishing, mining and other interests of this country. I think I speak for the party——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) to say 'increased' protection ? It is not so in the amendment, but 'adequate' protection.

Mr. TAYLOR. That means just what it says. For instance, the duty on biscuits is 35 per cent. But if, when we get into power, my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) comes before us and satisfies us that 35 per cent does not afford adequate protection, we will gladly increase it to 40 per cent. We want protection that will be adequate to keep in this country the boys and girls we grow here, protection that will be adequate to afford them opportunities for labour in producing every article required and not have those articles brought in from Germany as hon. gentlemen opposite are doing with their preferential tariff. We are prepared, as the resolution says, to agree to a fair preferential tariff between Great Britain and her colonies. But we do not want such preference as we have to-day which allows Germany to send her manufactures to England, have them wrapped and parcelled there, and then sent out to Canada under a preference on the plea that 25 per cent of the labour used in producing them is English labour. The hon. Minister of Customs knows that in this way large quantities of German goods come into Canada to compete with the honest labour of Canada. Our leader and every man on this side, so far as I have heard the expression of their views, is opposed to any such one-sided preferential tariff as this. We are prepared to deal fairly by Great Britain and her colonies, and to give them a preference if that preference will not injure our Canadian labour. We say that we are building up the British Empire by building up Canada, and we will not allow a lot of pauper labour or otherwise in London or in any other part of the empire to come in here and compete with honest Canadian labour. Therefore, we say that we will give adequate protection to Canadian industries. Our party is a unit on this policy, and the people of the country will be a unit in favour of it when we appeal to them.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Mr. Speaker, in the London, England, 'Daily News,' of March 18th, 1902, I notice the following paragraph, part of a long article dealing with incidents of the war in South Africa in the year 1900 :

> What struck me as a pretty horrible incident was that some Canadians who were too far off to join in the fight afterwards came in and stripped off the boots and socks of the dead Boers—a thing I should not like to do even in the case of a living Boer—and pulled out their toe-nails to carry away as mementoes.

That, Sir, refers to the only Canadian force that was there at that time, 'E' Battery, Royal Canadian Field Artillery. I may say in explanation that one of the young English yeomen who was present at that engagement and who knew the circumstances, has written, to do justice to the Canadian Artillery. His letter appeared in the issue of the 'Daily News,' two days later, the 20th March. He corrects the statement of the contributor I have just quoted, and shows that these Boers had themselves taken off their boots in order to creep noiselessly into camp. Inasmuch as the item I have quoted has appeared in some Canadian papers to the discredit of the Canadian force, I desire to quote what this young English soldier says, which is absolutely true. His letter, in the 'Daily News' of March 20th, 1902, reads as follows :

> Conservative Club, Carlisle, March 18, 1902.
>
> Sir,—In your issue of to-day, under the heading, 'When will the war be over ?' appears an account of the suppression of the rebellion in Griqualand West by General Sir Charles Warren, with particular reference to Colonel Hughes, the colonial scout, who was an exceedingly smart officer. There are many inaccuracies in the said account which I am not concerned to correct ; but I do wish to contradict the slander therein contained against my old comrades the Canadians. Your scout whose testimony is recorded could not have been present at the engagement with which he connects the Canadians, otherwise he would not name the fight 'Smith's Drift.' The battle was fought at 'Fabers Puts,' which is many miles from 'Smith's Drift,' and against the statement of your scout that the Canadians were 'too far off to join in the fight,' and that they 'stripped the dead Boers of their boots and socks,' perhaps you will allow me to say that the Canadians who were 'E' battery, R.C.F.A., and as efficient a body of men as have served in this war, were encamped within 200 yards of the garden whence the enemy made

their attack on the camp, and their (the Canadians) guns did good execution in the action. That the colonials had several casualties in their ranks is the best contradiction I can give, and as to the 'boots and socks' fiction, the fact simply is that the Boers doffed their own boots the more noiselessly to approach our lines. I can send you a photograph of a dead Boer as he fell shot through the heart in the aforesaid garden, minus his boots but plus his socks. Your scout lost some of his own chums in the action, but he was not there himself.

Since the Canadians herein mentioned have returned home, I trust you will permit me in their absence to record this protest.

Yours, &c.,
GEO. HODGSON,
late trooper, 24th Co., I.Y.

I may say, Sir, that there is no need for me to make any further statement in addition to what is contained in this young soldier's letter. The Canadians conducted themselves on that occasion, as on every other occasion, with the greatest gallantry. I had the honour of being present myself. The Canadians were not, as this young soldier says, two hundred yards from the position held by the Boers, they were only 65 yards, and they maintained that position, and did splendid service throughout. I would not have mentioned this matter, only that an item has appeared in some of the papers to the discredit of E Battery of the Royal Canadian Field Artillery. No better men served in South Africa.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). The amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition to the motion of the Minister of Finance, has been so thoroughly discussed from almost every point of view that it is not with the idea of advancing anything new that I rise to take part in this debate. In consequence of a statement made by the Minister of Finance in his budget speech, the idea has got abroad that at the next session of parliament the country may expect some changes, or some revision of the tariff, and it is because of that possibility, or that probability, that I deem it my duty as the representative of a district composed largely of the consuming classes to state briefly my position on the tariff question. I shall endeavour to make my remarks very brief. I hope that what I have to say will not be so woefully misconstrued as some few remarks I made on a similar occasion last year were misconstrued by one of the hon. members who followed me in that debate. Last year I discussed a question partially of a local nature, just as hon. gentlemen at that time, and again this year, have discussed some questions partly of a local character. But the matter I brought up at that time, the future of the North-west Territories, I think is as important to the whole of Canada as almost any question that could be raised in this House. The hon. gentleman who followed me at that time, the member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster), said that he found in my remarks the solution of something that had been puzzling him from the time of the general election. He found that I had made some promises of a local character to the people of my district superior to the promises which the opposition there had been able to make. Of course the reply might have been made to the hon. gentleman that there could not be found in his remarks any reason for his election to a seat in this House. But that would have been scarcely fair, because, from his point of view, I believe the speech he made was a very good speech, and a very good presentation of the case from his point of view. But to assure the hon. gentleman, and to assure this House, that he was entirely mistaken, I may state that the matter which I at that time discussed is not a matter of political difference in the North-west Territories. The statement that I made was similar to and, as a matter of fact, was largely a repetition of statements made by and of the position that is taken by the local Prime Minister of the territories who is a member of the party to which the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara belongs.

I am sorry that I cannot promise to follow very closely this afternoon the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) who has just taken his seat. I fear he has covered too much ground for me to chase him over. I am sorry too, that I cannot hope to approach the high statesmanship which he exhibited in his speech and which was exemplified when he touched the matter of private cars. I would not attempt, either, to follow his example in respect to fairness when he discussed the expenditure. He went over the figures in regard to expenditure, showing the increases that have been made since 1896 when his own friends were in power, but he abstained from any reference to the extra services that have been given to the people in return for that increased expenditure. I would not endeavour either to imitate the hon. gentleman's accuracy, as when he referred to the government as a government of lawyers. I think he used the expression that the government is all composed of lawyers. Now, unless I am mistaken, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is not a lawyer, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is not a lawyer, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is not a lawyer, the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) is not a lawyer, the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden) is not a lawyer, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) is not a lawyer, the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is not a lawyer, the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is not a lawyer, the Minister without portfolio (Hon. Mr. Templeman) is not a lawyer, but a journalist. Here we have 8 or 9 members of the government, nearly 60 per cent, who are not lawyers. That is enough to show his accuracy.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). That is pretty close for him.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, that probably is as close to the mark as he got in the greater part of his speech, and possibly it is as close as many hon. members opposite have managed to get to the mark when they have dealt with public questions in this House, and a good deal closer than many of them are able to get when they deal with public questions in the country.

The Liberal party, since 1896, has been accused of carrying out the policy of the Conservatives, and it has been stated that Conservatives are still governing the country because the Liberal government are enforcing the Conservative policy. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor), in his opening remarks, referred to the action taken in this House some years ago respecting oleomargarine, at a time when his friends were in power, and if I understood him correctly, he stated that the present Minister of Customs had made a suggestion which had been accepted by the then Minister of Customs and carried out. He brought this up in a spirit, it seemed to me, of reprobation against the hon. Minister of Customs. If this fact is true, then, our friends opposite, when they were in power, were not unwilling, at times—on very few occasions, it is true—to take a suggestion from the other side, and I believe that any government of conscientious, honest men will never be unwilling to accept good suggestions no matter where they may come from. I was rather amused, in listening to the remarks of the last speaker, to note the excessive anxiety that pervaded these remarks in behalf of the farmers of the country. His speech was an appeal from the farmer's point of view. It seems to me that he has changed his point of view to a considerable extent from the time when, in Goderich, he was talking privately to a manufacturer there by the name of Saunders, and when he told that manufacturer, that if he and his friends were in power the farmers would not be so well off, that they would not have free binder twine, free wire, or free cream separators, that they would put a 45 per cent duty on agricultural implements, and according to the statement of Mr. Saunders, the hon. gentleman said that the present government were doing too much for the farmers. If we get into power, that is myself and my friends, said the hon. gentleman then the condition of things will be changed radically. A reference was also made by the hon. gentleman to the question of coal oil. He asked if the changes made by this government in the tariff in regard to coal oil had resulted in any reduction in the price. I am very happy to say that in the country with which I am familiar, west of Lake Superior, the changes made in the tariff and in the regulations in regard to the transportation of coal oil have resulted in a reduction of price of from 5 to 10 cents a gallon which the people of that country very much appreciate. The hon. gentleman spent some time in endeavouring to refute the position taken by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) respecting the reduction of taxes which the present government claim they have made since 1896. The hon. member for Guysborough claimed that a reduction of 10 per cent had been made through the tariff legislation of the present government in the taxation levied on the people of the country. The hon. member who spoke last seemed to be puzzled by that statement and he sought to refute it. Possibly it is not worth while for me to spend very much time in dealing with his references to the question because the proposition should be perfectly plain to every one who has ever studied arithmetic. If we take three from eighteen it must be clear to every one that this is something in the neighbourhood of a 10 per cent reduction. It may be clearer to the hon. gentleman if it is put in another way. The duty that was collected in the last fiscal year amounted to $29,000,000. That was the amount of the taxation levied on the people of the country. Had the tariff not been changed, had the tariff been left as it was, when the hon. gentleman and his friends went out of power, there would have been duty collected to the amount of $34,000,000. There is a reduction of about $5,000,000 from $34,000,000, and that means a reduction of rather more than 10 per cent. Is there any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who is not yet assured of this fact. If five taken from thirty-four is not equal to as much as 10 per cent, then, I do not know anything about arithmetic. In common with, I think, I may say all the members of this House, and in common with all the people of this country, I was very much pleased at the statement that the hon. Minister of Finance was able to give to this House. The statement which he made showed that the finances of the country are in a very flourishing condition, and I think it is a fair indication that the affairs of the people, of individuals and business men and others in the country are in a fairly prosperous condition. Our friends opposite all state that they agree that the country is in a prosperous condition and that progress is being made, but some of them contend that the government should not seek to claim any credit for the prosperity and progress that are to be seen on every hand. If that is true, if the attitude and policy of the government have had no effect upon the affairs of the country, why do hon. gentlemen spend so much of the time of this House talking about the tariff ? If it be true that the tariff policy of the government has had no effect upon the business of the country, why spend so much time discussing it ? If it has had any effect surely it must have had a good effect. because conditions under the present tariff

have shown remarkable improvement. One point of that criticism that is made by our friends opposite is in regard to the expenditure. It has been said by a number of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that hon. gentlemen opposite are careful never to come down to details in regard to expenditure. It is an easy matter to state that the expenditure is too high, but any person who takes the responsibility of stating that the expenditure is too high should be willing to take the responsibility of pointing out the items in the estimates which should be cut out, or reduced and as long as none of these hon. gentlemen are willing to take that responsibility they have no right to be making the general statement that the expenditure is too high. As long as they will not take that responsibility they may rest assured that the country will not take very much stock in their statements about the expenditure. My hon. friend the junior member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) in fatherly tones told the hon. Minister of Finance that it was a dangerous thing to allow the expenditure to reach too high a point, because when the time came when there was any necessity of reduction, or when reduction became advisable, he would find it very difficult to make reductions. This hon. gentleman asked the hon. Finance Minister where he would commence to make reductions. On behalf of the hon. member for Centre Toronto I would implore the hon. Minister of Finance when the time comes when he must make reductions not to start in Toronto, because, if he does, there will be a howl against any such policy.

As I said at the commencement I intend to confine my remarks chiefly to my position on the tariff question. When I sought election in Assiniboia—while I asked for support as a Liberal, yet I also sought the suffrages of my constituents from the point of view that I should be absolutely independent in voting in this House, and that I should be free to support any measure which seemed to me and which seemed to the people I represent to be in the interests of the country. Therefore, Sir, if at any time the party led by the hon. leader of the opposition should propound a policy which I considered to be more in the interests of my constituents than the policy of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, I shall have no hesitation whatever in casting in my lot with them, and giving my support to that policy. To the people I represent, the fiscal policy of the government is one of the great issues of the day; as a matter of fact, I think it is the chief issue which divides the political parties in Canada. Consequently, the amendment that has been moved by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) and which lays down the position of the Conservative party on the tariff issue, becomes a matter of very great concern to me. Let me point out that it is very similar in terms to the resolution that was proposed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) last session. I regret now, as I regretted then, that the position taken by the leader of the opposition and his friends, is not somewhat more specific so that there should be no doubt in any part of the country as to what are the intentions of the leaders of the Conservative party, if they should be given an opportunity to frame and enforce a tariff in this country. Speaking last session on the resolution which was then proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition, I expressed the fear that in different parts of the country different arguments would be based upon it by the friends of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden). To show that my fear was not groundless, I shall read a few extracts from, what is next to the 'Mail and Empire,' possibly the chief Conservative organ in the Dominion of Canada; I refer to the Winnipeg 'Telegram.' Those of us who listened to the debates of last session and of this session, have not much doubt as to what would be the effect on the tariff, if our friends on the opposite side were reinstated on the Treasury benches. There cannot be any doubt in the minds of the members of this House as to what the hon. leader of the opposition would do with the tariff if he were Prime Minister. There can be no doubt that in such an event there would be a general and considerable increase in the tariff; but the Winnipeg 'Telegram' on December 3rd last, was so much in doubt about the matter that it wrote as follows :

> We have frequently pointed out that the Conservative resolution of last session did not call for a raising of the duties.

On December 26, the Winnipeg 'Telegram' again wrote :

> And they (the western Liberals) will probably consider that they have more to hope for from a Conservative government in regard to reductions in the tariff than from the present administration.

What may be described as the chief Conservative organ in the west, is, it will be seen, endeavouring to convince the people of that country, that it is to the Conservative party they must look if they are to have a lower tariff than at present. On December 28, the 'Telegram' said :

> But those who support the government because they fear that a Conservative government would make immediate and substantial increases in the tariff should remember that a party is better judged by its actions than by its words.

Apparently this organ has some little doubt about the words of its leaders. On February 13, while an election was pending in Lisgar, this paper wrote :

> Liberal speakers in Lisgar, as well as the 'Free Press,' are striving to convince the electors of that constituency that the Conservative party is pledged to increase the tariff.

It was surely a very strange thing that the

Liberal speakers in Lisgar should try to convince the electors of that constituency that the Conservative party is pledged to increase the tariff. The 'Telegram' declared that this was nothing but a subterfuge on the part of the Liberals. Now, these references were all made pertinent to the resolution that was introduced in this House by the hon. leader of the opposition last year, and the 'Telegram' has also spoken regarding the resolution at present before us. On March 20, a day or two after this resolution was brought down, the 'Telegram' said:

> The 'Free Press' tries to put the high tariff construction on the resolution, but this is only an expedient for avoiding the confession which would otherwise have to be made. There is no doubt what the resolution means. It means that there should be adequate protection for all branches of Canadian industry. If any labour, agricultural or manufacturing interests have not now adequate protection, it means that increased protection should be given, but it does not mean a great increase or a general increase.

The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) was in Lisgar during that election, and he is reported in the Winnipeg papers to have said:

> The Conservative policy does not call for increased protection.

The hon. leader of the opposition will no doubt realize from these quotations that it is necessary for him to be a little more explicit with regard to his tariff intentions, so that there shall not be this diversity of opinion among his friends as to what he and his party will do if they should come to power in this Dominion. I have here the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) this session, and it reads:

> This House, regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory, is of opinion that the country requires a declared policy of adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries, as will at all times secure the Canadian markets for Canadians.

The policy of the Conservative party therefore is, that a high protective wall shall be placed around Canada which shall prevent foreign goods coming into this country and which shall prevent the people of Canada from buying any, but goods that are manufactured in Canada. As I said last year: I may not be entirely satisfied with the tariff as applied by the present government; I may think that the tariff should be lower than it is at the present time, but I have to face a practical situation. If I am to do anything practical I have to vote either for the Liberals or for the Conservatives on this tariff question. Well, there is no ground left for me to hesitate upon as to my course. There is nothing left for me to do, in view of all the conditions, than to vote in favour of the policy; the declared policy which is in force and which has been put in force by the leaders of the Liberal party.

While the leader of the opposition was not quite as specific as he might be with regard to some of the phases of the tariff question, he was very specific with regard to others. He complained in his speech during this debate, that fruits were being imported to too great an extent, and he told us that in the fiscal year 1900-1, $2,433,974 worth of fruits were imported into Canada; $1,766,979 worth of which came in under duty and $666,995 worth of which came in free of duty. The plea of the hon. gentleman is that this fruit should not be allowed to be brought into Canada and that a tariff wall should be put up to prevent our people importing this fruit. This is a matter of considerable interest to the people west of Lake Superior who have to import all the fruit they use.

A point which possibly has not been emphasized as much as it might during this debate, is, that the policy which is announced by the leader of the opposition and supported by his party in this House, is not the old national policy. Under the national policy we had duties reaching on the average to a point around 30 per cent, but the declaration of the leader of the opposition now is, that we should have a tariff wall at least as high as the tariff wall of the United States, which of course is a great deal higher than the tariff wall we had under the national policy. The hon. leader of the opposition has stated (page 1334, revised 'Hansard'):

> If we intend to maintain and build up our own products and manufactures against such powerful and tremendous competition as that which we must anticipate from the United States we would fix our tariff of customs against that country on a scale at least as high as is that of their tariff against us.

This is a feature which I think should be emphasized before this House and before the people of the country—that it is not the national policy that our friends of the opposition would restore if they came into power, but a tariff 30 or 40 or 50 per cent higher than was the national policy tariff. In support of this, I will also quote from the speech of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), who said:

> Unfortunately for a long term of years we have been witnessing conditions which have been very distasteful to us, which have grated upon our finer feelings. Our pride has risen in us, and we have, as it were, set our teeth, when we have witnessed what has been going on in this country for the last 50 years. I refer to the exodus which has been talked of in this House under the administration of various governments.

The hon. member for East Toronto is a very enthusiastic advocate of the policy which is declared by the hon. leader of the opposition, and it is evident by his remarks that that policy is not the national policy tariff, but a tariff 30 or 40 or 50 per cent higher than the national policy tariff. Therefore, as between the attitude of the

government of the present day, and the attitude of our friends on the other side of the House, there is nothing left for me—although I cannot say that I am entirely satisfied with the present tariff—but to support the present tariff and the men who keep it in operation.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SCOTT. Before six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I had complimented the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) who immediately preceded me upon the extensive and complete collection of 1900 campaign chestnuts which he had embodied in his speech. I had remarked on the various opinions expressed by different Conservative authorities throughout the country respecting the application of the principles contained in the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition. I had endeavoured to prove, and I think with a fair measure of success, that what is really meant by the amendment before the House is not a return to the national policy tariff, but the enforcement of a tariff a great deal higher than was the national policy tariff. I pointed out the plain words of the hon. leader of the opposition to that effect, and quoted from the remarks of several of the hon. gentlemen who support him in this House in proof of my statement that what the people of this country have to expect, if the Conservative party should return to power, and apply the principle they advocate here, is not the national policy tariff, which was in force for eighteen years in this country, but a tariff exceeding 50 per cent, for I understand that the average tariff rate in the United States is a little higher than 52 per cent. I had explained that from my own point of view, no ground was left for me to do otherwise than support the government, which I intend to do very heartily, when the vote is taken, notwithstanding that it would please me and the people I represent if certain items in the tariff list were considerably reduced. I had also expressed the hope that the explanation which I intended to make of my position on the tariff question would not be so misinterpreted as were a few remarks on another matter which I made last year. It was not a matter of very great moment on that occasion that the remarks of any single individual should be misinterpreted or misconstrued; but in regard to this whole tariff question, it seems to me, from remarks which have been very generally made in this House and out of it, that the position of the representatives of the country to the west of Lake Superior and in fact the position and sentiments of the whole people who live west of Lake Superior, are considerably misinterpreted and misunderstood by the people in the eastern part of Canada. Time and again the people of the west are spoken of as clamouring for free trade. Now, not to my knowledge has any representative of the west, in this debate or in any debate that took place last year, asked for free trade. We not only do not clamour for free trade, but we do not ask for free trade. We have supported the government in their revenue tariff policy, and so long as that is the case I think it is not proper for representatives of eastern Canada to be imputing to the west what they term unreasonable views. So far as I am concerned, while I would be willing to support to the fullest extent any respectable and powerful party in this country that would go the whole length of free trade, I have to recognize that at the present time that the idea seems to be impracticable. There is no considerable party anywhere in Canada that seems to favour following that idea to its full extent; and therefore my position is that so long as there is a tariff in force, which affords incidental protection to a certain class of people in the country, the advantage of that tariff should as far as possible be made equitable to every class of people in the country.

Only a few days ago in this House a question was raised by hon. members from the North-west Territories who wished to have the minimum valuation which is placed upon imported horses increased and it was at once thrown at us that we were inconsistent, that we were usually free traders but that on any little matter which we thought would benefit the people we represent we were willing to turn ourselves inside out and advocate protection. I am not very much concerned with accusations of inconsistency. I am perfectly willing to stand the brunt of such accusations. So long as the manufacturing and other classes of the country are reaping some benefit from the incidental protection of the tariff which is in force it is perfectly proper to demand that the people whom I represent should be given such advantages as can be given them through the incidental protection of the tariff. But, in the matter I speak of, the matter of scrub horses, I contend that we were not asking for protection in the usual tariff sense. We were not wishing to promote the industry that we were speaking about. We were not wishing that any change should be made in the tariff for the purpose of promoting that industry. What we wanted was to stamp out that industry which is quite a different thing from asking the government to aid in promoting an industry by means of the tariff. I can only repeat that I do not wish to hold myself bound by an idea which in this country is only a theory—the idea of free trade. So long as there is a tariff in force, so long as an advantage is given to some classes of the people by this tariff so long am I going to contend that the advantage should be extended to all classes of the community to an extent as great as possible. But, the reason why I and other representatives of the consuming classes contend for the lowest possible tariff is because there is very little ad-

vantage that can be given by any tariff to the consuming classes. The advantage which can be given by our tariff in this country is almost entirely reaped by what are known as the manufacturers. Hon. gentlemen opposite who advocate high duties have been complimenting themselves upon their doctrine having obtained some converts on this side of the House. One of the members whom they have seemed to believe has become converted to their views is the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd). As it seems always to be well, if possible, to get evidence from the other side, I am going to read to the House a fairly lengthy statement which was made to this House in this debate by the hon. member for South Brant. If he is a convert to the doctrine of high protection, then, I think I may class myself in the same category. I read this in order to place it again upon the 'Hansard' because it states what I think to be the truth in a very much stronger, more forcible and more concise form than I could put it myself. The hon. gentleman said :

When I look at the trade figures once more and I discover that our agriculturists are the greatest manufacturers there are in this country, that the agricultural interest is the greatest manufacturing interest there is in Canada, when I find that that industry exported last year, in animals and their products alone, $55,000,000, where five years ago they exported $36,000,000 worth, that in agricultural products they exported $24,000,000 worth, while five years ago only $14,000,000 worth were exported, I ask myself the question : Am I entitled to speak for that great agricultural class which has no interest in a tariff, and whom we can only benefit by making life as easy as possible ? We cannot protect the agriculturists of this country. Neither have I been waited upon by any agricultural sccieties in the riding from which I come, asking me to seek increased protection for any product of the farm or of agriculture. I ask myself the question: Would I be justified in expressing the opinion that a declaration of protection will benefit the mining industry of this country ? That is an interest that does not appear to receive that calm consideration that its growing magnitude entitles it to. That mining industry of ours is going to become a source of enormous wealth to the people of Canada, which we, even in our day, have only a faint appreciation of. When we look at the actual facts of the case and see that only five years ago the exports of minerals from this country were $8,000,000, while, last year, they had risen to the munificent sum of $40,000,000, an increase of 500 per cent in five years, we can hope that when twenty-five years shall have elapsed the prediction made by Professor Bell, one of the most eminent geologists that we have in this country, recently in an address delivered in the city of Toronto, when he showed himself to be thoroughly conversant of the subject, that in twenty-five years Canada would export not $40,000,000 but $1,000,000,000 of mineral products, shall have been verified, and we are hardly in a position to say that by increasing the cost of mining machinery we will be advancing the interests of the miners of this country. That is an industry that can only be protected by making mining machinery cheap. The government have done what they could by removing the duty from mining machinery, and I do not therefore like to endorse this resolution even on behalf of the miners. Then, you take our fisheries; how can we give adequate protection to the fisheries ? They have no products we could give any protection to under the sun. The only protection our fishermen want is the protection of good harbours, good life-saving apparatus and the protection that markets easy of access will give to them. Any money in the form of protecting the fisheries expended to make the lives of the fishermen more secure and their occupation less hazardous and more agreeable, will be money well expended, and it will be the only kind of protection that we can give our fishing interests.

Take our forest products. As far as I am personally concerned—although I do not think it would do much good—I am in favour of putting reciprocal tariff on lumber as long as our friends to the south of us maintain a tariff on lumber. Taking the five great national industries I have spoken of : The minerals, the fisheries, the forests, animals and their products, and agriculture, we have an export of $161,000,000. On that vast trade, by no method of protection can you encourage it to the development of a single cent.

That is the declaration of the hon. gentleman whom hon. gentlemen opposite claim as a convert to the principle of high protection. I would not go quite so far as the hon. member for South Brant. I think there may be some few things in regard to which the farmers of this country, the greatest producers that we have and who must be for generations to come the foundation of our progress and prosperity, may possibly in some few slight particulars be given an advantage by the tariff, but the advantage which can be given is so very slight in comparison with the advantages which a smaller and comparatively insignificant class of the community reap from the tariff, that it is my opinion and it is the strong, and unanimous opinion of the people in the country I come from, that the tariff should be kept at the lowest possible point. From hon. gentlemen sitting actually on the opposite side of the House statements may be quoted in further proof of the fact that the products of the great producing classes of this country cannot be protected. For instance the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith), who claims to be a high tariff man, respecting the product of wheat, asks: What has the government done as to the price of wheat ? He held that no government could affect exports. He held that by the tariff they could affect imports into the country, but he contended that by no tariff could the exports be affected ? This is simply proving the case that the products of the great producing class in Canada cannot be given any advantage by the tariff. There are things that the government can do for the great producing classes, and there were a number of things that this government, when they come into power in 1896, found it possible to do, a number of things that they did do which have resulted in a great deal of advantage to the whole people of Canada.

In the matter of the United States cattle quarantine, I was very much surprised to hear my hon. friend from South Wentworth (Mr. Smith) speak disparagingly of the action of the government. The actual results of that action, I shall give in a very few words. In the four and a half years ending 1896, during which the quarantine regulations were in force, the sales of cattle in Canada to the United States amounted to 3,762 head, valued at $52,606, whereas in the four and a half years ending 1901, after the Minister of Agriculture had secured the abrogation of those regulations, the sales amounted to no less than 341,317 head, value $526,919. There can be no question therefore that the action of the Minister of Agriculture was of very material advantage to the people of Canada. I am in a position to state, on the authority of possibly the largest cattle dealers in Canada, Messrs. Gordon and Ironsides, whose headquarters are at Winnipeg, that this action of the Minister of Agriculture was equivalent to a profit of $10 per head to every cattle owner in the North-west Territories.

The policy of the government in perfecting our cold storage transportation system is also one the benefit of which can not be gainsaid.

Then there is the establishing of government creameries in the territories, and I might cite a long list of actions of the present government, which have resulted undoubtedly in very material advantage for the people generally.

While by means of a tariff, very little can really be done to aid the agricultural industry, there is one means by which that interest can be benefited, and that is by improving our methods of transportation. In this connection the government has done a great deal. The other day the Minister of Finance declared that the capital expenditure during the current fiscal year will amount to $14,000,000, the greater part of which has been devoted to the assistance of railway projects, and the improvement of our transportation facilities. To those gentlemen who sometimes contend that the west is too generously dealt with by this governement, let me point out that of this $14,000,000 expended in the current fiscal year on the improvement of our transportation facilities, a very small fraction indeed is expended in the country west of Lake Superior—very much smaller, I believe, than ought to be expended.

The advocates of protection now, as at all times in the past, endeavour, by some means or other, to give a sugar coating to the pill which they want us to swallow. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has recently become an ardent advocate of the protectionist system, and the sugar coating which he gives the pill is the idea of retaliation. He endeavours to play on the prejudices of the people rather than appeal to their common sense, by urging them to retaliate against our American neighbours. But when we reach bed rock in the ideas of protectionists, we find that first and last and all the time their main object is to give the manufacturing class an advantage by law at the expense of the other classes. And the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proceeded in his speech in this debate to abandon the retaliation plea by urging that apart altogether from the course of the United States in its tariff respecting Canada, our tariff should be a protective one, because our manufacturer cannot afford to live under the preference granted the mother country. If the United States, he said, had no existence, and there consequently could be no idea of retaliation, we would still require a high tariff wall to protect our manufacturing industries against the competition of the motherland. It was rather interesting to observe our friends on the opposition benches during the speech of that hon. gentleman. When he was proving to their satisfaction that he had been for many years entirely mistaken and inconsistent in his advocacy of a revenue tariff, they applauded him loudly as though inconsistency were a mark of intelligence and statesmanship, and apparently forgetting, for the moment, that whenever a reference is made to the policy of the opposition, they claim great merit of consistency in standing by the principle which they advocated twenty-five years ago. In their case statesmanship is based on consistency, but in the case of the hon. member for North Norfolk, its chief mark is inconsistency. Our opposition friends, however, do not occupy quite the same position in their tariff advocacy as they did twenty-five years ago. When the high tariff resolution was proposed in 1878, and that policy was applied in the succeeding years, they were continually advancing the plea that this high tariff would necessarily be a measure of short duration, because as soon as the infant industries were built up, the tariff wall could be taken down, and these industries could hold their own against the world. To-day, however, the leader of the opposition says he is not willing to have a measure of reciprocity with the United States because our industries require, and always will need, protection, and will never be in a position to compete against their American rivals. So that the position of hon. gentlemen opposite to-day is not at all that which they took twenty-five years ago.

I quite admit that our tariff may be improved. I think that it might be considerably improved by further reducing the duties on various articles. When this tariff was proposed in 1897, there was considerable dissatisfaction among the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories on the ground that the government had not gone as far as the people were led to believe, by their promises before 1896, they would go. I do not know that it can be

fairly urged, as the hon. gentleman who preceded me this afternoon did, that the leader of the government broke any specific promises he had given to the people, but the people of the west at all events thought that the pledges made by the leaders of the Liberal party in the campaign of 1896 and before that time could fairly have been taken to mean that greater reductions would be made than were made in 1897, and in 1897, 1898 and 1899 expressions of dissatisfaction were common. But since 1899 very much less dissatisfaction has been shown. As a matter of fact, I think, in some respects, our present tariff has worked very much more to the advantage of the people than was expected. The various reductions that were made have led to greater competition from the outside than was anticipated, and at present and for some months back very little complaint has been made by the people in the west or in any other part of the country.

There seems to be a general idea, as I mentioned this afternoon that, next year, a revision of the tariff will take place. If a revision is made fairly—and, no doubt, there is a possibility of a revision being made to the advantage of the people—and if it can be shown that there are certain industries that are suffering and are liable to be wiped out because of the lowness of certain items on the tariff, I believe that the people of the west, notwithstanding that the changes may not be to their advantage will concede the point and agree to the raising of the tariff. But, on the other hand, if it be shown that certain industries are without the competition necessary for the safety of the consuming public and are making too great profits, the people of the west will expect that the tariff, so far as the protection of those industries is concerned, will be lowered. If the government can make a revision to the benefit of the whole people and not increase the tariff rate generally over what it is to-day, I believe that no great complaint will be heard from the people of western Canada. The people of the west are willing to be fair; they recognize the fact that, for some time in the future, as now, the revenues of Canada must be raised by a customs tariff, and they are willing to pay their fair share, and even more than their fair share as they must do under any tariff. I am willing, as I believe the people I represent are willing, to judge every case on its merits. It has been contended that a duty should be reimposed upon lumber. From the information I have, I would not be inclined to accede to that view. Last session, we had a little discussion about lumber, and I took the trouble to look up the facts in regard to the matter. I found that, as far as could be gathered from the records, the annual production of lumber in Canada amounted to about $70,000,000, the exports from Canada to from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000, and the consumption in Canada to about $47,000,000. On the other hand the amount imported into Canada was only about $2,500,000—only about 5 per cent of the lumber used in Canada was imported, in other words, the lumber manufacturers of Canada controlled about 95 per cent of the Canadian trade. If these figures are correct, it cannot be contended that our lumbermen are being subjected to any unjust competition or that American lumber is being slaughtered in this country. I said a moment ago that it was good, sometimes, to get evidence from the other side. I find that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) now an ardent protectionist, made the following statement some days ago, a statement which, it will be seen has bearing upon the point I am now discussing :

> The United States produced 79,000,000 bushels of barley. Suppose that we increased our exports of barley to the United States to 7,000,000 bushels, such importation would have no influence upon the price.

The hon. gentleman was arguing that if the importations into a country did not exceed a certain proportion of the total consumption those importations had no effect upon the price of home-produced goods. He put the figure at 10 per cent and contended that until imports reached this point they did not affect the price of home products. I have pointed out that the importations of lumber into Canada do not exceed 5 per cent of the total.

A good deal of talk has been indulged in with regard to the woollen industry. If there is any class of manufacturers in Canada who are suffering, probably it is the manufacturers of some classes of woollens. But the evidence that even they are suffering is by no means conclusive. Many of them seem to find the tariff quite satisfactory. We have no woollen manufacturers in the North-west, but among my friends in Ontario are some engaged in this line. One whom I met in Ottawa the other day, when I asked him how business was, and how the present tariff affected him, said that he had all the orders he could fill and had no complaint to make against the tariff. I do not think it can be fairly contended that woollen goods from any other country are being slaughtered in Canada. Certainly, it will not be contended that this is being done with American goods, for this class of goods in the United States is higher in price than in Canada, and is hardly likely to be brought in over a 35 per cent duty to be slaughtered on this side of the line. The tariff under the preference is 23 per cent, which is considerably lower than under the general tariff. It may be that the manufacturers of certain classes of woollens find the duty almost too low to permit them to continue in business. Though it would be an extra load to put on the consuming class to raise the tariff on woollens, I believe that the people of west-

ern Canada are so willing to bear their share, and even a little more than their share, of the revenue burdens of the country that, if it could be proved that there was a woollen manufacturer in any special line who was suffering because of the low point to which the tariff was cut, they would be willing to have a little increased advantage afforded him.

Another article about which there has been considerable agitation during the last six months is farming implements. Among the hosts of deputations which have approached the government pleading for higher duties have been deputations of manufacturers of agricultural implements. That is one article which, I think it can be proved without possibility of dispute is not being slaughtered in this country. During last season, if it had not been that our implement dealers were able to go to the United States and buy implements, a portion of the immense crop in Manitoba and the North-west would be still standing in the fields, for the implement manufacturers of Ontario were absolutely unable to supply the number of implements needed to take off that immense crop. And as was pointed out by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), the American reapers sold in the Canadian North-west are sold at a price $10 higher than the price charged for the Canadian implements. It will hardly be said that slaughtering is going on in that line. In my opinion the best way to promote the prosperity of the manufacturers, as of every other class in the country, is not to put up a tariff wall or to choke up the ordinary channels of trade, but to take steps to increase the home markets by increasing the population. I am glad to be able to say that, on this point, I am in agreement with the hon. leader of the opposition, who, in his speech in support of this amendment used the following words :

> In this connection we must not forget the enormous importance of the home market, not only to Canadian manufacturers but also to Canadian agriculturists. Our total manufactures (including under that term all articles made in factories using machinery and motive power), have been estimated by a very competent authority during the past year at $730,000,000. Of these, we exported less than $68,000,000 or about 9 per cent. Therefore, 91 per cent of the goods manufactured in Canada have been consumed in Canada. We have consequently at the present time to look first to the home market and not to a foreign market.

The home market, during the year referred to, took no less than $662,000,000 worth of articles from the Canadian manufacturers. Now, it is clear to everybody that if five and three quarter millions of people could use this amount of manufactured goods, double that number of people would use double that quantity of manufactured goods. It seems therefore that the best policy we can pursue in the interest of everybody, of the manufacturers as well as of other classes, is to take such steps as will bring in rapidly a population to afford a home market for manufactures. It seems to me that the experience of the past should be a warning against returning to a higher tariff. For eighteen years we had the national policy tariff, and as has been frequently pointed out since this debate commenced the census returns ever since that policy was inaugurated have been most disappointing. The population has not increased at all in a satisfactory manner. There can be no question that since this government came into power, and since it has to some extent cut down the tariff, progress has been much faster. and population has been coming into the country more rapidly. At the present time we are getting immigrants from the United States in vastly greater numbers than the number of Canadians who are emigrating to that country.

I mentioned a moment ago that people in western Canada, and probably in all the provinces of the Dominion, who are interested in having a low tariff, have not been making as much complaint recently as formerly in respect to the tariff, and I think this fact has misled the manufacturers, and with a feeling of false security they have again commenced sending deputations to Ottawa to ask for more protection. I think they have very foolishly come to the conclusion that the consuming classes have gone to sleep on the tariff question, and that all they have to do is to come to Ottawa and get tariff increases, and then they will be able to live and fatten upon them for all time to come. I believe it is the duty of the members of this House to give warning to the manufacturers that they are entirely mistaken in that regard. While the people are finding the present tariff fairly satisfactory, and are not complaining under it as they did under the national policy tariff, and as they did for the first year or two after the present tariff was brought into operation, still, if any action is taken towards increasing the general tariff to the detriment of the consuming classes of this country, the manufacturers and everybody else will find shortly that the sentiment of the consuming classes is very much the same as it always has been, and that there will be such a renewed agitation that the manufacturers and every person in any measure responsible for such increase will find it very much to their disadvantage.

I was struck by the reference made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in his speech to the policy of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. I thoroughly believe what was stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that had the policy of Alexander Mackenzie been continued in force, we would have had five or six times as many people in the North-west as we have to-day ; we would have had a greater home market, and our manufacturers would have been much better off than they are at the present

time. What would be the case to-day had the advice of our friends in opposition been taken four or five years ago, and had a tariff wall been put up so high as entirely to prevent goods coming in from the United States? Do you suppose that we would see to-day people going into the Canadian North-west by hundreds and thousands weekly? Do you suppose the people of Manitoba and the North-west would have been producing, as they did last year, 112,000,000 or 115,000,000 bushels of grain? I do not think there is the slightest possibility of it. The North-west will be peopled by a policy which makes the conditions of life there as easy as possible. If transportation arrangements are made by which they can remove their products to the seaboard at the least expense, and if the tariff is kept at such a point that they can buy their goods at the least cost, such a policy will result in peopling the North-west, and will result eventually to the advantage of everybody in Canada, the manufacturers included. The parliament and people of this country have before them a great opportunity to people the vast stretches of fertile land west of Lake Superior, and the only policy under which that can be done is one which will make conditions of life easy for the people there, and enable them to buy their goods as cheaply as possible; and, as I said before, such a policy will eventually prove to be the most favourable one to the manufacturers of eastern Canada, as well as for the Dominion as a whole.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), in his opening remarks, reflected somewhat upon the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) because of his want of accuracy, as he called it, in referring to this government as a government of lawyers. The hon. member for Assiniboia, in endeavouring to refute the statement, mentioned these members of the Cabinet who are not of the legal profession. But the hon. gentleman should remember that when the Conservative government was in power the present Prime Minister himself, in his speeches throughout Canada, reflected upon the Conservative government for containing a lawyer as Minister of Justice, and a lawyer as Solicitor General; he complained that the government gave a great deal of their legal work to outside lawyers who were political supporters of the government, and he promised in his addresses to the people of Canada that all this would be changed on the advent of a Liberal government to power. But the fact is that since this government has come to power, not only have they a very large representation of the legal profession in the Cabinet, but their Solicitor General is allowed to practice his own profession in addition to his governmental duties, and they have increased to a very large extent the sum of money paid to outside lawyers who are political supporters of the present government.

The hon. member for Assiniboia, in reflecting upon another hon. member for want of accuracy I think has left himself open to the same charge. For instance, he spoke on the coal oil question, and declared that that was an article that had been reduced in price to the people of the west from five to ten cents a gallon, owing to changes and concessions made to the Standard Oil Company.

Mr. SCOTT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. What I said was that the change in the regulations for bringing coal oil into the country had resulted in that reduction to the consumer.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I can assure the hon. gentleman that in the town where I reside I cannot purchase a single gallon of the best American coal oil for less than forty cents, nor a gallan of Canadian oil of the first brand, for less than thirty-five cents; and these are exactly the same prices I paid in 1896. With a miserable reduction of one cent a gallon in the duty, how could we expect to get coal oil five cents or ten cents a gallon cheaper. It is true that some changes were made in the regulations regarding the admission of coal oil. We were allowed to import in tank steamers, and heretofore we were permitted to introduce tank cars into the west. To be sure the tank cars are admitted now and the number of distributing points has been increased, but at the same time the price of coal oil throughout Manitoba generally has not been reduced—so I am informed by those who buy and sell the oil, and they say that they are not buying it and selling it one cent cheaper than they did prior to 1896. In addition to that, and because of improper inspection on the part of the government officers, the quality of the coal oil sent into the North-west last winter was simply disgraceful. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) himself spoke on this question at an earler period in the session, and he admitted that the quality of the coal oil in the North-west, was, as I have said, disgraceful. So far as my information goes there has been no reduction in the price of coal oil since 1896.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) says that while it is all well enough for the members of the opposition to complain of the extravagant expenditure of the government, why do they not move to strike out the items that they object to? Well, it is not the province of an opposition to do that. The only thing an opposition can do is to make a general protest, as we do, on the floor of this House, and in addition to that we offer a resolution at the end of each session stating in general terms that the expenditure of the government during the past year was extravagant. Of course, the supporters of the government vote down that resolution. But when we move it and vote for

it we discharge our duties to the country, and we are powerless to do anything else.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) has taken exception to the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition because, he says, it is not definite enough. I wonder what the hon. gentleman wants in the line of definiteness. The amendment is definite enough to any one who wishes to read it plainly, but of course those who do not, can turn it and twist it in any manner they may see fit. The hon. member is afraid that some of the supporters of the opposition may place one interpretation upon that amendment and others place other interpretations upon it. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) first pluck the mote out of his own eye. Let me ask him : What kind of a declaration have we had from the Minister of Finance in reference to the tariff changes that are to be made at the next session of parliament. Some of the government supporters are claiming that it means increased protection and others, including the Liberal members from the west, are stating that it means a diminution of customs duties. The amendment of the leader of the opposition calls for a policy of adequate protection to all the industries of our country. Surely that is definite enough. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) would certainly not have the opposition formulate a tariff for every particular item in the Customs Act. That is not the duty of the opposition. When the leader of the opposition introduced his amendment to have a declared policy on the tariff, it is something that the people of this country will support him in, because now we have a cabinet rent in factions; some preaching one thing and some another; some free traders and some protectionists, just in order to rake into their fold the supporters of both kinds of fiscal policy. I was glad to see that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) had not the same assurance that the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) had. That hon. gentleman declared that the people of the west were perfectly satisfied with the tariff as it stands to-day, but the member for Assiniboia was candid enough to state that the people of the west are not satisfied with the tariff. He does say, however, that in 1897 there was a very great disappointment in the west when the tariff was submitted by the Finance Minister. They could not feel otherwise. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) is aware of the pledges made to the people of the west by the supporters of the Liberal party of that day, and he knows that the tariff submitted in 1897 was not a fulfilment of those pledges. The Liberal members in the House at that time recognized this very well, because they endeavoured to square themselves with their constituents for supporting the government, by declaring that they looked upon the tariff of 1897 only as the first instalment towards a policy of free trade. But session after session has since rolled by, and future instalments are overdue, and now we are led to believe by the Minister of Finance, according to the implications which any sensible man would draw from his words, that instead of lowering the duties, the customs duties will be increased in the future. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) tells us that there is not now the feeling of disappointment there used to be in 1897. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) knows full well that there is not going to be any material lowering of the duties, and therefore he, as a journalist and a moulder of public opinion, in line with such organs as the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' is endeavouring to educate the people of the west up to the fact that we must have, what they call, a revenue tariff. But what is in a name ? The Minister of Finance tells us that the present tariff is only a reduction of 2·22 per cent on the Conservative tariff, and without admitting that his figures are accurate, we know that the reduction is less than that. But even with the British preference applied the Minister of Finance claims that the tariff has been reduced only 2·22 per cent, and that is the difference which the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) claims is the difference between a revenue and a protective tariff. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) is paying rather a poor compliment to the intelligence of the people of the west and of Canada generally when he claims that the present tariff is a tariff for revenue purposes only.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) has spoken about the resolution moved by the member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) asking that the minimum valuation be increased on horses imported from the United States. The hon. member (Mr. Scott) supported that resolution, but he objects to have the term protectionist applied to it. Well, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) who introduced that resolution was candid enough to state that he purposely intended it to be a measure of protection to the western farmers. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) said : Why not let the people get cheap horses if they desire; you have settlers with possibly little money going into that country, and they may be desirous of securing cheap animals. But the farmers of the west do not want these animals to come to Canada for the reason that they are scrub animals, and are entering into competition with the better class of horses in the west. That is the reason why there is a demand that the minimum valuation should be increased. The proposition is a protection to the farmers, and the farmers of the west are not particular by what name you call it so long as it gives them that protection.

The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has referred to the woollen industry and he dealt very gently indeed with that question. Probably the hon. gentleman may have had a hint that there is something coming in the way of increased protection to the woollen industry next session of par-

liament, because he expressed the opinion that if any industry requires protection, probably the woollen industry was as badly in need of it as any other. However, he quoted the opinion of one woollen manufacturer to show that he was satisfied with the present tariff. If that be the opinion of the member for Assiniboia, he differs materially from the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who has openly declared himself in favour of increased protection being given to the woollen industry at the next session of parliament. I think it is a safe prophecy that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) may look forward to the duty on woollens being increased.

It was apparent to any one who followed the remarks of the Minister of Finance, that he endeavoured to buoy himself up with an air of assumed cheerfulness under cover of the general prosperity of the country. But, nevertheless, knowing the weak points in his argument, and that they would be taken full advantage of by his opponents, he could not hide a certain air of embarrassment because of the bubbles that would soon be pricked in the half truths with which many of his arguments were clothed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has the faculty, or the habit of quoting only those statistics that will add force to his argument, omitting those that might prove embarrassing, using percentages when they are in his favour, and when they are opposed to his contentions claiming that they are unreliable. He however was compelled to make several admissions which detracted considerably from his claim of wise administration on the part of the government. In doing so, of course he places his party in rather a ridiculous position before the public by approving of that which they formerly denounced, and using arguments which heretofore met with their condemnation when used by a Conservative government. For instance, the money on deposit in our savings banks, the amount of life insurance, the amount of the bank circulation, &c., which were heretofore quoted by Conservative finance ministers as evidences of the general prosperity of the country, were ridiculed by the Liberal party in days gone by as evidences rather of national poverty than of prosperity. But now we hear the Finance Minister, in each succeeding year, in every budget speech delivered in this House, using these very same arguments which were formerly denounced by him, apparently oblivious of the inconsistency of his course. As Conservatives, Sir, we welcome, and we join with our opponents in welcoming, all and any evidences of prosperity. As men who prefer country to party we hail with pleasure the advent of good times ; but in doing so, we are acting in marked contrast to our opponents, who when on this side of the House, never missed an opportunity, no matter how numerous or glaring the evidences of prosperity were, of decrying the fair fame and name of their own country in order to make paltry political capital against their opponents.

But the Finance Minister used a very apt term when, in answer to an interruption of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) he told that hon. gentleman that if he should ever have the privilege in the future of being a Finance Minister of Canada, and was as lucky as he was, he might well congratulate himself—a significant though no doubt unintentional admission ; for if there has ever been a party in the history of Canada, or for that matter in the history of any other country, that has proved to be lucky to the fullest extent of the term, assuming the reigns of power on the eve of a wave of prosperity that has proved to be universal in its character, that party is the present Liberal party of Canada. It makes very interesting reading for the student of politics who desires to refresh his memory as to the opinions expressed by these hon. gentlemen when in opposition, to turn up their past speeches. He will see that there is scarcely an argument used by them to prove mal-administration on the part of their opponents that cannot be used with double effect against themselves to-day. But charges of inconsistency and insincerity, no matter how strongly they may be pressed home against hon. gentlemen opposite, are met with an air of levity that could only proceed from those who have not a due sense of their responsibilities or a full appreciation of what constitutes honour in public men. What care they for consistency so long as they are in the enjoyment of the fruits of office ? What store do they set by sincerity so long as they are basking in the sunshine of power, and having full confidence in their ability to corrupt the electorate by divers means, they snap their fingers at public sentiment and rely entirely on the practice of ways that are dark and tricks that are vain, of which they are past masters, to secure for themselves a renewal of power which they would not otherwise secure if a fair field and no favours were permitted when the people are called upon to make their selection. A Liberal of the rank and file is quoted against himself. He meets the quotation with a laugh—' good politics,' says he. A member of the cabinet is confronted with his declarations of the past in direct opposition to his present actions. ' Oh,' he exclaims, ' that was before I had any responsibility as a minister of the Crown ; that was when I was in opposition, before I was drawing $7,000 or $8,000 per annum.' The Prime Minister himself, the premier of His Majesty's premier colony, the man who above all others should set an example of public probity, who should be an example for the young men of our country to imitate makes light of gross breaches of faith on the part of himself and his colleagues, and airily replies, 'We are here, and you are there ; what are you going to do about it ?' With this experience and these examples, I think the Canadian

people may well feel rather discouraged at the outlook for pure politics in the future. It is not surprising that so many of the better class of our citizens are deterred from entering public life, with such examples of duplicity and double dealing practiced by those who in days of yore made loud professions of virtue in their pharisaical manner but who have exploited the possibilities of hyprocrisy to its fullest extent since their advent to power. A surplus is claimed by a Conservative finance minister. He is immediately held up to the ridicule of the public by his Liberal critics. An evidence of incapacity, said they, on the part of a finance minister. The former philosopher of the House, the Hon. David Mills, who has been transfered to the judiciary, when a member of the opposition in this House, declared that a government had no business to have a surplus. These are his words :

> I say that a government is not entitled to have a surplus. There it no stimulus to economy when a large surplus remains in the hands of the government.

Which is true, though it does not remain very long in the hands of this government.

> A large surplus invites to extravagance, and has invited to extragance in this country. The government and parliament should inaugurate a system of economy.

And to this declaration of the Hon. David Mills, the members on the back benches pounded their desks in noisy approbation. He was not the only member of the cabinet who took exception to surpluses. The present Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) in stentorian tones that made the rafters of the House of Commons ring, gave utterance to the following words in 1883 :

> It is no part of the duty of the Finance Minister to extract more money out of the pockets of the people than is absolutely wanted to carry on public affairs. What would be said of a chancellor of the exchequer in England if he could not estimate the requirements of the public service nearer than $2,000,000 ? He would be ridiculed as unable to grasp the financial conditions of the country.

This sentiment was also welcomed by his Liberal supporters. This, however, was before these hon. gentlemen held office. What do we find now ? We find a Liberal finance minister getting up in his place in the House and actually boasting of having extracted from the pockets of the people during the last five years $19,000,000 more than was necessary to meet the lavish expenditure of this extravagant government—more than was necessary to meet the requirements of the public service. If that was a good principle in days gone by, it should be an equally good principle to-day. Now, with a revenue of $56,800,000 during the present year, and a surplus of some $5,000,000 on consolidated account—although taking the total expenditure of the government, on consolidated account and capital account together, by the figures quoted to the House by the Finance Minister himself, we shall have on the 30th of June next a deficit of $8,450,000—the least any one could expect was that this government would apply this surplus to a reduction of the burdens of the people. We expected that they would have reduced the national debt, reduced taxation, and our household expenditure. But instead of decreases there have been increases all along the line. What do we see with regard to the public debt, under which they claimed the people of Canada were groaning, when the Conservatives held office, and when that debt was millions of dollars less than it is to-day ? They then exhausted all their ability and eloquence and powers of denunciation in making out that the people were being impoverished in order to pay the interest on that debt. Well, how does it stand now ? We find that this year the public debt will be increased by $6,000,000, making in all an increase of $16,000,000 since these hon. gentlemen came to office. Had they applied their so-called surpluses to the relief of taxation, they might with some reason have claimed our approval, but they have raised our taxation $2.66 per capita. Had they reduced the expenditure, they might have claimed some credit for their policy, but instead they have increased our annual expenditure by $23,547,617. So that we have a record thus far of an increase of $16,000,000 in our public debt, of over $23,000,000 in our expenditure, and of upwards of $11,000,000 in our taxation. A wonderful showing for this so-called economical government. And mark you, Sir, these were the particular items upon which these hon. gentlemen judged their predecessors and called upon the people to turn the Conservative government out of power. Is it at all surprising that, with such a showing, the hon. Finance Minister did not evince that spirit of jubilation in his budget speech which the good times would otherwise have warranted ?

But what a spectacle did we see when the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) rose in his place and endeavoured to draw a red herring across the trail, endeavoured to divert the attention of parliament and the people from the true condition of affairs, by delivering a nine years old speech on the census, which most of us had read before coming to parliament, and in which, by his cheap criticism, bitter invective and gross charges of wholesale perjury against all the officials connected with the census of 1891, he endeavoured to alleviate the disappointment in the country caused by the census returns of 1901. One would have thought that that hon. gentleman, in what is practically his valedictory in this House—a House that is to know him no longer—though I am quite willing to admit that his training in opposition has not been conducive to amiability in one of so bilious a temperament, one would have thought that he

would have endeavoured to assume a virtue even if he had it not, and adopt a tone more becoming to one who is about to take his departure from parliamentary life. True there may be some excuse for the bitterness of the hon. gentleman in the fact that he had been relegated to that useless appendage of the government, as he was wont in the old days to describe it, the Department of Trade and Commerce—that office which he himself used to declare had been simply created in order that a haven of quiet repose might be afforded to a supporter of the government for whom a cabinet position had to be supplied. How true those words are when applied to the hon. gentleman himself. How those chickens have come home to roost. But apparently it is very difficult for some hon. gentlemen to change their old-time habits. He accused the census officials of 1891 of having made false returns, at the instigation no doubt of the government of that day, of having perjured themselves in order to do political service to their party, but he forgot that the Conservative government or its officials did not resort to the tactics adopted by this government when taking the census of 1901. The late government did not send out private circulars to the census enumerators, asking them to count as residents of Canada people who had left the country, and to keep a separate list of the young men, showing their political persuasion, in order that that might be afterwards used to party advantage. It ill becomes the hon. gentleman to make groundless charges against a host of officials who are every bit as honorable as he is, especially in the light of the experience we have had in the taking of the last census.

The hon. minister could not abstain from giving a rap to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) for his so-called lapsing or backsliding to protectionist doctrines. The hon. member for North Norfolk had been the colleague of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, he had served with him on the International Commission, and has always been considered one of the most level-headed and brainy men of the House. In days gone by he has been accused of being rather too friendly to the neighbouring republic, and no one in this House is better posted on the needs and requirements of Canada and on trade questions in the United States. But if the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce were in quest of members on his own side who were in favour of protection, he need not have travelled beyond the confines of his own cabinet. He could have found one within the radius of the ministry itself. Why did he not attack the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who is an avowed protectionist, both in his speeches in this House and on the public platform ? Why did not the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce turn his guns against this colleague of his own ? Was the doughty knight afraid of his colleague ? Did he shrink from a contest with the fiery little champion of protection within his own charmed circle, the Minister of Public Works? Nor is the Minister of Public Works the only member of the cabinet who is a protectionist at heart, though I give that hon. minister the credit of saying that he has the courage of his convictions and will give voice to them, whereas the other members of the cabinet who share his views, practice protection while preaching free trade. Had he done this, then the hon. minister, after having subdued his colleagues, could turn his attention to the back benches, where he would find at least a score of his own supporters who are protectionists at heart, and having routed them, he might have had a little sweet communion with himself. For have we not had it on no less an authority than the Prime Minister himself that the Minister of Trade and Commerce lived for twenty years a double life, politically speaking, previous to attaining office. Has not the Prime Minister told us that when the Mackenzie administration held office, the Minister of Trade and Commerce was willing to adopt a protectionist policy, was willing to increase the duties, and was only deterred from doing so by the pistol put to his head by the members from the maritime provinces, in response to which the coon came down. He sacrificed what he knew would be in the best interests of his country for the sake of his party, and the right hon. gentleman lauded him for this spirit of sacrifice. The people of Canada, said the right hon. gentleman, knew but very little what they owed to the Minister of Trade and Commerce for having endured during all those years the obliquy of having been an inveterate free trader while in fact he was all along willing to be a protectionist. The Prime Minister, at a banquet given the Minister of Trade and Commerce down stairs, thus expressed his opinion of his colleague amid no doubt the cordial approval of those around the festive board on that occasion. That opinion has been quoted before by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), but a good thing will stand repetition, and let me now read to the House what the right hon. the Prime Minister then said :

> There never was a day of the many days since we have had to discuss questions together in council but I could count and rely on the support of Sir Richard Cartwright, and though, as sometimes happens in the councils of the party, we did not agree when in the council, when the policy of the party was agreed upon Sir Richard Cartwright never wavered in his support of it. I may give you an instance which has come to me from reliable sources, and it is a thing which goes far to show the character of our guest of this evening. In the days of Mr. Mackenzie, when the country was much depressed, there were many who believed that if the tariff was increased that policy would be justified by the necessities of the revenue, and that it would be a valuable policy for the country at large. I

can give you the story without betraying secrets, because these things happened before my day, but if the advice of Sir Richard Cartwright had prevailed at that time this policy would have been adopted. If it was not accepted it was on account of other influences——

That was the pistol influence.

—which prevailed with the government of the day, and for sixteen or twenty years Sir Richard bore the brunt of the obloquy of not having responded to public sentiment, whereas the truth was he was ready to respond to public sentiment. For eighteen years he bore the brunt of all the obloquy, and never whispered a word. It is not every day you can find such abnegation and such loyalty to the party, and I have reason to believe, and repeat it to you—I not only repeat it to you, my colleagues, but I wish my words to be heard all over Canada—that Canada little knows the debt of gratitude that it owes to Sir Richard Cartwright.

This was considered by the Prime Minister to be a meritorious act on the part of Sir Richard Cartwright, and I have no doubt he was cheered by those assembled around that table. But there are people in Canada who have rather higher ideals of what constitutes good statesmanship. I am glad to be able to say that there are many people in Canada who, instead of approving of a man being a protectionist at heart and preaching free trade, consider such a course to be of the very essence of political hypocrisy.

Now, the Finance Minister claimed—claimed by imputation at any rate—that because our trade with Great Britain has increased to a certain extent this was solely and wholly due to the operation of the preferential tariff. But when he was asked to produce the figures showing our trade with the United States, he had conveniently forgotten them. But these figures have been made available to hon. gentlemen in this House since then, and they entirely nullify the arguments of the Minister of Finance. That hon. gentleman himself admitted that our trade with the United States had vastly increased, and said that our trade with every other country had also greatly increased. If the increase of our trade with Great Britain has been less than the increase of our trade with other countries, how can the Minister of Finance say that the increase of our trade with Great Britain, such as it is, is due to the fact that we have given Great Britain the preference. It would be absurd to take such a position. Our exports to the United States last year decreased by about 681,507, while our exports to Great Britain fell off $2,407,412. Our imports from the United States during the same period increased by $6,762,783, while our imports from Great Britain decreased during that period by about $2,307,977. Is this great decrease of our trade with Great Britain amounting to no less than $4,700,000, owing to the preferential tariff ? The hon. minister cannot claim credit for the increases of our trade without assuming responsibility also for this great diminution of our trade with Great Britain. The fact is this whole preferential tariff has been so arranged as to deceive not only the people of Canada but the people of the motherland as well. England derives little, if any benefit, while Canada derives from it no benefit whatever. It may be true that, in some instances, the English exporter and the Canadian exporter may benefit to a certain extent, but the consuming population are not benefited one whit. And, on the other hand, the chief products of Germany, sent to Great Britain and a small portion of work done upon them, come into Canada under the guise of British goods, and so get the benefit of the preference, while Canadian products are placed on the German maximum tariff. It would prove very interesting reading if a reliable statement could be presented showing the quantity of German goods that have taken advantage of the preferential tariff and have come into Canada under the guise of British goods. Our greatest competitor is the United States. The products of that country are similar to our own. American products go into the German market under the German minimum tariff, while ours must pay the maximum tariff. The Americans have an advantage on every bushel of wheat sent into the German market as compared with the Canadian product of 9½ cents per bushel; on oats, 4⅓ cents per bushel; on barley, 1¼ cents per bushel; on rye, 9½ cents per bushel; on peas, 3¼ cents per bushel; and so with butter, beans and other articles. This is a discrimination against Canada for having given a preference to Great Britain. And our government has not lifted a finger to improve this condition of affairs. The average rate on dutiable goods coming from the United States last year, according to the Finance Minister, was 24·83 per cent, and the average rate on dutiable goods coming from Great Britain was 24·74 per cent practically the same, notwithstanding the fact that Great Britain is supposed to enjoy a preference of 33⅓ per cent. The average duty on all goods, dutiable and free coming from the United States was less than 12½ per cent, while the average on goods coming from Great Britain was 18·23 per cent. This, in the old days of the Conservative government would have been seized upon with avidity by our opponents as evidence of rank discrimination against the motherland. As I said, this whole preferential tariff, lauded as it was by its promoters because of its possibilities from both a sentimental and a business standpoint, has proven a disappointment to everybody except the German exporter. The English man, taking a superficial view and not knowing that the general tariff had been increased on many articles before the preference was applied, thought he was going to be very highly advantaged; and it is only recently he has been undeceived and has found how he was hoodwinked. The Cana-

dian consumer was led to believe that he would purchase goods at a cheaper rate under the operation of this tariff, and, as a result of sentimental considerations, would receive a real preference for his goods in the mother country. But now, since the tariff has been in operation and he has had an opportunity to attest its value, he admits, and must admit, that he pays prices as high and even higher in some instances, and that the products from our Canadian farms are admitted on exactly the same footing as are the products from every country in the world. And he is practically shut out of the German market. Now, had the right hon. First Minister pressed upon the home authority the necessity and advisability of giving us a real preference in their market and thus fulfilling his pledges to the people of Canada prior to 1896; had he, at the time of his visit, when the olive branch had been held out by the leading statesmen of Great Britain, endeavoured to secure what he promised, he would have conferred upon the people of Canada a benefit of whose advantages it would not have required days and weeks of argument to convince the people of Canada. But, unfortunately for us, the right hon. gentleman was more anxious about receiving those empty baubles and glittering titles he used to refer to so contemptuously when he was a democrat to the hilt, than about winning solid advantages for the people. He thought more of receiving Cobden medals—and, by the way, I do not think that that Cobden medal was sent back since it was shown that it was received under false pretenses. As we know, Lord Farrer said that had it been known that this preference would apply to Great Britain alone, the medal would not now glisten on the right hon. gentleman's breast. It was because it was thought that this preference was offered to the whole world that the right hon. gentleman was admitted as an honorary member of the club. When he was forced to change his law and make it apply to Great Britain alone, he did not return the Cobden medal, evidently being a thorough believer in the motto, 'What we have we'll hold.' The right hon. gentleman should have been active in looking after the interests of Canada rather than in making speeches to the people of Great Britain, in which he advised them not only that Canada would not ask for any return for the preference given in our markets, but not to make any return. Why? Because it would injure Canada? No, but because it would cause a departure from the old free trade traditions that had made Great Britain such a mighty power. It was not in looking after the interests of Canada that the right hon. gentleman said it, but in advising the statesmen of Great Britain what policy they could adopt to injuriously affect this country. It is to be hoped that on the approaching visit of the right hon. gentleman, where he has been invited to participate in the Coronation ceremonies and also to discuss questions of inter-Imperial relations, he will do better. I see that the manner of his acceptance has caused profound disappointment among the people of Great Britain. It is to be hoped that he will not repeat the error of the past, but that instead of looking after titles for himself and making those empty speeches which prove little but his own desire of saying something pleasant to the particular audience he happens to be addressing, he will do all he can to promote the interest of the country he represents.

These hon. gentlemen claim that they gave this preference to the motherland to show their loyalty, to show their attachment, and their gratitude for her assistance to us in the past. Well, Sir, I will admit that something needed to be done by a party with the record of these hon. gentlemen, a party that, in 1891, advocated a policy which, if it had been adopted, would in all probability have resulted in political union with the United States, at any rate that was the belief of their former leader, the Hon. Edward Blake, who severed his allegiance with them, and would neither lead nor follow a party that advocated such a policy. I admit that a party having done that, needed to take some steps more than ordinary to prove their loyalty and attachment to the motherland. But, Sir, if they considered it necessary to adopt this policy, and if that policy can be proved to be injurious to Canadian interests, I say as a young Canadian that it is our duty to look after ourselves, and that our loyalty should begin at home. I would call to my aid no less an authority than the Prime Minister himself, who declared, when he was advocating this policy, that John Bull himself would think all the more of a son that looked after his own interest, and he stated that we should not mix up business with sentiment. Here is what the hon. gentleman said in one of his speeches, at Brantford, according to the report of the Toronto 'Globe':

> I think England can look after her own interests and if I know John Bull at all he expects his son to follow his example and do the same, namely, to look after number one. I think he would have a contempt for a son who did not turn an honest penny.

These were the sentiments of the Prime Minister at that time. He went on to say:

> Business was business and sentiment was sentiment: but he did not believe that sentiment was business any more than business was sentiment.

Most profound logic, and worthy the approbation of his party. Now, Sir, I do not desire to discuss this question from a sectional standpoint. Some of my colleagues from the west on the Liberal side of the House have declared that the people of the west were satisfied with the action of this government on tariff matters. The mem-

ber for West Assiniboia admitted as much, and the member for Saskatchewan declared they were satisfied. I wish to deny that statement emphatically. The latter gentleman declared that there were some reductions made on some small implements, and what were they? Axes, adzes, pronged forks and spades in which the farmers invest a few cents each year. It is true they reduced the duty a little on these minor articles, but the farmers do not buy them a single cent cheaper. It is possible that the importer may get them a little less, I am doubtful of that even; but the reduction would be so infinitesimal that the purchasing farmer does not reap a single cent from it. But on those larger implements such as mowers and binders in which the farmers invest thousands and thousands of dollars every year, these hon. gentlemen claim that the duty should not only be reduced, but that these implements should be placed upon the free list. Now, I have here a list of articles in which a vast amount of money is expended each year by the farming population, the list shows the imports during the last year under the general tariff, the amount of duty paid, and the number that came in under the preferential tariff:

	General Tariff.	Preferential Tariff.	Duty.
	$	$	$ cts.
Harvesters, self-binding and others, 20 p.c..	828,118	.....	165,623 60
Mowing machines 20 p.c.....	426,084	.....	85,216 80
Ploughs, 20 p.c..	147,381	.....	29,476 20
" ..	.....	No. 6, 104	13 87
Horse rakes, 20p.c	104,075	.....	20,815 00
Harrows, 20 p.c..	47,833	.....	9,566 60
" ..	.....	No. 2, 29	3 87
Drills, 20 p.c....	31,092	.....	6,218 40
Reapers, 20 p.c..	57,681	.....	11,536 20
Buggies and carriages, 35 p.c..	47,915	.....	16,770 25
" ..	.....	No. 5, 6,259	1,460 44
Farm wagons, 25 p.c.	42,064	.....	10,516 00

On several other articles in which the farmers invest a vast amount of money each year, the duty remained exactly the same as it was prior to 1896, notwithstanding that the people were told at that time that should the Liberal party come into power they would place many of those articles upon the free list, notably self binders and reapers.

The Minister of the Interior, in his speech delivered in Winnipeg in 1896, told the people of Manitoba that they were being bled white for the purpose of amassing huge fortunes for the Massey-Harris Company, and others by paying them such an outrageously high tariff duty as 20 per cent on mowers and binders, and he declared these articles should be placed upon the free list. Free coal oil was another promise they made, and it was given a miserable reduction of 1 cent a gallon. Now they neglect to point out to the people of the west that the Conservatives have proved themselves to be the true tariff reformers in respect to the duty on agricultural implements, since they cut the duty almost in two, and reduced it from 35 per cent to 20 per cent. The Minister of the Interior also stated that the Conservative government, by a system of drawbacks, were allowing these men to export their reapers and binders to Australia and sell them for $85 or $90, whereas the farmers of the North-west had to pay $140 and $150 for the same machine. But in a return I asked for in this House, I find that there has been paid out to these same manufacturers in drawbacks since the Liberal party came into power, $300,000 under the very same policy which they condemned in opposition. Certainly if it was a vicious principle prior to 1896 it ought to be equally vicious at the present time. The Minister of the Interior also told the people in Manitoba that the manufacturers of these implements were employing 9,000 hands, and he declared that if this duty were reduced—because he now claims that far from being a protective duty, it is not even a revenue tariff—if this duty were reduced these 9,000 hands would have to seek employment in the United States, and our own manufacturing establishments would be crushed out. Certainly that is good Conservative doctrine, the hon. gentlemen opposite condemned it strongly in the past. In his campaign speeches during the contest in Lisgar, the hon. gentleman harped and harped upon this matter, and I will not be surprised if, in the tariff revision next year, we shall see increased duties on agricultural implements as well. Possibly one of the reasons why the Minister of the Interior has changed his ideas regarding the duty on agricultural implements is to be found in the fact of a certain deal having gone through in which the Manitoba 'Free Press' changed hands, and the Minister of the Interior and the Massey-Harris Company were mixed up in the deal, and as a result he has had turned over to himself the leading organ of the Liberal party in the west.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the present government took great credit for having changed many of the duties from a specific to an ad valorem basis. I desire to point out that the value of many of those articles purchased by the consumer in Canada to-day is much higher than it was prior to the time before the Liberals came into power. We find it to be the case under the system of specific duties that when such duties are imposed they do not increase in proportion to the value of the article. These duties remain the same no matter how much the price may be increased to the consumer, but where the duties are placed on an ad valorem basis

the consumer not only has to pay more for the goods but he has to pay more on account of the duty as well. In many of these instances where a change has been made where the price has been increased, the farmer does not realize how much more he has to pay in duty, because he is called upon to pay for an increased value as well as for an increased duty, whereas under the system of specific duties he was called upon to pay merely the increased prices of the articles that he purchased. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) gave voice to an expression which he meant to be a reproach to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and the Conservative party in general because they were consistent enough to advocate the one policy for twenty-five years. He stated that he might close his eyes and let his mind revert back five and twenty years. The hon. gentleman is always living in the past. No wonder he is considered to be a back number. He stated that he could imagine that he heard from the very self-same desk, from the hon. gentleman's predecessor the self-same views given expression to a quarter of a century ago, and he expressed amazement that there could be a politician or a party that could be true to a principle or a policy for the space of a quarter of a century. If he judged us by the standard of his own party he had every reason to cast that reflection upon us in his speech because during that time his party has changed its policy half a dozen times. No sooner did they meet defeat on one policy than they produced a new one, and advocated it with all the gusto of new found converts. They never had any principle, political exigencies being their guide. Instead of this being a reflection upon the policy of the Conservative party, it is a matter of very great credit to the Conservative party, and the hon. gentleman will look in vain for its parallel within the ranks of the Liberal party. Hon. gentlemen opposite have increased the expenditure, as I have already declared, upwards of $23,000,000, they have increased the taxation upwards of $11,000,000, they have increased the national debt by $16,000,000, they have bestowed upon a score of members of parliament positions of emolument under the Crown in direct opposition to their declarations in the past, they have failed to even make an attempt to obtain a mutual trade preference within the empire when the time was opportune, they have, ever since they assumed the reins of power, violated that well laid down rule of letting contracts to the highest tenderer, parcelling them out instead to political supporters in return for favours present and to come, they have increased the number of cabinet ministers by two, raising their salaries by $2,000 per annum, they have abandoned that plank in their platform calling for the reform in the Senate, and they are disposing of senatorships to those who are the largest contributors to the campaign fund. We have one member of the government preaching free trade, another member of the government preaching increased protection, another one preaching revenue tariff, and as to several others it is immaterial to them what they do preach so long as they are left on the treasury benches, all in opposition to that well known rule of constitutional government that all the members of a government are expected to be a unit in matters of public policy. They have been guilty of a violation of pledges that has been a disgrace to this country, that shocks our electorate, that has brought reproach upon the country. They have brought reproach upon our country at home and abroad. With such a record as this I think the time surely cannot be far distant when a long suffering public will refuse to longer tolerate these autocratic politicians who are more wedded to office than to principle, and though up to the present time, the hands of chastisement have been temporarily stayed, it is not at all because of any display of virtue on the part of the government, but rather from the practice of those methods that will not stand the light of day. I do not desire to go over the mass of figures that have been presented during this debate or to occupy the attention of the House repeating arguments which have been traversed much more ably by those who have preceded me, but I will simply say that it is my intention to support the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition and for this reason; the people of this country I claim, are in favour of a government that has the courage of its convictions, and they will have a declaration of policy of some kind. The present government have no declared policy on which to go before the country as to whether they are protectionists or free traders, because they are, as a matter of fact, practising protection while they are preaching free trade and even then their ranks are divided. The people of the country must be at a loss to know to whom to look. Here are the men who are the advisers of His Majesty. One-half of the cabinet are preaching one tariff while the other half of the cabinet are preaching another, while we, as Conservatives, believe, that, situated as we are alongside of the most highly protected country in the world, the United States, with 4,000 miles of a boundary line between this country and that, it is an impossibility, no matter how beautiful the theory may appear, to inaugurate a policy of free trade for this Canada of ours and that unless we have a system of protection for all the industries of this country, not merely for the manufacturing industries, but for the agricultural industry as well, we cannot hope ever to be a thriving nation. It is also true that when we state that we

are in favour of moderate protection in this country that does not mean that we are going to have very high rates of duties on every article grown or manufactured in Canada. It was not the intention of the designers of the national policy that we would have certain fixed high rates of duty for all time to come, but only until such times as our industries could be placed on a footing to withstand the keen competition offered by the Americans and the keen competition of the world, when they would be able to compete with them not only in our home market, but in the foreign markets as well. There are some articles that I would object to having the duties raised upon, but there are others that if it could be shown that by an increase of duty it is necessary and desirable to keep establishments going in Canada to be operated by our own people these people to be fed by Canadian farmers, then I am in favour of adopting such rates of duty as are necessary for this purpose. But, some hon. gentlemen opposite take the stand that protection is a folly and a farce so far as the agriculturist is concerned and that it is not possible to protect him. It is true that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has always taken this position, but surely that hon. gentleman should have taken a lesson from the 17th of September, 1878, when prior to that time, when he was Minister of Finance of Canada, he was approached by one hundred thousand farmers with a petition to parliament asking for agricultural protection, and he told them that practically they did not know what they were asking for. The result was that he met with condign punishment when his government went to the country in 1878. It is paying a poor compliment to these farmers who ask for protection to be told now that they must be so green that they will not burn. Articles that are grown on the farm can be and are being protected. Take as an illustration the protection to pork. Our opponents, when on this side of the House, when the tariff was raised on pork by the Conservative administration asserted that it would be of no benefit to the Canadian farmer. What was the result ? The quantity of American pork which came in to displace so much Canadian pork immediately shrunk in value. The importation did not cease entirely, but it greatly diminished. The market was enlarged for our Canadian farmer, and he was enabled to export a very much larger quantity of his pork than he would have been able to do but for this protection. If those hon. gentlemen who say to-day that that protection was of no value, why do they not remove the duty on pork ? What is it kept there for if it is not for protection ? If a duty of 15 cents a bushel on wheat was of no use in Conservative days, why is 12 cents a bushel imposed now ? If it is of no use as a protection to the farmers, why not remove it ? Why, Sir, the whole thing shows the absurdity of the statements made by those gentlemen when they say that the farmers cannot be benefited by protection.

For the reasons I have given, it is my intention to support the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition, which amendment will, I believe, commend itself to the intelligence of all right-minded people. We are a country of diverse interests. To-day we may not be a manufacturing country in the west, but we hope in the future to have extensive and profitable manufactures there, and then, Sir, these very same gentlemen who are now decrying protection will be just as ready to cry out in favour of protection.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) It is on record that in times of old lived nations characterized by their loquacity. From the experience gained in the House of Commons, I daresay that our hon. friends opposite are decidedly Gallic in that respect.

The hon. gentlemen opposite are loud in their denunciations of the government. To their mind the administration is composed of men entertaining conflicting opinions. They lay great stress on the fact that the Liberal party do not entertain the same views on the different questions which engage our attention. I have always held that the progress and development of a country proceeded from a conflict of opinions. Even the Conservatives were sometimes divided amongst themselves, and it ill becomes them to taunt on that score the members occupying seats on this side of the House.

We are told that the Liberal party has no definite policy, that a change may occur tomorrow, and people are anxious to know what will be the nature of that change.

Let them rest assured that any change that may occur will be beneficial to the interests of this country at large. In 1896, when the Liberal party came into power, after the general elections, their policy well known to the electorate, had received the popular endorsation. Had it not been agreeable to the people, the present administration would not have been then sustained as it has been since.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) said a few moments ago that he was at a loss to understand what was going on. It is well that we should take note of that admission. It is because those gentlemen failed to understand what was going on around them that they were hurled from power, and may they live long in that blissful ignorance.

When one looks up the records of the Conservative administration, it is easily understood why they were driven from power in 1896, and why the people will long keep in office those who were called upon to replace them.

When I hear the hon. members opposite state that our country is prosperous, but that we are indebted for that prosperity to the action of Providence and to the maintenance of their policy, it reminds me of a certain dynasty. Like the Bourbons, they have learned nothing and forgotten nothing. As much can be said of the hon. members opposite.

It is true that governments cannot control the business of a country nor create prosperity ; but they can largely contribute to developing that prosperity. Thus the government of the day have greatly helped the agriculturists by patronising the cheese and butter industry, by encouraging the trade in eggs and other agricultural produce, in securing for them the markets of Great Britain, thereby causing a large increase of our trade with the mother country. Is it not true that such a result was achieved through the Department of Agriculture so ably presided over by the Hon. Mr. Fisher ?

It may be said : what good purpose can it serve, so long as there is an increase in the national debt ? In the first instance, we might retort that though we have increased the public debt, we did increase it to a smaller extent than they did, but such an answer would be inadequate ; that would only amount to an argument ad hominem.

We are also taunted with having increased the expenditure. In reply, we could point out to a corresponding increase in the surpluses. If we spent $42,000,000, it is because our revenue amounted to $46,000,000 leaving a surplus of $4,000,000, whereas under Conservative rule, when the public expenditure aggregated $38,000,000, there was a deficit of $4,000,000. Such a retort, good as it may be, would not be altogether conclusive. There is a very simple answer to be made. All those expenditures have been sanctioned by the unanimous vote of this House. Why did not they object to them ; why don't they take exception to these expenditures if they find them exorbitant ? Let them muster up courage and impugn these expenditures if they be as extravagant as represented.

Therefore it must be conceded that these expenditures will benefit the country at large. As not one single Conservative member attempts to denounce them, we have reason to infer therefrom that those expenditures are warrantable. I say it ill becomes the Tory party to take the present government to ask for their administration of public affairs ; because to offer criticism one cannot rely solely upon the increase in the public expenditure. Has not a large concern to spend more than a minor establishment has to ? Does not Canada, a commercial concern, so to speak, transact more business now-a-days than she did when the hon. members opposite had the management of public affairs ? Yes, undoubtedly. However the people will be told that there is no justification for an increase in the expenditure.

Others will say that we have collected too considerable an amount of duties. Well, if such be the case, what then would have been the result had we raised the tariff to suit the wishes of the hon. gentlemen opposite ? If, as they claim, the development of trade, in Canada, were merely due to the action of divine Providence, the trade of this country would have been equally prosperous under a higher tariff.

The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Roche) taunted the Liberal party with having impaired the fair name of Canada. If ever the fair name of Canada was imperilled, the hon. member for Marquette should know that it was on account of the numerous scandals by which the government of his friends became famous, and on no other account.

Our trade, Sir, has increased by leaps and bounds, especially our trade with England, and it would be idle to deny that such a result was brought about by the preferential tariff established by the present government. I know that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and the Conservative members in this House have stated that nothing could justify the maintenance of that tariff. First, it seems to me that the conditions have not changed since 1898, when that tariff was first introduced, and it rests upon the hon. member for Labelle, who at that time approved that measure and even delivered a very eloquent speech in its behalf, to show that a change has occurred which justifies the stand he now takes. So far, he has not done so.

The hon. member for Marquette said that the preferential tariff could not benefit England. However, a mere perusal of the English newspapers and of the speeches of public men in Great Britain would convince him that the preferential tariff was looked upon as a gracious act on the part of Canada. Moreover, who will deny that England, a purely industrial country, is largely benefited by the lowering of our tariff ? Besides, that preferential tariff is in accordance with the policy of the Liberal party.

My hon. friends opposite, in face of a prosperous condition of affairs which cannot be imputed to the sole intervention of Providence, say everywhere on the public platforms : But, you have cheated us out of our policy ! According to them prosperity was brought on by Providence and by the policy of the Conservative party. But then, if the policy of the Conservative party is responsible for the present prosperous condition of affairs, I shall ask my hon. friends : why do they move an amendment ? Indeed, the motion presented by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) states that the operation of the present tariff is unsatisfactory and detrimental to Canada. Therefore it cannot be their policy that we have propounded. There is no way out of it.

We did not cheat them out of their policy. We have adopted that policy to which we were pledged.

The fiscal platform of the Liberal party was propounded as early as 1893, when we pledged ourselves to a fair policy in everything; we promised to consult all those concerned, and to reconcile all the interests at stake—a very difficult thing to achieve. The east favours a certain policy, while in the west, where there are no manufactures, people are differently inclined. So the government has to blend together these various interests according to the requirements of the case, and of the times. This the government did after conferring with those concerned; all advantages were equitably balanced without a single interest being sacrificed. That is the reason why before framing a tariff the government conferred with the manufacturers, without fearing the sarcasm of the Conservative party. Should the tariff be readjusted next year, the same process will be adhered to by the administration, without any preconcerted plan or unalterable principle. Nothing will be decided that is not according to the best interests of Canada, and then only after having heard all the interested parties. Is it not a wise policy that can compare favourably with the extravagant statements of the opposition as voiced in the amendment offered to the House?

Just one word about the preferential tariff. It is said that the English markets are thrown open to all nations, that every country is allowed to trade freely with Great Britain, and that there is no need of a preference. It is said that England, though her markets are open to our wares, does not intend thereby to confer a favour upon us, for she acts in the same way towards other nations. Should we be grateful only when we know what motives prompted our benefactors? If any one saved my life, even if it were not out of pure benevolence, am I not bound to be grateful just the same? For my part, I think it is fair and just that we should give a preference to England, for we are at liberty to sell our goods in that country without being asked and without giving anything in return. English goods have to pay a duty of 20 per cent, when imported into Canada; our wares have nothing to pay in England; nevertheless, hon. gentlemen opposite are not pleased.

In reply to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), who stated during the debate that England deserved no favours at our hands, because she did not take advantage of the Bulwer-Clayton treaty, and surrendered our interests in the Alaskan question, I will say that this is a very simple matter. England concluded that treaty for her own sake; Canada never was, and is not yet, interested in it. Therefore, Great Britain could give up every privilege secured by that treaty without exacting in return any favours for Canada. We have no cause to complain on that score. Had she been willing, or had she thought it possible, England could have secured advantages for us, but can we reproach her for not having done so? It should not be said that Canada was sacrificed. I own that it would have been better for us had she exacted certain privileges for Canada; however, can we reproach her for having thought that charity begins at home, when the question was the abrogation of a treaty in which alone she was interested. Besides, how can we pass judgment, not knowing all the circumstances of the case?

The hon. member for Labelle taunted the government for having disallowed the statute respecting Chinese and Japanese immigrants, passed by the legislative assembly of British Columbia. I entirely differ from him. The British empire had an interest in that problem. The matter could not be settled by the provincial legislature. All international matters are within the scope of the imperial authorities interested in the question of the treatment of aliens. This was a matter coming under international law. The intervention of the imperial government was therefore fully justified. Through the British authorities our treaties are negotiated, and Great Britain also acts as a go-between in all our negotiations with foreign countries. Who will dare stand up and say that England had no right to suggest to the federal authorities a policy consistent with imperial interests? The mere mention of these circumstances will show that the Imperial parliament was justified in requesting the Canadian authorities to disallow that law respecting naturalization? Even according to our constitutional laws, naturalization is a matter within the sole control of the federal parliament here. The British Columbia statute rendered naturalization impossible, and I contend that the federal legislature alone could legislate upon the matter.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Will my hon. friend allow me to say that it was a statute respecting emigration; that it did not deal with naturalization?

Mr. DEMERS. (Translation.) Granted; but I intended to show that for one to become a British subject, for instance, it is necessary to reside in a province during three years, and that naturalization was within the exclusive control of the federal parliament.

My hon. friend from Labelle then undertook to establish that, after all, Canada had constantly been exploited by England, without ever receiving anything in return. Such was the purport of his speech. Our forefathers fought for England as early as 1775. But it would not be wise to think that, in 1775, they fought for the sake of Great Britain alone. They took up arms

for their own sake as well as for England's.

By referring to the address of the Americans to the British people on the 5th September, 1774, it will be seen that the war between the mother country and the American colonies was a war in which we were concerned. Let us see how the Americans in that address stated the grievances which brought on the conflict :

And by another Act the Dominion of Canada is to be so extended, modelled, and governed, as that by being disunited from us, detached from our interests, by civil as well as religious prejudices, that by their numbers daily swelling with Catholic emigrants from Europe, and by their devotion to administration, so friendly to their religion, they might become formidable to us, and on occasions, be fit instruments in the hands of power, to reduce the ancient free protestant colonies to the true state of slavery with themselves. . . . . Now can we suppress our astonishment, that a British parliament should ever consent to establish in that country a religion that has deluged our island in blood, and dispersed impiety, bigotry, persecutions, murder and rebellion through every part of the world.

Such was one of the reasons which prompted the American colonists to warn Great Britain that they would shake off her yoke if she did not listen to their petition. Her refusal to accede to their petition was one of the causes of the American revolution. Now, in 1775, when Canada took part in that war, she was almost exclusively inhabited by men of our own race and blood. Therefore, when we took part in that war, it was not only for Great Britain that we fought, but we fought also in defence of our own rights.

It was an act of justice on our part to have given a preference to England, and it was also an act of justice on our part to have sent troops in aid of the mother country, out of gratitude also for the benefits she had conferred on us. Great Britain rendered us justice, in 1867, when she gave us the constitution guaranteeing the rights of the French Canadians. Lord Carnarvon, when moving in the British parliament the adoption of that constitution, said that he wished thereby to confirm the treaty entered into by Great Britain at the capitulation of Montreal, and that it was for that purpose that this constitution was granted to Canada. As I said, our rights were guaranteed by that constitution. We, French Canadians, Mr. Speaker, are the most interested in maintaining British connection. Our choice is between British connection and annexation to the United States. There is no other alternative ; and between the two countries, it is no difficult matter to make a choice.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) laughs ; he thinks, no doubt, that our participation in the wars of the empire is a new departure—something unheard of before. Allow me, Sir, to call attention to some utterances of the hon. gentleman, at Ste. Rose, on the 8th January, as reported by Le Journal :

Did you ever hear of Canada participating in the wars of the Empire, before the coming into power of Mr. Laurier, never. How we came to take part in the South African war, is easily explained. In 1897, before the Transvaal war had broken out, Mr. Laurier went over to England. A few days later, at a banquet in honour of the representatives from the colonies, he delivered a speech in which he pledged his word to the mother country that, should a war break out, let the beacon-lights shine on the heights, let the sound of the bugles be heard and Canada would be ready to contribute soldiers and money.

On the 12th January, at a meeting held at the Bonsecours market, during the contest in the electoral division of St. James, Montreal, the hon. gentleman delivered a speech, which was reported by La Presse, in its issue of the 13th, as follows :—

The Conservative leader explained his attitude on the question of the contingents. The question, he said, arose out of Mr. Laurier's famous resolution, approving of the principle of the South African War. But it goes further back ; it originated in Mr. Laurier's visits to England, at the jubilee of the Queen, when, at the banquet of London, he offered soldiers and money to the mother-country. Canada was bound by that solemn pledge, and when the time came when it should be redeemed, I consider that the honour of the country was pledged, and that it was our duty to stand by the word of the first Minister. That is the reason why Parliament voted without a dissentient voice in favour of the sending of the first contingent. As to Mr. Bourassa's motion, Mr. Monk said that he had not voted in favour of it, because it was only academic.

The hon. gentleman is like the Bourbons, with this difference, that the Bourbons have learned nothing and forgotten nothing ; whereas the hon. gentleman has learned a great many things and has also forgotten many things.

I do not know to what school of thought my hon. friend belongs. Does he belong to the school of Sir John Macdonald, the leader of the great Conservative party, whose words were received with the greatest respect by the hon. gentlemen opposite ? Sir John had the support of all the civil authorities in the province of Quebec, and it is important that we should know what was the opinion of that statesman, who moulded to a great extent the destinies of his party.

As early as 1865, during the debates on confederation, when the new constitution was being discussed which Canada was going to adopt, the question of our participation in the wars of the empire came up for discussion, and Sir John Macdonald said:

And England will have this advantage, that, though at war with all the rest of the world, she will be able to look to the subordinate nations in alliance with her, and owing allegiance to the same Sovereign who will assist in enabling her again to meet the whole world in arms, as she has done before.

If the hon. gentleman is no admirer of Sir John Macdonald, I am sure he must be an

admirer of Sir George Cartier. Now, on April 26, 1865, when the question of confederation was being debated, Sir George E. Cartier, in a speech delivered at a banquet in London, said :

> We want to adopt it (the federal constitution), not only in order that our prosperity and our strength, may be increased, but also that we may be enabled to participate in a more efficacious way in the defence of the British Empire.

So, it cannot be said that in 1897 the right hon. Prime Minister did take any new pledge, since Canada was already committed to that policy. What the present government did was merely to carry out the pledge taken in 1865.

Further on, referring to the future, Cartier said :

> We do not wish to become independent and still less do we wish to be annexed to the United States. The idea is abhorrent to us.

We have here in a nutshell the policy of the present government. We have here the very terms of the pledge referred to by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier ; and when he stands up and says : Did you ever hear before of Canada having taken part in the defence of the empire ? he no doubt forgets that, in 1865, Cartier said : 'Give us a constitution, so that we may be enabled to participate in a more efficacious way in the defence of the empire.'

Perhaps my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier belongs to another school of thought. There is the school of Ultramontanism, the ultra-conservative school and the liberal-conservative school. That latter school of thought had for its chief exponent a man of most brilliant achievements, to whom we never did refuse our admiration, though we could not follow him—the Hon. J. A. Chapleau. On January 8, 1880, that gentleman, who was conversant with the history of the Canadian confederation, spoke as follows :—

> All that Canada asks is that she may be at liberty to contribute to the defence of the empire, should the empire be attacked, and that the empire should defend her, were Canada to be attacked.

It stands to reason that if we want the empire to protect and defend us, it is our duty to offer England our assistance and to stand by her in her hour of distress. Have we not, from our very boyhood, been told that Canadians boasted of being the happiest people upon earth, living as they did under the protection of the British flag ? But as to coming to the assistance of Great Britain, not a word.

I have referred to these facts, to show the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, that if he is now under the leadership of the hon. member for Labelle, he has, on the occasion mentioned, put a question which he should never have put. As a matter of fact, the answer to that question was given in 1865, during the debates on confederation. On this point, I think the position assumed by the people of the province of Quebec is similar to that taken by the present government. The attitude of the government on this question is one that commends itself to all thoughtful men, to all business men. What is, after all, imperialism, about which we hear so much nowadays, and which is used as a bugbear to frighten people out of their wits ? Imperialism, if I understand it aright, might be taken to mean an agreement among all the members of the British family. Is there anything else in imperialism ? We are all British subjects, but if by imperialism we are to understand an agreement or a manifestation of good will among all members of the British family, then I say that I am an imperialist.

But imperialism must not be confounded with federalism. We Canadians may, of our own free will, offer help to the mother country, without changing our constitution. England has had wars to wage in the past, and only once did we participate in those wars. Therefore, I hold as fallacious any doctrine implying that we must never take part in imperial wars, as also any doctrine implying that we should always fight the battles of the empire. We should not commit ourselves to any policy in that respect, and on that ground all men of good will in Canada—I do not speak here, of extremists —should be able to meet. On that ground, all sections of the community, French, English, Scotch and Irish, should be able to join hands. Such are also the views of the Chamber of Commerce of Montreal, a most important body, composed of the best representatives of the trade of Montreal ; men who know the value of money, as well as the value of the blood of their fellow-countrymen. In a report, dated 14th March, 1900, drawn up by a committee of the Chamber of Commerce, appointed to study and inquire into the several questions that were to come up for discussion before the congress in London, in June of the same year, we read as follows :

> Shall Canada, moreover, take part in all the Imperial wars and fight all the battles of the empire ? This Chamber is of opinion that Canada is not bound to do so.
>
> Should Canada contribute to the defence of the empire, and fight the battles of England, she would then be actuated by a lofty feeling which would be justified according to such cases of emergency, right, justice and reasoned gratitude as might occur, but without being coerced into doing so by any statute. Such are the views of this Chamber.

Here we have an adequate expression of sound public opinion in the province of Quebec, on the question of our participation in the wars of the empire.

As to imperial federation, as I said a little while ago, I think it would end disastrously to the country. The government having laid down so clearly the lines of their policy

on that question, there is no reason to fear that the coming conference of London will be fraught with such dangers as some people think it may invite.

As to the question of colonial representation, when it came up for discussion in the British parliament, Mr. Blake, on a motion of Mr. Sinclair, said: 'Why should the colonies be represented here, were it not for the purpose of being taxed?' In these few words, Mr. Blake spoke the whole truth.

I consider that imperialism would result in the downfall of the empire. For, when our people will have to increase their burdens, to share in the expenditure of England's wars, they will not hesitate, like the other colonies, to sever the colonial tie. When, prior to the war with the United States, Lord North tried to bring about the unity of the empire by drawing closer the ties which bound the colonies to the mother country, what was the result? The result was that England lost her best American colonies.

To sum up, I may say that the province of Quebec considers that our participation in the present war was but an act of justice on the part of Canada towards Great Britain, and that for us, French Canadians, it was an act of gratitude, a manifestation of good-will towards the imperial government.

We are proud to be British subjects because of the political rights conferred by that title, and there is no man among us who, when he goes abroad, does not feel happy to say, like the Roman of old: 'I am a British subject.' However, that feeling is by no means inconsistent with our love for our old mother country.

I heard an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House express his surprise at the fact that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) had stated in Paris that we were French, and that we would remain French. On that occasion, the hon. minister only voiced the feeling entertained by all his fellow-countrymen of French extraction. Is it not true that our fellow-countrymen, the Irish, are proud to call themselves Irish, loyal as they are to the British Crown? So, we glory in our French extraction, and we are and shall always be proud to say that we will remain French, loyal subjects of Great Britain as we are. Why should people try to do away with our race by a process of assimilation? In Canada are to be found the descendants of the strongest races which now sway the world. Here are to be found Englishmen, Scotchmen, Irishmen, Germans and Frenchmen, all of them called upon to develop this immense country, and to display their intelligence in the construction of our great public works, in the development and the extension of our industries, in the cultivation of letters, sciences and arts. Let the different elements try to outstrip each other in those fields of human activity, avoiding all causes of friction, so that we may grow up and prosper alongside the great neighbouring republic.

As to the province of Quebec, I make bold to say that so long as we enjoy the same sum of protection as we are now enjoying under the British flag, so long as our rights are respected, none among us will ever dream of annexation to the American republic. I am confident that Canada will remain loyal to Great Britain, and that, as Sir Etienne P. Taché said: 'The last gun in defence of the British flag on this continent will be fired by a French Canadian. As the future grows out of the past, our past conduct is a guarantee of our future conduct.

So long as Great Britain respects that constitution under the ægis of which we have been enabled to live in freedom, and to preserve the sacred inheritance of our laws, our language and our religion, England may depend upon it that we shall always be ready to assist her, and to stand by her. So long as the other provinces deal fairly with the province of Quebec, so long as they keep their hands off the constitution, every French Canadian, loyal as he is to his province, will place the love of Canada above all the rest.

Mr. A. A. C. LARIVIERE. (Provencher). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have to congratulate the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Demers), because he has succeeded in turning into a patriotic speech what was, at the outset, but a mere array of figures. He began by referring to the changes brought about by the elections of 1896, a result which he attributes to the misdeeds of the former government, who had to bow to the popular verdict, after those elections. I think the least that will be said about what transpired during that gigantic struggle, at a time when the Conservative government, prompted by a most noble feeling, and championing the cause of a downtrodden people, had lost their prestige with an ill-informed electorate, whereas their opponents did not hesitate to make political capital out of that question; the least that will be said about those elections, the better it will be for the honour of their party.

My hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) undertook to call in question the action of Divine Providence in bringing about the prosperity which Canada is now enjoying and he gave the fiscal policy of his party credit for that prosperity. As I did not rise in my place in this House to vindicate Providence, I enter my protest against that kind of spoliation the hon. member is guilty of, when he denies Providence all credit for the great prosperity which prevails not only in this country but throughout the world.

Let my hon. friend allow me at least to tell him that he might have adduced some proofs in support of his contention. He should have substantiated his statement that the prosperity we are enjoying was

due to the action of the government. Now, I should like to know what changes the government have made in their fiscal policy to bring about such a result. I do not know of any. True, they have, a few years ago, readjusted their tariff to a certain extent; but those changes amount to so little that it is not reasonable to contend that the prosperity we are now enjoying has resulted from such changes. On the other hand, if we take into consideration the course pursued by the government as to their past pledges, we have to reach the conclusion that they have not redeemed their pledges. Formerly, the country was suffering from a commercial depression; and we had our lean years, compared with the fat years we are now enjoying. That the Liberal party, with the political platform adopted by them in 1893, can now claim that the prosperous state of the country is the outcome of the enforcement of the principles formulated in that platform, is more than I can understand.

If we take the different articles of that creed—and I may say that, not unlike other creeds, it ought to be revised from time to time—we shall find that the first article stated that it was high time for a change in the fiscal policy of the country. They denounced the Conservative government, because their policy, as they said, was one of protection to our industries and to all classes of the community. The hon. gentlemen said: It shall be the duty of the next government, when coming into power, to adopt as their fiscal policy a revenue tariff, for the efficient management of public affairs. The question is, whether the hon. gentlemen opposite have carried out that first article of the programme framed by them in 1893. To show that the very opposite was the case, it will suffice to see what was our public debt in 1896, as compared with what it is now. In 1896, the public debt was $258,497,432,77. In 1901, the last fiscal year officially accounted for, that debt had reached $268,480,003.69, or an increase of $9,982,570.92.

Now, my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) told us, this evening, that the present government always had surpluses, and that, if they had spent forty millions, it was because they had forty millions to spend. But how can it be claimed that the government has had a surplus every year since their advent to power, when, as a matter of fact, the public debt has been increased by over two million dollars a year, and to such an extent that it is now ten million dollars larger than it was in 1896? And did not the hon. Minister of Finance tell us on the floor of this House, the other day, that, next year, the public debt would be increased by six million dollars? That is a larger increase than has ever taken place under Conservative rule, if we except the period during which was being built the Canadian Pacific Railway. Never was such a result reached before. Now, we are paying $10,807,955 interest on the public debt, or $305,525 more than was the case in 1896. How, then, can hon. gentlemen opposite give this government credit for being more economical in the expenditure of public moneys than were their predecessors in office?

The public revenue is much more considerable now than it was in 1896, and this means that the rate of taxation has increased. From 1892 to 1896, for the five years which have elapsed between those two dates, the total revenue was $138,106,054, or an average of $27,621,211.

From 1897 to 1901, for the first five years under Liberal rule, the revenue was $170,-168,924, or an increase of $34,033,785, Therefore, we find that for those five years the average increase was $6,412,574.

In the face of such an increased revenue, the expenditure was considerably increased. Instead of increasing their expenditure, they should have applied those surpluses to reducing the public debt. But the reverse was the case, and notwithstanding that, from 1892 to 1896, the total expenditure was $210,708,819, or, on an average, $42,141,764, on the other hand, the expenditure from 1897 to 1901, during the first five years under Liberal rule, was $250,550,005, or, on an average, $50,110,001, or about eight million dollars a year. So, as will be seen, Mr. Speaker, the surpluses referred to by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville are quite ephemeral, as they have already vanished, and as the public debt itself has been increased to the same extent.

I now come to the second article of the political creed of 1893. The hon. gentlemen pledged their word to the people that, upon their coming into power, they would give us reciprocity with the United States. They said: 'Within six months from our advent to power, by a scratch of the pen, a treaty of reciprocity will be put in force between Canada and the United States. As to you, Conservatives, you have so unfairly treated the citizens of the neighbouring republic that you cannot expect to come to an understanding with them; but, as to us Liberals, it is quite another matter: we have always treated them so liberally—and heaven knows if our good friends, the Liberals, have ever been on friendly terms with the Americans—that should we ever come into office, we shall be able to make a good treaty with the United States.'

Mr. F. D. MONK. (Translation.) Hear, hear.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. (Translation.) What happened? The Liberals made several attempts, but they relied too much upon the friendship of the Americans. They had fancied that they would be received with open arms. A joint commission was appointed. We all know how things have turned out. The president of the commission died in the

attempa ; another member, the most distinguished representative on the American side, is also gone to his reward, the commission has discontinued sitting, and the question is now whether they are going to wait till all the other members have joined the majority, before calling another meeting of the commission. In short, they have finally come to the conclusion—and we have the admission made the other day by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to that effect—that the question was no longer a live issue. They have given up all hopes of ever having a treaty with the United States. What the hon. member for North Norfolk is now advocating is a policy of reprisals. He said : Let us endeavour to come to an understanding with our neighbours ; let us try to induce them to bring down their tariff to the level of our own tariff, and should they decline to do so, we shall have no other expedient left but to raise our tariff to the level of their own. Such is the policy suggested by one of the most eminent members of the commission, who was formerly so conspicuous for his friendship towards the Americans, that he was styled the hon. member from the United States.

The third article of the celebrated programme of 1893 provided for a reduction in the expenditure, and a policy of retrenchment ; but as I have just shown, that article remained a dead letter ; their pledges as to the reduction in the expenditure was never redeemed ; on the contrary, we shall be called upon to vote subsidies double those voted prior to 1896.

The fourth article referred to the enormity of the public debt. This is another article of their creed to which our friends, the Liberals, have proved false. As a matter of fact, the public debt is increasing in an alarming ratio, and the hon. Minister of Finance told us the other day that he would have to borrow six millions to meet the most pressing requirements.

The fifth article of the Liberal creed advocated the necessity of investigating the management of public affairs. We all know the result of the investigations held by the hon. gentlemen opposite. It is on record that during last parliament we asked for investigations, and that nothing was done in that direction. During this session, when we insisted in a committee of this House, that a substantial witness should be called, the government would not comply with our request. Now, in article 5 of the programme of 1893, in connection with investigations into the administration of public affairs, it is expressly stated that such investigations are a necessity.

In article 6, it is stated that the public domain should be preserved for the settlers. Well, Sir, there have perhaps been more grants made, in aid of the construction of railways, since the present government has come into power than at any time under the Conservative government. Have they preserved the public domain for the settlers ? Far from it, and things have come to such a pass that there are very few lands available for settlement now. As a matter of fact, immigrants, when they come to settle down in this country, have to apply to the railway companies for lands. Article 8 refers to the redistribution of seats, an operation which is known under the name of gerrymander, so as to describe a redistribution made with a view to favouring one party to the prejudice of the other party. The Liberals gave the solemn pledge that they would not resort to a gerrymander. We shall see, next session, to what an extent the government is going to redeem that pledge.

Article 9 is in reference to the reform of the Senate. How the government have made their appointments to the Senate is a matter of public notoriety. It is well known that those very Senators—whom hon. gentlemen opposite had formerly delighted in calling mischievous old men—have been replaced in the Upper House by young men who, for the most part, are quite harmless. At the present time they think they are about to have a majority in the Senate, and everything is for the best in the best of all possible worlds ; so that nothing is heard about Senate reform.

Article 10 relates to the plebiscite and prohibition. That plebiscite has cost the country a large sum of money, without having given us any practical results worth mentioning. And now the provinces are endeavouring to get rid of the prohibition issue. The province of Manitoba has just taken the lead in the matter, and the province of Ontario is preparing to follow in the footsteps of the former ; but as to the federal government, they have done nothing so far, besides incurring an expenditure of $200,000 to find out that there were in the country teetotallers unwilling to vote in favour of a prohibitive legislation.

I do not intend to follow my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville when he deems it his duty to lecture the hon. member for Labelle. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) almost occupies the next seat to his ; they both belong to the same party, and the differences which may crop up between them are family matters. Now, in family matters no stranger should venture to interfere. Therefore, I shall refrain from offering any comments upon the opinions expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Demers) as to the position taken by his colleague. Besides, I might possibly entertain the same views as the hon. gentleman on certain points, while as to others I might differ from him. There is this, however, to remark, that when referring to imperialism, he told us in the same breath that there should not be too much of it, and that there should be enough of it. That means,

no doubt, that my hon. friend is on the fence, and that he is ready to jump over to whichever side will prove the most suitable to him and to his political party.

My hon. frind (Mr. Demers) also told us that the discussion now raging in some newspapers on the question of imperialism was merely got up to frighten the people. But I should like to know who first started the debate ; for it is by no means of recent growth. That discussion has long been raging throughout the country, and I remember perfectly well that a few years ago the Liberal papers used to upbraid the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) because he was vice-president of the Imperialist League of Toronto. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was a Conservative at the time, and he was denounced by the Liberal papers. The Liberal press, besides, always held that the tendencies of the Conservative party were imperialistic.

Let us now come to the question of the contingents. We are told to-day that the government is denounced by such or such a paper, or by certain political men, for having sent contingents to South Africa in defence of the empire. Who was it that first started agitating the public mind about that question ? Let us go back to the elections of 1896. The Liberals then went about the country telling the people that the Conservative government had secured from the House an appropriation of one million dollars to buy rifles and guns, and that they meant to send our children to South Africa to be butchered there. I could name some hon. gentlemen who now occupy seats in this House and who were the first to resort to such means to bring about the defeat of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec. Now, if at the present time Conservative politicians denounce the government for their double game on that question, it is to show how inconsistent the Liberals are, since they approve to-day of the very same thing which they blamed us for yesterday. Not that we mean to censure the government for their action in this matter, but we mean to show that the government has pursued a double-faced policy in this respect. When they began agitating the question of sending out soldiers to South Africa, the hon. gentlemen told us : That cannot be done, for it is against the law. And 'La Patrie,' of Montreal, plainly told us that it would never be done.

A great deal has been said, during this debate, about the tariff, and my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville ventured to give some statistics on the matter. Before resuming my seat, I may be allowed to say a few words on the same subject.

I entirely approve of the motion made by the hon. leader of the opposition, and here is the ground on which I think it is worthy of approval : it is not stated in the motion that, to our mind, the tariff is not high enough in a general way, but that it is not so framed as to secure an adequate protection to all, and so as to distribute the taxes equally among all classes of the community. In fact, the question is not merely how to protect and promote the interests of the various industries of this country, but to extend also protection to other important classes of the community ; and one of the classes which it is most essential to protect is the farming community.

It was with a view to fostering the interests of that class, that the Conservative government, in 1894, reduced the tariff on agricultural implements from 35 to 20 per cent. It is true that the present government did not interfere with that portion of the tariff, that is to say, they did neither reduce nor increase the rate of 20 per 100 ; but they have succeeded, indirectly, in increasing the valuation of articles coming from the United States, so as to increase the tariff, and this, to such a point that, instead of having a rate of 20 per 100, farmers have to pay 25 per 100 on all agricultural implements coming from the United States, owing to the appraisement made by the government officials, under a peremptory order. Therefore, the tariff has practically been increased in this respect. That this is the case is known by the fact that, when one of my colleagues on this side of the House asked the hon. Minister of Customs for the production of the schedule of valuation, the minister refused to produce it, on the plea that it was a confidential paper, which could not properly be made public. This goes to show that the rate has been increased on agricultural implements.

There is something more, and the difference now existing between the American tariff and the Canadian tariff is detrimental to the farming community. So, wheat in the United States is taxed 25 cents a bushel, while here it pays a duty of 12 cents a bushel. Last year only, we imported from the United States one million dollars' worth of oats. This quantity of oats could have been raised here by our farmers, and we have imported it from the United States, having had to pay a duty of 10 cents, notwithstanding that the United States do not buy any from us.

Barley has to pay a duty of 30 cents in the United States, while it pays only 12 cents a bushel here. Our imports of barley reach the sum of thirty thousand dollars. On peas there is a duty of 40 cents a bushel in the United States, while here it is only 10 cents. Last year we imported fifteen thousand dollars' worth of peas. Hay has to pay $4 a ton, while we impose but a duty of $2 on the hay imported from the United States. There is a duty of 25 cents a bushel on potatoes in the United States ; here it is only 15 cents. Our imports of potatoes from the United States last year were $90,000. It is so much agricultural produce that our farmers do not sell in the country, and it shows how they are made to suffer

under the odious tariff which the government refuses to change or to alter.

I could single out a great many other farm products, but to go through the whole list would take too long. In short, in 1900 we have bought from the United States $25,700,000 worth of farm produce and cattle. That money, which went into the pockets of the Americans for articles which could have been raised here, we should have kept it, had we had a tariff so framed as to protect us from the competition of the United States.

During the same year, we imported manufactured articles from the United States to the extent of $65,000,000. And while we were importing $25,700,000 worth of agricultural products from the United States, the Americans only bought from us similar articles to the value of about $8,000,000, leaving a difference in their favour of $17,000,000, to the great detriment of our farming community.

Let us now see how we fared as to our exports of butter, cheese, eggs, lard and meat. Our imports from the United States amounted to $2,257,183, while they bought from us only to the extent of $116,353 worth of those articles.

That is the way, Sir, that the interests of our farming community are hurt by the American trade. While our manufacturers are enjoying the protection of a tariff, readjusted with more or less care, our farmers have no protection at all. The manufacturing cities go to the United States for their supply of farm produce, to the detriment of our own farmers.

By the motion which we have offered in amendment to that of the hon. Minister of Finance, we declare that the tariff now in force is ill readjusted and does not adequately meet the requirements of the country; that it needs to be revised, so as to give a more efficacious protection to the working classes, and mainly to the farming community.

I say that the policy which is formulated in the amendment now before the House is the true national policy, and to borrow the words used by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), that policy means: Canada for the Canadians. Such is the policy that we wish to see adopted and carried out.

My hon. friend from St. John and Iberville—to return once more to his statements, which have engrossed my attention to a pretty large extent so far—referred in quite sentimental terms to our duty to Great Britain, without entering into the consideration of business matters. As to that, I may say that my views quite coincide with his; but when it comes to the discussion of our commercial relations, I no longer side with him. To talk about protection and of what we owe to England is one thing, and to discuss business matters is quite another matter. After all, business is business.

The hon. gentleman told us that it was our duty to give British goods a preferential treatment; that we owed it to Great Britain to give her that mark of sympathy, on account of the many compensations we had already received, but I cannot see eye to eye with him on that point. As I said, business is business, and politics is politics. Out of the 168,900 tons of butter imported into Great Britain in 1900, Canada has supplied but 12,000 tons. It cannot be said that our standing on the British markets has been improved by the preferential policy. In 1901 Great Britain bought from us but 7,500 tons of butter; notwithstanding the fact that we have an output of 130,000 tons in this country.

Cheese ranks among our most valuable products, and is consequently deserving of every protection at our hands. Whatever the hon. gentleman may say to the contrary, if that industry has developed in such a wonderful way in Canada, the credit for it cannot be claimed by the present government, as they have only carried out the work undertaken by the old government, and followed in the footsteps of their predecessors. Nor can it be said that they have dogged the footsteps of the old government, because the late administration had provided for the establishment of a fast steamship service, from which service, had it been maintained, would have accrued most substantial advantages to this country. Far from doing that, the present government, with one scratch of the pen, did set aside the contract which had been signed, saying: We can do better than that, and we are going to draw up another contract. It is on record how many troubles our lamented colleague, Mr. Dobell, did experience with his bottle-nosed ships. At the present time, we stand exactly in the same position as we stood in 1896. We have no system of fast Atlantic service yet, despite the fact that from every chamber of commerce, and from every railway corporation, are coming loud appeals for the organisation of this Atlantic service.

Hon. gentlemen opposite claim credit for all the development and progress realized by the country within the last few years, and they refuse to allow any share of it to Divine Providence. That the government cannot rightly claim credit for the prosperity which the country is now enjoying, goes without saying.

What we press upon the attention of the government is the desirability of taking under their most serious consideration the question of an adequate protection to be given to the farming community and to the manufacturing classes. What we press again upon their attention is this, that they should have a well defined policy; for, of all things that contribute to expose trade to disturbances and to paralyse industry, the worst of all is uncertainty as to the features of the fiscal policy of the country.

The sooner the government will have adopted some well defined course of action, and allayed the anxiety of business men who are awaiting the action of the government, the better it will be for the country at large. And as prosperity and depression come by cycles ; as, in the course of time, the lean years are wont to come after the fat years, I hope that the government, being mindful of the future, will give us a well defined and fixed policy, so framed as to afford protection to our manufacturing classes, and mainly to the farming community, which is the bone and sinews of the country, and deserving of every encouragement, both at the hands of the government and of this House. Let us, therefore, join hands to make of this Canada of ours a prosperous country and one in which all will feel happy to dwell.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, I will not attempt to-night to address to the House the few remarks which I have to make on this question. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 4, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

IRREGULAR PETITIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. In regard to petitions Nos. 1 to 42, asking aid for the construction of the Montreal bridge, as they involve the expenditure of public money, and in addition as petition marked 41 has not, as required by rule 85, three signatures attached to the prayer, they are out of order. The same thing applies to petitions Nos. 43 and 44 which ask a sum of money to be expended for a harbour of refuge on the Bay of Fundy. These two petitions asking for the construction of that harbour also involve an expenditure of public money and are therefore out of order. The only petition which is in order therefore, is the first one.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 95) to incorporate the Penny Bank.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Manitoba and Keewatin Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the Dominion Railway and Power Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Montreal Subway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville).

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Toronto and Niagara Power Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Nepigon Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Malouin.

TREATY RESPECTING THE PRESERVATION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to mention to my right hon. friend that I observe a press despatch from Washington yesterday in these terms :

> Washington, April 2, 1902. Secretary Hay and Mr. Raikes, secretary of the British embassy today signed a treaty extending to the British colonies the provisions of the original treaty between the United States and Great Britain for the preservation of industrial properties.

There was some such treaty more particularly with regard to trade marks in 1877; subsequently a treaty between France and Spain and other nations to which the United States and Great Britain also became parties at a later date. I understood that these two conventions already applied to the British colonies. I would like to know whether my right hon. friend has any information on the subject which he would like to give to the House ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government has no information whatever upon the subject, but of course its attention has been called to the despatch quoted by my hon. friend, and we have asked, and at this moment are expecting information with regard to it. Without having received any such information, I am quite sure of one thing: That whatever treaty has been concluded by Great Britain with the United States, would not

ipso facto apply to the colonies, but that the colonies will be left to decide for themselves whether or not they shall be parties to that agreement whatever it may be.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). Mr. Speaker. At the hour at which I moved the adjournment of the debate last night, it seemed inadvisable to ask the House to listen then to the remarks which I feel it incumbent upon me to make in this debate. I would not have cared to enter into a discussion of the public questions of the day at this time, had it not been for some statements which have been made by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House in regard to two or three matters in which I am somewhat personally concerned, and in which I have been taking considerable interest during the present administration. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made some statements in this debate which I cannot help characterizing as not only reckless but rash, inasmuch as they have shown thereby the lack of study of the condition of affairs and of what has actually occurred under the administration of the present government during the last few years.

First, let me say a word or two in regard to a matter which was brought up by my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), when he spoke a week or two ago in this debate, in regard to certain figures pertaining to the census which has been taken by my department during the past year. Hon. gentlemen opposite alleged that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce had made statements which could not be substantiated, and one hon. gentleman, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) undertook to disprove some of those statements, and asked that further proof of them be submitted. I venture to think that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce put this matter in an incontrovertible form before the House, so far as the broad question is concerned. The statements which he made did not go into such detail as could perhaps be called absolute and entire proof on every point ; but they were sufficiently detailed, I think, to appeal to the mind of any unprejudiced individual who either heard or read them, and to prove his main contention, which was that the census of 1891 was unduly swelled in the figures of population, and that therefore comparisons on this point were unfair to the progress and prosperity of Canada during the last decade, and that it was necessary to show that these were unfair, or else the people of the world and the people of our own country, in studying the census, might not understand and appreciate to the full extent the immense progress which Canada has made in the last few years.

Now, Sir, I have under my hand a number of statements which go into greater detail than those submitted by my hon. friend. I venture therefore to supplement what he has stated by placing some of these statements before the House and the country. They are far too voluminous for me to read them all ; but I wish to read some specimen ones, which I have taken very much at random, amongst the many papers which were laid on the Table by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and other statements which I have prepared. My hon. friend from Pictou claimed that in the taking of the census of 1891 extreme care had been taken by the government and the minister in charge of the department at that time to insist that the enumerations should be carefully and accurately made. He pointed out that, in so far as industrial establishments were concerned, the enumerators were instructed to include only those which had an annual output of $200. He therefore concluded that it was only such establishments that were included in the tabulation of the census of 1891, and that it was quite reasonable that industrial establishments yielding an annual output of $200 should be regarded as industrial establishments.

I have under my hand the instructions which were issued to the enumerators in 1891, and I find no such statement in those instructions. There was no instruction given to the enumerators that they should only include industrial establishments which gave an annual output of $200. As a matter of fact, that was the same instruction as was given in 1871, in 1881 and in this last census. I do not quarrel with that instruction, but I want to correct the impression that was conveyed by the remarks of my hon. friend from Pictou.

But, further than that, I find that in these tabulations not only did the enumerators take industrial establishments which had not an annual output of $200, but here in the bureau at Ottawa such establishments were included to a very large number indeed. I have in my hand the third volume of that census, which gives these industrial establishments. I have not undertaken to go through the whole 386 pages of that volume, but I did go through the first 80 pages, and as a specimen I find that in those 80 pages there are 339 industrial establishments included in the tabulation the product of each of which was less than $200—a pretty fair proportion, in fact a very large proportion of the whole number.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the proportion of the whole number ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not worked out the exact proportion ; but these 339 establishments had a total annual output of $44,500, or an average of $144 for each establishment, instead of $200. This shows that the industrial enumeration was not made on the basis which has been alleged.

But, Sir, there is a much more important part of the tabulation and the enumeration which I also want to go into, that is, for the population. Hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends in the country have been making certain criticisms of the census of 1901. In the first place, I may say that the instructions that were given in 1901 with regard to the enumeration were practically the same as the instructions given in 1891, 1881 and 1871. It is true there was one difference made in the census of 1891, which was pointed out by my hon. friend from Pictou, that difference being that people who had been absent for more than 12 months were not to be enumerated ; and my hon. friend took great credit to the government of that day for taking that precaution and thereby preventing the enumerating of people who had left the country or left the particular locality permanently. Now, Sir, what have we found ? We have found, by a careful investigation, in so far as it has gone—and it has gone very far indeed in the province of Quebec, and a reasonable distance in the province of Ontario—that if that instruction was given, it was disregarded to such an extent that we must conclude that it was wilfully disregarded. The enumerators, some of them, ignored it entirely ; because I shall be able to show, not by general statements of the number in the aggregate, but by individual statements, that many individuals and their families were enumerated who had been more than 12 months absent from the place where they were enumerated.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. member a question ? Was not the first question of the enumerator this : In the event of any of the members of the family being away, do you expect them to come back ? In the event of their not being expected back, the next question was : Have they been away more than a year ? But in the event of the first question being answered in the affirmative, even if they were away five years, the enumerators would be obliged to include them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were no such instructions. The instructions were that if they were absent more than twelve months they should be held to be away permanently and should not be put on, but, as a matter of fact, they were put on in 1891 in numerous instances. In the census of 1901 the instructions were that they should not be put on, and we have no proof or suspicion that any were included who were away more than twelve months.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken two positions on this question. First, they claim that the census of 1891 was correctly taken and then they imply that the census of 1901 was not. The accusation is made that in the province of Quebec, in the census of 1901, the enumeration was excessive, that some people were counted who should not have been, and that in Ontario fewer people were counted than should have been on the schedules. I venture to say that I can prove that in the province of Quebec in 1901 no more people were enumerated than should have been, but that in the census of 1891 names were put on to an enormous extent that should not have been enumerated at all. If, therefore, there is any accusation of favouritism committed by either government in unduly swelling the population of the province of Quebec, that accusation comes with ill grace from hon. gentlemen opposite, because it was really the late government which was guilty. Let me cite a few instances just to show how the administration of these hon. gentlemen opposite proceeded in taking the census in 1891. Let me first say that in the investigation which I caused to be made, we found a ready means of obtaining information in the province of Quebec, where there is a large Catholic population. And I took care to have the investigation made in those counties in which the population is practically and entirely Catholic, and not where there is a large mixed population. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) spoke of the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska, in which there is a mixed Catholic and Protestant population, and he argued that the reason of the disparity was that in the parochial census the Protestants were not included, but in the counties where I have had an investigation, the details of which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce laid on the Table the other day, the county of Drummond and Arthabaska does not appear because we limited our inquiry to those counties where there is a homogeneous Catholic population and where, therefore, the census bulletins should give results similar to the parochial censuses.

Mr. CLANCY. In every case has the hon. gentleman observed this rule ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Practically.

Mr. CLANCY. Practically—that is another thing.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that there is no part of the Dominion, no matter where, where there are not some

people of a different religion from that of the majority, but the numbers are so small in the counties I have alluded to that they can be practically ignored. My hon. friend is not so familiar with the province of Quebec perhaps as some of those who come from that province, and know more about it.

An hon. MEMBER. We do not know very much about it.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a pity.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As my right hon. friend says, that is a pity. Comparing the census taken by the late government in 1891 with the parochial statistics, we find that the numbers in the former were in every case much the larger, whereas in the census of 1901 there are four counties, namely, Bellechasse, Bagot, Portneuf and Lotbiniere, where the parochial statistics are larger than those of the official census. In other words, if any error has been made by the census enumerators in 1901 it is due rather to their having failed to count all the people than to having unduly swelled the numbers.

Mr. CLANCY. Were these censuses taken at precisely the same period ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were taken within three months of each other, and the figures I will give afford such glaring and convincing proof that no one can imagine for a moment that any difference could be due to any radical change in the population within that period. In these twenty-one constituencies, to which I have referred, the difference in 1891 between the official census and the parochial censuses is 40,000 to the advantage of the former, or very nearly 2,000 per constituency of an excess in the official over the parochial census. But in 1901, on the contrary, the difference is only 8,000, or about 400 per constituency.

I would ask the House to bear with me while I read a few of the details just to show in what way this enumeration was taken in 1891 and what were the results. I have here the returns from the county of Joliette, the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Morin, attested by Dr. Turgeon and Mr. Dugas. I am not making any general statement, but taking individual instances and giving individual proofs, and here is one of the first instances that I find :

Leon Charbonneau, aged 39, and his wife, aged 36, absent from the parish for at least the last fifteen years. Yet they are registered in the schedule of 1891 as being present and having six children, namely, Joseph, aged 10; Leon, aged 8; Elizabeth, aged 6; Lea, aged 4; Elise, aged 3, and Olive, aged 2. These people have been absent fifteen years, but they and their six children were registered, and not one of these children was born in that county.

I find again Norbert Charbonneau, aged 30, and his wife, aged 31, both have left the parish over fifteen years. Their children were also registered in the census of 1891. Aged 5 years, 3 years, and 9 months respectively.

None of these people ever resided in St. Jean de Matha, yet their names appear in the census schedule.

Mr. CLANCY. Was this investigation made under oath ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was made by the parish priests.

Mr. CLANCY. That makes no difference.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was made by people who knew the locality and had personal knowledge of the individuals who were living in the parish for years.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). When were these investigations made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Last year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And the fifteen years date from last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. But it was only ten years between the two censuses.

Phillippe St. Ama, 34 years, and his wife, Athelia, were enumerated in 1891 though they never resided in St. Jean de Matha. Still they were counted with their four children, aged respectively 9 years, 6 years, 7 years, and 2 months. That family was absolutely unknown in that parish, never having lived there either temporarily or permanently.

Here is another instance : Alexander Houle, aged 42, and his wife, Marie-Anne, aged 40. They left for the United States eighteen years ago, but still their names appear on the census schedules of 1891 together with those of eight children, aged from sixteen years down to two years. And two of these children appear in the schedule as having the same name, which strikes one as rather peculiar.

Onesime Cleremont, aged 36, and his wife, aged 34, were absent in the United States when the census of 1891 was taken, but their names and those of three children appear in the schedule.

A little further down we find the name of Onesime Cleremont, aged 38, and his wife, aged 39, and three children. The enumerator, not content with entering absentees once, counted them twice.

Then there is the name of Jean Baptiste Piette, aged 46, with those of his wife, aged 40, although they left St. Jean de Matha twenty years ago.

Their names appear on the census schedules with two children—Marie Sara, aged 15 years;

Melina, aged 13 years. Immediately after the name of Jean Baptiste Piette and family, we find again Maxime Piette and Lea Piette, aged 33, with six children—Marie Louise, aged 14 years ; Rose Anna, aged 14 years ; Alexandrine, aged 12 years; Marie, aged 10 years; Joseph, aged 8 years; Napoleon, aged 6 years—which is a repetition of the same Maxime Piette and Lea Piette, already referred to as having left for the United States 15 or 18 years ago.

Here again, the family, the father and mother and six children are reported twice over, and none of them ought to have appeared on the schedule list. I cannot read all these cases, but I am trying to read fair specimens.

Louis Rocheleau, aged 60, and his wife, Agathe, aged 56, are registered with five children : Joseph, aged 34; Louis, aged 36; Elie, aged 29, Alarie, aged 15, Nathalie, aged 17. But they have never resided in the parish, according to people who have never left the locality during the last 20 or 25 years. One old resident of St. Jean de Matha said that he remembered that about 40 years ago, one Louis Rocheleau was living in the parish, but he never saw him since that time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to ask the name of the clergyman in that case.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Rev. Jean Baptiste Morin.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How long has he lived in that parish ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have no memorandum on that subject, but he has lived there for many years.

Paul Guilbault, aged 48, is registered with his wife, Philoméne, aged 30, and 18 children.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I wish hon. members to notice that the wife was 30 years of age, that her eldest son, Joseph, was registered as 24 years of age. The other children were :

Elizabeth, aged 23; Marie, aged 22; Philomene, aged 20; Pierre, aged 19; Olive, aged 18; Melina, aged 17, Armeline, aged 16, Paul, aged 15, Georges, aged 14; Miose, aged 13; Hormisdas, aged 12; Eugène, aged 11; Martin, aged 10; Arsène, aged 9; Albert, aged 8; Norbert, aged 8; Marie-Anne, aged 3 months.

The father was 48 and the wife 30, with 18 children, and all were registered.

But Paul Guilbault and his wife and his alleged children have never resided in St. Jean de Matha. It is said in the locality that the same Onesime Plouffe above mentioned in this report had a son-in-law by the name of Guilbault. He was residing, at that time, at St. Damien, in the county of Berthier, but he has left many years ago for the United States, and has never come back to the country. He has never resided in St. Jean de Matha.

This is another specimen of the way the census was stuffed in the province of Quebec in 1891. I have a number more here, but I will not detain the House by reading them.

Some hon. MEMBER. Go on.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All right. I will take another at haphazard :

Alem Parent, aged 23, is registered with his wife, Marie-Louise, aged 18, and their daughter, Rose-Alba, aged 4 months. Alem Parent is the son-in-law of Jean-Baptiste Layer, who was residing in St. Jean de Matha in 1891. Parent himself has always been living in St. Beatrix and never in St. Jean de Matha. This did not prevent the enumerator from registering him and his family twice. The second time he was recorded as follows : Olem Parent, aged 21; Marie Louise Parent, his wife, aged 19, and Rose-Anna, their daughter, aged 3 months.

Olivier Belanger, aged 42, is registered with his wife, Celina, aged 35, and four children : Joseph, aged 8; Henry, aged 7; Albina, aged 5, and Arthur, aged 3. These people are absolutely unknown to the old residents of the parish. They are probably some relatives of Mrs. Emelie Robillard, an old lady of 70 years old, who then resided in St. Jean de Matha. But if Olivier Belanger and his family ever lived in the parish, it is over twenty years ago.

And so on.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Go on.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) wants me to go on, but I have cases from other counties here that I want to give.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. minister lay on the Table the names of the enumerators in each case ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will look up the name.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman name the enumerator charged with this fraud ? And I would like to ask also whether he has made inquiries of the enumerators in any of these cases, and, if so, in which, and what answers has he got ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall be glad to look up the names and lay them on the Table.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon. minister made inquiry of the enumerators charged with this fraud ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In some cases that has been done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has it been done in this particular case ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot, at this moment say as to that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does not the hon. minister think it would have been fair to ask an explanation before making this charge on the floor of this House ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The probability is that when an enumerator

has made such an exhibition as that, his evidence would not be worth taking. I have here some cases from the county of Bagot also. In St. Liboire we find the same kind of thing occurring to a very great extent. Here is one item I would like to read :

The stuffing in the town of Acton Vale and in the Parish of St. Andre of Acton, is probably larger, and the evidence of it is absolutely undeniable. Mr. J. E. Marcil, M.P., for Bagot, has resided in Acton Vale for the last forty years, and for thirty years he has been engaged in business either as a clerk or as a merchant. He had consequently every opportunity of knowing every one in the locality. Mr. Marcil examined in our office the schedules of 1891 and has pointed out to us the names of those who had left the town of Acton Vale or the parish of St. Andre of Acton many years previous to the census of ten years ago.

Then the names are given

Joseph Gagnon, aged 24, son of Alderic Gagnon and of Sophie Gagnon, is registered in the census book, but has not resided in the town of Acton Vale for the last fifteen years.

Leon Mousseau, aged 24, and Alexandre Mousseau, aged 21, both sons of Bénonie Mousseau and Genevieve Mousseau, are registered on the census book, but have left the locality for over fourteen years.

Parmelie L'Heureux, aged 24, daughter of Leon L'Heureux, appears on the census book, but has not been living in Acton Vale for the the last sixteen years.

Louis Favreau, aged 26; Louise Favreau, aged 14; Dorinda Favreau, aged 21; Eustache Favreau, aged 20; Georges Favreau, aged 18; Charles, aged 31; Marie, aged 11; Delima, aged 56; Johnnie, aged 28; Angele Favreau, aged 47, and John Favreau, aged 35, are all sons and daughters of Louis Favreau and Angele Favreau. They appear in the census book but they were all born in the United States, and have never resided in Acton Vale.

Clara Lambert, aged 19, and Mary Lambert, aged 19, daughters of Pierre and Celima Lambert, are registered, but they had gone to the United States many years previous to the census of 1891.

Joseph Leveillee, aged 43, and his wife, aged 26, are registered with eleven children——

I need not read their names.

The whole family of Joseph Leveillee are living in the United States for the last 20 years, and therefore had left Acton Vale ten years previous to the census of 1891, and still their names appear on the census book.

Louis Levesque, aged 37 and Matilda Levesque aged 31, are son and daughter of Mrs. Vitaline Levesque. Their names appear on the census book, but in 1891 they were residing at Valcourt in South Ely, county of Shefford, and that three or four years previous to the census.

We have here also :

Pierre Boirier, aged 62 and his wife, Philomène, aged 46, are registered on page six, of the book with nine children:—Pierre, aged 25; Hélène, aged 21; Joseph, aged 19; Madeleine, aged 17; Napoleon, aged 16; Antoine, aged 12; Edouard, aged 8; Marianne, aged five and Philippe aged three. They also appear on page 10 of the same book with also nine children as follows:—Pierre, aged 24; Henri, aged 20; Joseph, aged 19; Madeline, aged 16; Napoléon, aged 15; Antoine, aged 11; Edouard, aged 9; Ernestine, aged 5; and Louis, aged 3. It will be noticed that the names of the two last children in the first instance are Marianne and Philippe. There is also a small difference in the second inscription of the age of the children. But it is absolutely the same family registered twice by the same enumerator.

We have this one also :

Noé Houle, aged 34, is registered with his wife, Delima, aged 34, and five children : Willie, aged 11 ; Emma, aged 9; Délia, aged 6 ; Rosie, aged 4, and Louise Anna, aged 3; but he left with his family for Duluth, Minn., in October, 1889. He had a property in the parish of St. André and was registered on the voters' list at the revision made during the summer of 1889. At the general elections of March 5th, 1891, the Conservative committee of the county of Bagot brought Mr. Noé Houle down from Duluth. He actually came, and it was his first visit to this country since he had left. He came down alone, his whole family remaining at Duluth. He was objected to by the scrutineer representing the Liberal candidate in the poll, and he did not take the oath, as his fare had been paid from Duluth to Acton by the Conservative committee. He again left for Duluth at the end of March, 1891, and has never come back since. Still his name appears on the census book with all his family.

Mr. CLANCY. Who makes that report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Marcil.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who is Mr. Marcil ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The present member for Bagot.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Who knows the county so well that he has been elected as a Liberal, the first time in many years that a Liberal could be elected there.

The enumerators in the parish of St. Ephrem d'Upton have not been more scrupulous ten years ago than in some other localities in the county of Bagot. Here follows a list of persons who should not have been registered on the census book.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was any explanation asked of this enumerator ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell which were asked for an explanation and which were not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the hon. minister know that any were asked ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. I will take also the county of Rouville in which a most extraordinary condition of affairs was shown.

In the county of Rouville there were 3,123 people enumerated on the Dominion census

more than the parochial census of the same year showed. This is the way in which the work was done in the village of Canrobert :

Pierre Reindeau, aged 44, and his wife, Onesime, aged 37, are registered with eight children: Philias, aged 17, Emma, aged 15, Arthur, aged 13, Rosanna, aged 11, Maria, aged 9, Azarie, aged 7, Thais, aged 5, Florina, aged 3 ; that family have left Canrobert village 14 or 15 years ago.

Julien Coiteux, aged 58, and his wife Octavie aged 50, are registered with seven children : Napoleon, aged 22, Zephirine, aged 21, Emma, aged 19, Octavie, aged 17, Louis, aged 16, Joseph, aged 13, Delia, aged 11 ; that family were not residing in Canrobert.

Here follows a list of persons entered in Richelieu village who should not have appeared at all, because they all lived in the United States or had gone to other parts of the province more than twelve months previous to the census of 1891. The list is given here, with the names and details.

Mr. CLANCY. Who makes that report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This was made by the parish priest.

Mr. CLANCY. What is his name ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. His name is not here. Then I have the county of Lotbinière, another one of the same character.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not wish to be constantly interrupting the hon. gentleman, but in any of these places where he has made inquiries of the enumerator and has received an answer, will he be good enough to state it, in connection with his other remarks.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I told the hon. gentleman a little while ago that I could not lay my hands on the information to show which enumerators inquiries were made from and which were not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman be able at some subsequent stage to give us that information ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will try to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We would like to have that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have thus far pretty completely showed the result of the investigations in the province of Quebec. As I said at the beginning, these investigations have been conducted comparatively easily because of the peculiar conditions in that province which enabled us to get, not only the general figures, but the absolute details and statements of the individual.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand from the statements he has read now, he wants to show that a large number of French families in the province of Quebec were enumerated in 1891 that should not have been ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was not particular to say that they were French, but as a matter of fact I think they all were French.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to a statement he made when the Côté circular was before this House two years ago. The hon. gentleman stated then that the French families of the province of Quebec were not properly enumerated, that a large number of families were not taken in that census of 1891 ; and that for the purpose of getting at the correct number of French families in the province of Quebec this circular was issued by Mr. Côté. How do these two statements coincide ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was a statement made that in the province of Quebec a large number of people that ought to have been enumerated were not enumerated. Our investigation shows that whether that was the case or not, a very large number of people were enumerated that ought not to have been enumerated. The two statements do not conflict at all. It may well have been that people who ought to have been enumerated were not enumerated, but at the present time I have given proof that hundreds and thousands of people were enumerated who had no right to be enumerated.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman explain to us how these parties were enumerated that should not have been enumerated other than those he now mentioned ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will go on with my argument, if the hon. gentleman will allow me, at a later stage perhaps he may speak and say what he wants to. Now we did not wish to confine the investigation by any means to the province of Quebec. Although the difficulties were much greater in the province of Ontario, still a slight investigation was made to find out whether anything like the same conditions obtained. I may say at once that we did not find anything like as much of this sort of thing in the province of Ontario as we did in the province of Quebec. Whether the difficulties in Ontario were so great that we could not get at the facts, or whether there were no such errors committed, I am not prepared to say ; but I state frankly that the difficulties of obtaining this information in Ontario are much greater than they are in Quebec. Now we chose five places in Ontario for that in-

vestigation, they were chosen at hap-hazard, we chose them without knowing in the slightest degree what the results were going to be, we chose them chiefly for the reason that they showed certain inconsistencies in the figures, they showed that while the number of families had increased and the number of dwellings had increased, the population had decreased.

Mr. INGRAM. That is reasonable.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is very unfortunate, if it is so, and it is rather an extraordinary condition of affairs. One of these five places was the township of Thurlow and the city of Belleville. A slight investigation showed that the census seemed to have been correctly taken there, there was nothing to show that there had been any stuffing of the lists. But in the other four places there did appear to have been stuffing, in Huron West, in Goderich and Clinton we found errors of that kind. In Goderich we found sixty-three persons out of 3,839 who ought not to have been there, and in Clinton, thirty-eight persons out of 2,633 who ought not to have been there, with an undue swelling of the list by 1·7 per cent and 1·5 per cent. In North Middlesex—

Mr. CLANCY. Before the hon. gentleman reads that, will he say who gave that statement ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. D. F. Macpherson, and he gives the names of the individuals, and all about them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Let us have the names.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not going to read them all, I will lay the names on the Table. I will read a few :

George Nimmens, page 13, lived in London in 1891 ; Martha Tebbutt, page 25, taken twice in Goderich township and in Clinton ; James Robb, page 3, never lived here. A farmer in Tuckersmith ; Fred Crabb, page 19, in Michigan in 1891; Charles Crabb, in Toronto in 1891 ; Charles Gibson, page 23, in North-west Territories in 1891 ; Colin Sinclair, page 27, in Detroit in 1891 ; J. M. Proudfoot, page 4, in Winnipeg in 1891 ; William McCallum, page 3, in Vancouver in 1891 ; William Campbell, page 12, in Chicago in 1891 ; Christine McIver, page 3, taken twice in Goderich town ; Minnie Gordon, page 24, in Nebraska in 1891 ; Angus McKay, page 28, in Buffalo in 1891 ; Frank Simmons, page 35, in American army in 1891; Robert Reid, page 38, in Brantford in 1891 ; Donald McIntosh, page 46, in Detroit in 1891 ; Wilson Cox, page 50, in North-west Territories in 1891 ; Maggie Burns, page 51, taken twice in Goderich town ; John McIntosh, page 55, at Sault Ste Marie in 1891 ; William Vivian, page 5, in Michigan in 1891.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him if the report states that these parties were away more than one year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were not there at all. In South Norfolk I find there were 3 per cent away in Simcoe, and 3·6 per cent were added to the list in Port Dover. Then I find a similiar condition of affairs in Cornwall. The inquiry was difficult to make, and I have a report detailing the means taken to arrive at the facts: In order to make the report as authentic as possible I examined the assessment rolls of the municipalities, together with the registers of the high and public schools of the district for 1891, and a comparison of those records with the census schedules has shown that in many cases persons were counted at their homes in the country by one enumerator, and in their boarding houses in the town by another. Many of the pupils attending the Cornwall high school were recorded in this way, and so also were domestic servants and others. In some instances it has been difficult to identify persons of the same family name, such as McDonalds, Frasers, McPhails, &c., who are numerous in the district, and where I had any doubt I have marked such names with a star. All other names given on the appended list as duplicated in the census are susceptible of the clearest verification and I am sure that many others might be furnished if one's memory and exact local knowledge could recall every person who lived in the district ten years ago and discriminate between the floating and the fixed elements of the population. Here is a list of 150 persons whose names were duplicated and appeared twice on the schedule of that census division.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What division was that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In Cornwall. I have here a list of the individuals named, of the two enumerators who enumerated them, the places in which they were enumerated, Cornwall town and Cornwall township, many enumerated twice in the town, some enumerated twice in the township, but all of them enumerated twice, once in the town and once in the township, as the case may be. This goes to show that the stuffing of the lists was not alone carried on in the province of Quebec. We have another proof of that which was given to this parliament in 1894 by my hon. friend the present Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Borden), who at that time proved conclusively that in his county of King's N.S., there was a very great stuffing of the lists. That proof was given so conclusively at the time that my hon. friend the member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) the other day, acknowledged it ; he granted that it was true and he simply defended it by saying that the enumerator was prosecuted and had to leave the coun-

try. As a matter of fact the enumerator did not leave the country; he only went into a neighbouring county, where, apparently, the Minister of Justice of that day was not able to reach him or to punish him. We have another fact which goes to prove the same thing. I have here some returns of the school population in the province of Nova Scotia, and I find some confirmatory facts in that connection. Here we have the different counties with their populations in 1891 and 1901 with the increases or decreases as the case may be, and we have also the statement of the school children for these two years. I find that in some counties the population actually decreased very materially while the school population largely increased. It seems hardly possible that the difference can be actually so great. It points to the fact that the change between 1891 and 1901 cannot have been correct in both instances. There is no possible reason for supposing that the population of the school children was in any way changed or tampered with. But it is quite possible that the census of 1891, with the proof that we have which the hon. Minister of Militia gave in regard to King's county, was tampered with extensively at that time. In Annapolis county the population decreased 3·1 per cent, but I find that the number of school children increased 12·3 per cent. I find in Antigonish that while the population decreased 15 per cent the number of school children increased 1 per cent. In Colchester the population decreased 8·3 per cent while the number of school children increased 9·9 per cent. In Digby the population only increased 2 per cent while the number of school children increased 21 per cent. I find that in Hants the population decreased 9·9 per cent while the number of school children increased 8·1 per cent. I find that in King's county the population decreased 2 per cent while the number of school children increased 21 per cent. Here, we have a confirmation in this comparison of the statements which were made by the hon. Minister of Militia. We have here the key to the solution of the difficulty and I would venture to say that the same key will open the lock in regard to other counties in that province. We have in Queen's county a decrease in both cases. In Victoria county there was a decrease of 14·9 per cent in population, and an increase of 1·5 per cent in the number of school children. I think that what I have submitted to the House thus in detail, and I have only taken these figures at haphazard from the mass of detail that I have here, is sufficient to show that whatever may be the census of 1901, the census of 1891 was, generally, throughout the country, very unduly swelled by the manipulation of the enumerators. I venture to say that it accounts to a large extent, if not entirely, for the fact that in the comparisons of the growth of the population the growth from 1891 to 1901 is actually and in fact much greater in population than it was from 1881 to 1891. Therefore, we as Canadians need not blush as we would otherwise have to do at the comparative stagnation and lack of growth of the population in our country. I venture to think that there are other points which tend to prove the same thing. There was one notable fact in regard to the census of 1891 which shows how easy it was to misrepresent the actual growth of population. In the census of 1891 while the names of the people are given, there is no address given of the people, there being no place in the schedules of 1891 for this purpose, and consequently, there is no sure and accurate way of laying your finger on an individual except by the local knowledge of other people. In the census of 1901 we have obtained not only the names of the people, but in the cities, we have given the street and house number of every individual on the list of the census, while in the country parts we have given the lot and range and the position of the house of each individual whose name appears on the list, the schedules of 1901 being so drawn as to provide for this. The result is that with the census of 1901 anybody can prove to a demonstration whether an individual was present or not, while, with the census of 1891 there are difficulties in the way of doing that and there are facilities given to the enumerators to stuff in just as many people as they desire to do because there are no immediate means except by the local knowledge of some other individual of laying your finger on a man who was reported as being present or who might not be present. This is a most extraordinary difference in the manner of taking the census and one to which I wish to draw the attention of the House and the country. There are some other matters in connection with the census to which I wish briefly to allude.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Fisher) pardon me? He speaks of a great mass of information. Is he referring to what has been laid on the Table of the House or to something else?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To what has been laid on the Table of the House and to what I have been reading from here to-day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I take it for granted that he will lay all the information on the Table of the House in so far as it has not already been laid on the Table?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly. There has been one effort made in the province of Ontario, and it is the only one I know of in the Dominion of Canada which has been undertaken, for the purpose of showing the incorrectness of the census of 1901, and that is the effort that was made

in the city of Toronto. I was rather surprised that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), in alluding to census matters, did not allude to this. I can only take it for granted that he felt that the census of 1901 was completely justified and verified by the police census which was taken in Toronto soon afterwards. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) gave a good many of these figures to the House and I will not therefore go over them but I will point out that the assessment department of the city of Toronto took their census between April 1st and October 1st, the mean of which was the 1st of July. The assessment department showed a population of 205,887, a smaller number than the Dominion census which showed a population of 208,045. If therefore we were trying to minimize the population of Ontario we evidently did not do so in the city of Toronto. The police census of the city of Toronto was taken some time afterwards and it showed a population of 221,000. The difference between the Dominion census and the police census was completely accounted for by the fact, that in the police census 4,439 pupils who are non-residents of the city were included, and these ought not, and were not enumerated by the Dominion census enumerators. The number of patients in the hospitals who were non-residents was 527, and in other institutions there were 175 non-residents. The hotels reported that on November 10th, the day on which the police census was taken, 1,413 transient visitors were enumerated who would not be enumerated in the Dominion census, and it is reasonable to suppose that there were at any rate 1,000 transient visitors in the city who were not in the hotels. This, with the natural increase within the two dates would give a complete confirmation of the Dominion census of 208,000, because the difference which can thus be made up between the two is practically 13,000.

There is another fact in regard to this about which I would like to say a word. In the directory census of the city of Toronto an effort was made to show a much larger figure. The directory census has on frequent occasions been referred to, but we have found on investigation that the estimates in these censuses are very uncertain and very irregular. The estimate made by the directory of the city of Toronto has varied very materially; a different multiplier has been taken to make up the estimate in different years, and some of these estimates have ranged very much higher than the municipal statistics, and some of them very much lower; showing a very wide difference and consequently showing the utterly unreliable character of such a census. I was rather surprised that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) did not deal with this matter. He certainly had the opportunity to do so, but he left it without any cavil, and I therefore take that as a practical confirmation of the census of 1901.

I have dwelt at some length on these things, because I have felt, and I still feel that it is important to show to the country and to show to the world, that the population of Canada has not been so stationary during the last ten years as it would appear to be from a comparison of the census of 1891, with that of 1901. I want to speak a little further upon another phase of this subject of population, and the census will have to necessarily come into that part of my address also. I stated a few moments ago that one object of discussing this was to show that the progress of Canada had not been so slow as it appeared by the census returns to have been. I believe I can show from the census figures, and other figures which I can place before the House: that not only has the growth of Canada during the last ten years been considerably greater than it was during the ten years preceding, but that in those ten years, the growth of Canada during the last five years of the period has been greater than it was in the fifteen years preceding the advent of this present government to power. The Minister of Finance alluded to that briefly in his speech, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce showed pretty conclusively that the development and progress of Canada had been very much greater during the last five years than it had been during any previous five-year period in the history of this country. And furthermore, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) went on to show that in some respects the progress of Canada had been greater during the last five years than in the fifteen years preceding. Hon. gentlemen opposite themselves acknowledge the prosperity of the country. I want to give a little proof of what that prosperity is, and in this connection I will refer to the speech of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke). When he was dealing with the increase in the population between 1881 and 1891, and between 1891 and 1901, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) stated that the increase of population during the last decade had been less than it was during the first decade. I do not know where he got his figures, but they are certainly not the figures of these three censuses. As a matter of fact, in 1881 the population of Canada was 4,324,810 ; in 1891, the population of Canada was 4,833,-239 ; and in 1901, the population of Canada was 5,371,051. The increase from 1881 to 1891 was 508,429, but the increase from 1891 to 1901 was 537,812, or, about 30,000 increase more in the last decade than in the first. This is no very great difference I confess, but still it is to the advantage of the last decade.

Now, Sir, in the province of Ontario we have municipal statistics and these statistics enable us to deal with, not only the decen-

nial census periods, but also with the conditions from year to year. Before I go into that I should say that these municipal statistics have to be taken with a certain reserve, because in the early days in 1881 and 1882 and 1883, these municipal statistics were not as carefully or as accurately compiled as they were afterwards. Up to 1881 they were avowedly imperfect, and therefore the figures for 1881 are acknowledged to be, not by any means correct; so that when we come to compare 1881 with 1891 we do so simply for what it is worth. In these ten years there was an increase of 226,000 according to the municipal statistics. But there is this curious fact to be noted: that in 1882 and 1883 there was a sudden increase from 2,000 increase to 19,000 increase. In 1883 and 1884 the increase in the population was 40,000, according to these municipal statistics; in 1884 and 1885 the increase was 33,000, and in 1885 and 1886 the increase was 38,000. Knowing as I do something about the way in which these municipal statistics were handled in the province of Ontario at that time, I am aware of the fact—and I have no doubt hon. gentlemen from Ontario here are also aware of the fact—that these enormous increases were due to the improved methods in the compilation of these statistics.

Mr. CLANCY. They are just as loose now as they were then.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Possibly so, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is right, then the comparison made by the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) would not be of very much value. As a matter of fact it was only about 1882, that these statistics began to be in any way carefully and completely compiled. In 1885 and 1886, when they had got to the point at which the statistics were compiled about the same as they are now, the increases did not go on to the same extent. In 1890 and 1891, the increases went down almost as low as in 1881 and 1882. I find that in the ten years from 1891 to 1901, these municipal statistics show an increased population in the province of Ontario of 102,626, but they show in the five years from 1891 to 1896, an increase of 50,165, and in the five years from 1896 to 1901, they show an increase of 52,426; or in other words, these same municipal statistics in the province of Ontario show that the population was increasing more rapidly during the last five years than it did in the five years preceding.

There are one or two other points in this same connection. We have in this Dominion census a statement of the numbers of the foreign-born population of Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia, which shows the immigration that has come into that western country. The increase of the foreign population in the different periods was as follows: From 1881 to 1885, 19,000; from 1886 to 1890, 31,526; from 1891 to 1895, 38,728; a total immigration of foreign-born people into that part of Canada in those fifteen years of 89,932. But from 1896 to 1900, there was an increase of 94,527, and from the 1st of January, 1900, to the 31st of March, an increase of 6,451, a total of 100,978. So that we find that 11,000 more foreign-born people came into that country since the present government came into power than came in during the whole fifteen years preceding.

We have also the five-year period census of the province of Manitoba, and what does it show? In 1891, there were in the province of Manitoba 152,506 souls; in 1896, there were 193,425, and in 1901, there were 254,947. That increase in the five years of the last decade was 40,919, while the increase in the last five years of the decade, since this government came into power, was 61,522, or over 22,000 more than there was during the same number of years under hon. gentlemen opposite.

An hon. MEMBER. How many of those are Doukhobors?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are very few Doukhobors in the province of Manitoba; but I have no reason to regret the fact that Doukhobors are coming into the country. On the contrary, I think it is a good omen for the future that we see industrious people coming in to add to the productive capacity of the country, whether they are Doukhobors or Mennonites or anything else.

Now, Sir, in connection with the census there has been a good deal of talk about the exodus. Though hon. gentlemen opposite proclaim that the exodus is still going on, one of their principal organs some three years ago said that the exodus was a thing of the past—a matter of history. I am not prepared to say for a single moment that there is no exodus in one sense, although in another sense, I am prepared to deny that there is still an exodus. There is and there always will be a certain migration of people across this continent, with the people of the south speaking the same language and having largely the same institutions as ours; that migration being sometimes from the south to the north and sometimes from the north to the south. But there is this difference, that under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite the migration was invariably and to an enormous extent from the north to the south, people leaving Canada to go to the United States, whereas I am proud to know that, since a change of government has taken place and a new policy has come into operation in the Dominion of Canada, the great stream of that migration has changed and is now from the south to the north and no longer from the north to the south. This I consider one of the best auguries for the future of our country, and

it is one which our people cannot too long dwell upon or boast of; because if the wide-awake and up-to-date American people are finding the conditions in Canada—the conditions of government, of civil liberty, of material prosperity—better than in their own great union, it surely will happen that the people of the European continent will follow their lead and come to us in greater numbers than ever before.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister explain how it is that of settlers' effects imported into the United States from Canada there were in 1899, $1,037,000 worth, in 1900, $1,144,000 worth, and in 1901, $1,143,000 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Has the hon. gentleman found how many came from the United States to Canada ?

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the migration to the United States had stopped.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not say it had stopped. The hon. gentleman has not listened to me. What I said was that it had changed to a great extent its direction—that while there will always be, as there always has been in the past, a migration across the continent, at the present time the greater stream is from the south to the north, and the smaller from the north to the south, while under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite there was hardly any stream at all from the south to the north, but a great broad river flowing from the north to the south.

The hon. member for Pictou, in his speech, referred to what appeared to be a quotation, I know not from what document, in regard to the migration of Canadian population to the United States, and he read a passage which had a very strong likeness, although it is not verbatim the same, to a statement which appeared in the press three or four weeks ago, supposed to be on the authority of Mr. George Johnson, who is described as the Dominion statistician. I may say that that statement had no authority from the department, and that the department takes no responsibility for it. I note this statement, quoted by the hon. member for Pictou, in regard to the number of Canadians who went to the state of Massachusetts in the five-year periods from 1885 to 1890, from 1890 to 1895, and from 1895 to 1900 :

> In the first period Canadians went to the state of Massachusetts, according to the statistics of that state, at the rate of 12,050 a year ; in the second period, at the rate of 7,236 a year, and in the third period at the rate of 9,888 a year.

Then my hon. friend from Pictou went on to say :

> If these figures are right, there was a larger exodus from Canada to the state of Massachusetts in the last five years ending with 1900 than there was in the preceding five years.

The hon. gentleman was well advised in saying : 'If these figures are right,' because these figures are not right. There is a misstatement and miscalculation in the quotation made by the hon. member for Pictou, just as there was in the statement which Mr. Johnston published without the authority of the department. I have here under my hand the United States census and the Massachusetts census, and in them I find these figures. In the state of Massachusetts the Canadian-born population between 1880 and 1890 rose from 119,302 to 207,601, or an increase of 88,299; from 1890 to 1900, it rose from 207,601 to 293,169, an increase of 85,568. But, according to the records of the Massachusetts State census, during the period from 1890 to 1895, the number of Canadians in the state of Massachusetts increased from 207,601 to 251,346, an increase of 43,745. From 1895 to 1900, the Canadians in the state of Massachusetts increased from 251,346 to 293,169. In other words, the Canadian-born population in the state of Massachusetts increased, in the first five years of the last decade, 43,745, and in the last five years 41,823, or just about 2,000 more of an increase in the first five years when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, than in the last five years when we were in power.

The statement which the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) read and which was made by Mr. Johnson was also to the effect—which is quite true—that during the last decade the number of Canadians in the United States increased much less than it did in the previous one, and the fallacy appears to lie in the figures of the year 1895. A certain number of those who went to Massachusetts before 1895 had been added to the period after 1895, which shows an entirely false statement of the facts and an unfair statement of the condition of the exodus from Canada to Massachusetts. At this however I am not surprised.

What do I find when I look back ? In the whole of the United States, taking ten year periods, I find the Canadians increased as follows :

From	1860 to 1870	243,494
"	1870 to 1880	223,693
"	1880 to 1890	263,781
"	1890 to 1900	202,287

What is noticeable about these figures is that the increase between 1880 and 1890, when we had a continuous ten year period of Conservative rule, was far the greatest, and was least between 1890 and 1900 when we have five years of Conservative and five of Liberal administration. And if you go back to the period between 1870 to 1880, in which there was also five years of Liberal administration, we find that the figures are less by 40,000 than they were in the succeeding period when the country was entirely under Conservative rule. We find therefore that notwithstanding the howl of the hon. gentlemen oppo-

site about bad times under the Mackenzie administration, notwithstanding the attacks which they made on that administration and the manner in which they decried the country during that period fewer Canadians by 40,000 then went to the United States than during the ten years when these hon. gentlemen opposite had full control.

When we come to another decade, during one-half of which the Conservatives governed and during the other half the Liberals were in office, the exodus was still less by 60,000 than in the decade which was distinguished entirely by Tory administration.

I shall not dwell longer upon the exodus and the movement of population, but I would like to say a few words with regard to another phase of the subject, which at this time is specially interesting. I need not go into any details to show the great prosperity which Canada is to-day enjoying. Hon. gentlemen opposite acknowledge it, but they seek refuge in the statement that this prosperity is not due, in any way whatever, to the present government, but solely to natural causes, among which are the great crops that we have been blessed with during the past few years. Well, while I do not question the great advantages we have enjoyed in these abundant crops, I venture to think that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is hardly warranted in saying that our administration has had nothing whatever to do with our present prosperity. My hon. friend and others like him have been somewhat decrying my own administration, and the work done by my department on behalf of our farmers. Far be it from me to boast of what I have done, and I have not the slightest desire to magnify anything I may have done or attribute any improvement in our agricultural industry to any personal merit peculiar to myself. But I think I am justified in pointing out certain facts and allowing hon. gentlemen to draw their own inferences. In the first place, during the last five years, our exports, as everybody knows, have enormously increased. We sent out from Canada in that period $23,000,000 more of the products of the mine than in the previous five years, over one-half million dollars more of the products of the fisheries, $29,000,000 more of the products of the forests, and $113,000,000 more of the products of the farm. These are all the natural products of our country, and it is on these we must depend to pay our foreign debts. I was rather surprised and somewhat amused by the statement of my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) that we would be unable to pay our foreign debts unless we had manufactures. He asked pathetically: How are we going to pay our foreign debt if we do not have manufactures in the country? Well, I would ask my hon. friend just to pause a moment and contemplate the figures. We sent out of this country, in the five year period to which I have referred, $205,000,000 worth of the product of the soil, the mines, the fisheries and the forests. And how much do you suppose we exported of manufacturing products in that same period? Only twenty-two and a half million dollars worth.

Mr. BROCK. Yet our debt is not yet paid.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well, we seem to be pretty solvent, and I venture to think that we are paying our debts pretty well as we go along. We are paying our foreign debts and bills chiefly by the exports of our natural products, and only to a very small extent indeed by the export of our manufactures. We are paying them almost entirely by the exports of our agricultural, mineral, forest and fishery products.

Mr. BROCK. What has the government to do with that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I appreciate fully that the government cannot create these things, but no one can deny that it can encourage, stimulate, guide and direct them, by opening the most profitable channels and encouraging those industries which help to open up the country and increase our mining, forestry and agricultural development. And it is only to the extent that it does so that I claim credit for this government. But my hon. friend must not forget that this great increase in our export of natural products has taken place under a Liberal administration assuming proportions which it never did under the administration of my hon. friends opposite. If our policy has had the blighting effect which they attribute to it, if our administration has been so prejudicial to the best interests of the country, how is it that in those five years we have had this enormous development of these natural resources and at the same time a considerable development of our manufacturing industries as well?

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman point out now where they have changed the policy of the Conservative party which brought about these grand results?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why then are you dissatisfied?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Surely my hon. friend is not serious. He is about to support a resolution which declares distinctly that our policy is contrary to the life long policy of the Conservative party. I think that he was in the House when Sir Charles Tupper, then leader of the opposition, in answering my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, told him that he could hear the wail of the men engaged in manufacturing industries, who were crying out in fear and trembling that they would not be able to find bread for their families because of the tariff which my hon. colleague intro-

duced in 1897 and which is the same tariff that my hon. friends opposite want to reform. It is true that somewhat later, finding that that wail existed only in an imagination, stimulated at the time by the disappointment of losing office, Sir Charles Tupper—I think it was 1899 or 1900, just before the general election—gave utterance to the same opinion to which my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) has just given expression, and told the country that we had stolen the clothes of the late Conservative administration.

Mr. CLANCY. Which was correct.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was neither correct as to the future nor as to the present effect of the Reform tariff. The duties have been lowered.

Mr. CLANCY. No.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Then why does the hon. gentleman support a resolution to have them raised? Why does he want the tariff changed? If he has to-day that protection for the manufacturing industries which he had before 1896, why does he support the resolution of the hon. leader of the opposition? Or does he wish to support the resolution of the leader of the opposition? No; these hon. gentlemen cannot ride the two horses in that way—they are not clever enough. And the amusing thing about it is that the hon. gentlemen practically answer one another, and we hardly need to answer them at all. But I wish to tell the hon. gentlemen a little of how we have changed this; and, in doing so I have to refer a little to agricultural matters. My hon. friend the member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith) a little while ago dealt at considerable length with the question of cold storage. I have here an analysis of the agricultural exports of the country in recent years. It is very suggestive. The hon. member for South Wentworth says that the government has nothing whatever to do with the increase of these exports. I take here products of a certain kind, the chief of which are wheat and flour, oats and oatmeal, and peas. These are the chief products of the field that we export, the chief products of the country that do not call for the intervention of what I might speak of as the manufacturing side of the agricultural industry. In these articles we have increased our exports in the last five years from about $8,500,000 to about $16,500,000. That is due to the increased crops of this country—

Mr. CLANCY. And increased foreign demand.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And increased foreign demand, possibly. The hon. gentleman can put that in if he chooses, and I do not object. We have, however, another class of agricultural products usually spoken of under the general name of animals and their products. In these the industry and skill and intelligence of the Canadian farmer is exercised in turning the crude products of the soil into a higher class of agricultural products and exporting them. In helping to increase this class of products and in helping to increase the export of them, the government has done a great deal during the last five years. The increase in this class of exports has been, in round figures, $21,000,000. And out of that increase, I venture to say, a very large portion has been due to the guidance and stimulus of the government policy and the work that has been done by my department in providing facility of transportation and otherwise and in guiding and educating the farmers of this country to produce these goods and send them out. And I venture to say that neither the hon. gentleman nor any person can controvert what I am about to put before you. In these years we have sent $2,000,000 more of cattle in 1901 than in 1896, our increase in cheese exports was from $13,000,000 to $20,000,000; of butter from $1,000,000 to $5,000,000; of pork products from $4,500,000 to $11,750,000; and of eggs from $800,000 to $1,600,000—a total as I say of about $21,000,000. This has been due to the improved methods pursued in production and the better facilities for transportation provided, to a very large extent by the work of the administration.

Mr. CLANCY. It is due to one point in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) has followed the policy of his predecessors.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Clancy's) opinion because he has not studied the question. The hon. gentleman thinks that this is simply due to the one item of cold storage. But I am going to refer to that in a few minutes. The analysis of export that I have given, I think, is of value. One other point I wish to refer to is the fact that this increase of export is almost entirely to the old country. This increase has been an increase not only in quantity, but in value to a very considerable extent. We have been able to get better prices for these articles in the old country than we got before. And I venture to think that the increase in prices is, to a considerable extent—I do not pretend that this is the cause of it all—due to that preference which was an integral part of the tariff arrangement established by this government, and that struck the people with such surprise and pleasure in 1897.

Mr. CLANCY. I supposed that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) would assume that—

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) can restrain his impatience for a little while until he gets the floor, perhaps his speech will be a little more coherent than his present interruptions. That preference attracted the attention of the people of the old coun-

try to Canadian products, and the difference was shown immediately by this fact—that while before 1896, Canadian products were sold in the old country under the names of other countries—were deliberately asked to be sold in such packages that they could not be recognized as Canadian—to-day every retail dealer in the old land tries his best to put the name 'Canadian' on everything he is selling in order to attract his customers and induce them to try it. And I am glad, as Minister of Agriculture, to say that when these people have tested the Canadian products, they are glad to go back for more. The result is the splendid showing of increased exportation of the articles that I have just given. But hon. gentlemen opposite are always decrying this preference and taking the line that, while the preference may—they are doubtful of it—may have helped our agricultural sales, it has not helped the English people. And my hon. friend from Toronto brought forward in his speech a little while ago a rather specious argument, the fallacy of which, I should think, the hon. gentleman must have been aware of, because I would naturally give him credit for enough intelligence to recognize it. I did not expect to have to impute to him disingenuousness in putting the argument forward. He stated that in the five years preceding the preference the aggregate of British imports into Canada were $187,000,000, and that from 1897 to 1901 inclusive, the aggregate was $186,000,000—practically the same. He put this forward as proof that the preference had done no good. Surely, the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that the aggregate in the first five years was an aggregate of yearly importations into Canada which were steadily decreasing from $43,000,000 in the first year to $29,000,000 in the last year, while the aggregate in the succeeding five years was made up of importations which began at about the lowest figure of the first five years and went on increasing. The one was an aggregate composed of amounts on a descending scale, the British importations gradually and pretty rapidly tending toward the vanishing point, and the other of amounts which were steadily rising, and had got back in five years to just about the place from which the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite had lowered them. Sir, that is a fair specimen of the kind of argument and manipulations of figures to which hon. gentlemen opposite descend in order to prove their contention. I was surprised, I confess, that the hon. gentleman from Toronto should make an argument so disingenuous unless, he was so obtuse that he could not see the fallacy in it.

Now, the hon. gentleman opposite spoke a few minutes ago about one of these articles I have read over as being the only one in which we did anything for the export trade to England. I suppose the hon. gentleman alluded to the trade in butter, which even hon. gentlemen opposite confess, has been enormously stimulated and improved since their time, and which could not be improved under the old condition of affairs, because butter from Canada could not be carried to England and placed on the market there in good condition owing to the condition of transportation that obtained under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. Since that time, however, things have changed.

I want to point out that in respect of those articles I have alluded to we have done an enormous amount of work of which, perhaps, the House and the country are not aware. During the last five years what I may call the educational side of the Department of Agriculture has been greatly enlarged. We have been able, by the addition of some officers to our staff, though I must confess at some considerable expense, to reach the farmers and producers throughout the country in a way that was never even attempted before; we have been able by the distribution of information from the Experimental Farm and from the agriculture and dairying branch under Professor Robertson, to disseminate information, to bring new points to the attention of the people, and help them to overcome the difficulties in their various industries. This has resulted in the increase of our cattle trade with Great Britain, taken in connection with the admission of free corn to feed their cattle, and it has resulted in the increase of the cattle trade with the United States by removing the quarantine impediment which had effectually shut out our cattle from the United States market. We have appointed a live stock commissioner who is to-day organizing the live stock interests in this country, and enabling those engaged in that interest to work together, to understand the situation of their trade, and better to overcome the difficulties which they encounter. We have stimulated the fruit trade by the passage of the Fruit Marks Act, which, though only in operation one year, has already done something to improve our export trade in fruits, by the appointment of inspectors under that Act to supervise the trade, by arranging for proper ventilation of the holds of steamers which cross the Atlantic, to carry our fruits and cheese in a proper condition, by arranging for cheese curing rooms, and the improvement of cheese curing in this country, which is only beginning to-day, but which has been necessary for a couple of years past, and which we have been working the people up to during the last two years. We have established a complete and continuous chain of cold storage from the creameries in Canada to the retailers in Great Britain, and that has been done so effectually that the butter trade of Canada is to-day fivefold what it was in 1896. These things have been done by the department without much ostentation, but they have resulted in stimulating production and improving the exports.

Now, I have here a few details which I wish to give in reply to some strictures that were made by the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith). That hon. gentleman said that I had not done my duty because I had not compelled every steamboat that sails from a Canadian port to put in fans, &c. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman is crediting my department with a great deal more power than it possesses. We have no power to compel any steamship company to do anything against their will; though we have power to offer them inducements, we can show them the advantages they will reap from making these improvements. I found that difficulty from the commencement of my work. As a result of the representations that were made to one of the largest steamship lines, I was able to induce them to put in mechanical cold storage apparatus which, until that time, had never been put in any ship sailing from Canada. The result was the stimulus of the butter trade, followed by experiments in regard to the export of fruit, and this also offered prospects of improving the condition of the poultry meat exports, which have already grown to considerable proportions. When I found there was a necessity for proper ventilation in the holds of the vessels for the carriage of apples and cheese I exercised some pressure to induce the steamship companies to make the arrangements necessary, and succeeded to some extent. I went further than that. Last year I endeavoured to get the steamship companies to put in cooling apparatus by which the air would be artificially cooled in special chambers, and in that state forced through the holds where the fruit and cheese were stored. I was not successful with all the steamship companies at first, and I am condemned for that. I would like the hon. gentlemen opposite to tell me how I could compel the steamship companies to do this. Hon. gentlemen do not reflect that these are independent companies who trade for their own benefit. I went to the head of one of these companies in England, and represented the necessities of the Canadian trade. I asked him if he would not put in one of these cooling apparatus into the holds of each of his vessels in which butter and cheese were carried. I had already been in communication with his agents in Montreal, who had recommended to him that it should be done, but the head of the firm in England refused to do it. When I went there last summer I asked him to do it and he said he would not. Although I urged him, he still refused, and then I said, 'well, I have only one resource left, I will publish to the people of Canada who ship these goods across the Atlantic, that while your competitors do make these arrangements in their vessels to meet the demand of the Canadian trade, you refuse to do so; and I will see, and you will see, whether the shippers of Canada will patronize your boats.' But my arguments had no influence with him. The moment that Professor Robertson and I came back from England, I instructed Prof. Robertson to meet the shippers at Montreal who were engaged in shipping these goods, and he told them that this company had refused to meet our demands. At once I got a cable from the company, asking me how it was that I authorized a Dominion officer to do this, and I replied that it was necessary in the interests of the exporters and shippers of Canada. To-day that company is fitting up their ships, because they do not dare to go contrary to the demands of the Canadian trade and shippers of these goods.

Mr. CLANCY. Did that company give reasons for their refusal?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The reasons were that they did not think it would pay, now they do think it will pay.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I did not catch the name of the company.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not give the name, I do not think it is wise to give it. I will give the name to the hon. gentleman privately, but I do not think it right to publish the name of the company to the public.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think the hon. gentleman should not make the statement unless he is prepared to give the name of the company.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think so. The hon. member for South Wentworth read a statement in connection with which he pointed out that certain ships going from Halifax did not give the accommodation necessary. That statement was, to a certain extent, correct. There is a line going from Halifax which agreed to give certain accommodation for the shipping of our products. That line was granted the usual help for doing that. The owners of that line carried out to a certain extent their contract, but they refused to carry it out further and the assistance given to them was stopped and in addition to that they were obliged to refund what they had already received because they had not fulfilled their conditions and had not fulfilled their contract. More than this cannot be done. They are at liberty to put in the necessary facilities or not but in order to obtain the assistance that this government gives it is necessary for them to provide the accommodation and fulfil their contract.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. gentleman say whether the government were repaid as well for the sum they expended in fitting out these steamships with cold storage?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the money paid for them was refunded.

This particular line which was referred to by the hon. member for South Wentworth was under contract to supply certain vessels. They put on those vessels which the fruit-growers of Nova Scotia declared were suitable vessels. They, for their own convenience and for their own purposes, sold two of these vessels and they offered to put on other inferior vessels. The result has been that they have not been paid their subsidy and I venture to think that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce will not pay them their subsidy until they provide the accommodation which they are required to provide by the contract and which is needed by the trade. We have no means of compelling these companies. We can only hold inducements out to them that certain things are necessary to accommodate the trade of the country. We can describe what things are necessary and help them to meet these requirements. If they refuse to do it we have nothing more to do with them. If they will do it, we can give them the assistance which it has been the policy of this government to give for the purpose of inducing these companies to provide the necessary facilities. But, they have provided these facilities to a great extent. There were five main lines plying to Montreal during last season. Twenty-eight steamers have been fitted up and others are being fitted up today so as to be in readiness for the season of 1902. There were 77 sailings from Montreal last year with exhaust fans for the ventilation of their cargo space. We also induced the fitting out of four steamers with cold chambers to force air through. Canada, with one exception, that of the line from Bristol to the West Indies which was subsidized lately by the home government, is the only country that has obtained vessels fitted out in this way for the carriage of cheese and fruit. We opened these negotiations last year and the result was that four steamers were fitted out as a trial and these steamers were so successful and our products were carried so well that this winter the main line companies are fitting out more vessels. Ten others are under way and it is expected that they will be fitted out for this season. These things are directly in the line with what I have been describing. These are the things that the hon. member for South Wentworth ignored while he quoted one particular case down in Nova Scotia. During the season of 1901 there were from the port of Montreal 254 sailings of ships. My officers reported on and inspected 204 of these sailings.

Mr. CLANCY. How many ships ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman how many ships there were. But these were the sailings. There were so many sailings of the ships from Montreal. It does not matter very much whether one ship made forty trips or four. The other fifty sailings which were not inspected were at the commencement of the season when there were none of these products going forward. We supervised and inspected and reported on every sailing of the regular line ships that went forward from Montreal last year. We have the records of all of these sailings in the department. We placed in these ships self-registering thermometers which could record the temperature in the cold storage chambers and the ships' holds during the voyage. These instruments were taken out of the ships on their arrival at the ports in England by our officers who recorded the temperatures shown by the thermometers. We have a complete record of these temperatures. The hon. member for South Wentworth said we ought to do that. It has been done for three years past.

Mr. CLANCY. Could the hon. member give the House the value of the goods shipped by these sailings ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the value of them. All the butter shipped from Canada practically went by these sailings, as well as the fruit that went from Montreal and the cheese during last season. This was so much thought of and so well liked that I was gratified to receive a resolution from the Montreal Board of Trade and a letter from the buyers of these products in England. The following is a resolution from the Butter and Cheese Association of the Board of Trade, Montreal :—

The members of this association have noted with gratification the complete success of the cold air chambers system used on some steamers running from this port during the past season, and they feel they cannot exaggerate the importance of having it installed in every vessel carrying dairy produce from here next season. It is certain that having experienced the benefits of the cooled chambers last season the great majority of British buyers will next year insist on having all goods shipped in these chambers. The demand is likely, therefore, to far exceed the supply unless some effort is made to induce the steamship companies generally to turn all their available cheese carrying space into cold air chambers. This association believes it would be immensely to the advantage of the whole dairy interest were there no other way of shipping possible, than in cooled chambers, and it would heartily join in all efforts made to accomplish this result.

This is another communication which came to me from the Home and Foreign Produce Exchange, Limited, of London, Eng. :

A few steamers sailing from Montreal to London have been fitted with cool air ventilators, which have proved a great success in carrying Canadian cheese, and it is the opinion of the undersigned that the best interests of cheese importers would be served if all steamers catering for the cheese trade were so fitted. It is also the opinion of the signatories that even during the winter months it would be desirable to continue this system, as it is well known that heating in steamer's hold is caused by storage near other cargo, which has a tendency to create heat. The signatories would be glad

if the committee of the Home and Foreign Produce Exchange would take the matter up, with a view to furthering the end suggested.

The importance of these representations will be appreciated from the fact that the memorial has been signed by practically all the London firms importing cheese.

Now that the matter has thus been brought to your notice, I would urge that no effort should be spared to give effect to the wishes of the trade.

Yours faithfully,
JOHN D. COPEMAN,
Chairman.

Mr. CLANCY. Do the hon. gentleman's contracts not cover the whole season ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The contracts covered all the trips that the ships made.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, then, that letter has not much point.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is the kind of work that is being done. I want to say a word or two in regard to the cheese trade, a trade which has been the glory and the boast of the people and particularly the farmers of Canada for many years. We have made notable progress in this trade which commenced so many years ago. Many years ago, by the enterprise of the people of Ontario chiefly in the beginning, this trade obtained a high position and it maintained that position ever since until last year. Unfortunately, last year, in consequence of the heating of the cheese in the cheese factories, in the storing rooms here and during transportation, the cheese of Canada did not have as good a reputation on the English market as it had before.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will have a moment's patience I will give him all the information he wants and perhaps a little more. My hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) quoted apparently a statement made by Prof. Robertson before the Committee on Agriculture last year. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) intended to quote correctly, but as a matter of fact he did not. He said that Prof. Robertson prophesied that we would lose $3,000,000 on our cheese trade this year. Prof. Robertson as a matter of fact said $2,000,000, and I have no doubt that is a misprint, or a slip of the tongue on the part of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith). But the other misquotation can hardly be that, for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) was in the committee and he himself questioned Prof. Robertson. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) said in his speech :

Professor Robertson came before the Agriculture Committee of the House a year ago, and stated that owing largely to the bad ventilation of these steamships, our cheese, which is one of our largest exportable products and most valuable, had received a black eye in the old country market; that our cheese, which had stood in the highest notch, had received a setback, and he prophesied that this year our exports of cheese would shrink in value by $3,000,000.

It should have been $2,000,000, as a matter of fact. Then the hon. gentleman also said that instead of taking hold of it in a whole-hearted fashion, I neglected to compel the steamship companies to work the fans to ventilate the holds and that in consequence our cheese was injured in transit to England. As a matter of fact what occured is this, and this is what Prof. Robertson said :

Professor Jas. W. Robertson, Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying, was called, and continued his evidence, as follows :—

The next matter I wish to bring before the committee is the improvement of the cheese trade, with special reference to the need of better curing rooms at cheese factories. I need not go into details at length, as there is now in course of publication a bulletin for distribution before the factories open this season.

Last season our cheese trade got the worst set-back from poor boxes and heated quality it ever got. It is now in a precarious position. I do not know of a time when it was in a more doubtful position than it is at present. We got good prices in the summer, but hot weather in August and September caused the cheese to be heated, and much of it was landed in England in poor condition. It looks as if we might receive this summer of 1901 to the extent of $2,000,000 less from our export cheese trade, because of the bad impression made in England last season by the poor condition in which so much of it was landed.

By Mr. Smith (Wentworth) :

Q. Where was this cheese heated ?

A. In the factories first, from want of good curing rooms. In many of the factories last summer the temperature went up to 85 degrees in the rooms when it should not have gone above 65. Some of it was heated in the railway cars.

That was Prof. Robertson's statement, that was the evidence which the hon. member for Wentworth obtained from Prof. Robertson in the committee, but the hon. gentleman gave this House the impression that Prof. Robertson had attributed that difficulty entirely to transportation on the steamer from Canada to England, when as a matter of fact, Prof. Robertson said nothing of the kind.

Now, Sir, what are the facts ? For the last three years Prof. Robertson and my dairy officer have been urging upon the cheese makers of Canada to make a change in their cheese factories; to get better curing rooms so that the cheese could be cured in a cooler temperature. We carried on a number of experiments three years past; first scientific under a bacteriologist and afterwards practically in a number of cheese factories in the country. The same kind of experiments were carried on a little later at the Guelph Agricultural College, and the same kind of experiments were carried on next year in the Geneva Experimental sta-

tion in New York under Prof. Van Slyke. It was proved conclusively by all these experiments that cheese which was cured at a temperature below sixty-five was materially better than, and worth more than cheese which at any period of its curing or after handling was subjected to a temperature above that. We therefore urged upon the people of the country to so improve their curing rooms that they could insure a temperature in them below sixty-five degrees. I am sorry to say that the people were led away by the fact that next year they got a good price for their cheese as it was, and they disregarded this advice and these warnings. Last year they continued in the same way, and the result was that our cheese in England acquired a bad name, and we lost, I venture to say, at least $2,000,000 as the result of the disregard by the cheese makers of this country of the advice that was tendered to them, and of the facts that were laid before them in reference to the experiments conducted by my department and by those others to whom I have alluded.

Mr. CLANCY. The cheese makers say that is not so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The cheese makers will not say that is not so, in the presence of myself, or of Prof. Robertson, or of the experts who carried on the experiments I have referred to. I have stated the same thing at the Eastern Dairymens' Convention which was held at Whitby. Mr. Ruddick also went to the Western Dairymens' Convention at Woodstock this last fall, and he laid the same facts before that great dairy convention where the best dairymen of the Dominion congregated, and the result was that the people begged us to put in practice the new scheme which was suggested to them for trying to get over that difficulty. Not one single man in either of these great conventions stated what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy)—without knowing anything about it—dares to state here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I venture to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) that the Eastern and Western Dairymens' Associations for the province of Ontario, represent the farmers and the dairymen of this country far more than he does, and that they know more about the cheese business than he.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not give that statement as my own opinion at all. I told the minister that the cheese makers generally denied the statement, and they point out that long before the hon. gentleman's cold storage business they had established the Canadian cheese trade in England.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) does not yet know the difference between the cold storage system, and that cool storage necessary for the carriage of cheese.

Mr. CLANCY. I know it quite well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has made a statement which is not supported by the facts. If the dairymen of Ontario agree with the hon. gentleman, how was it, that at the dairy convention at Whitby where there were assembled 600 or 700 of the best dairymen of the province of Ontario, there was not a word of dissent when the statement was made before them by myself? If the hon. gentleman is right, how is it that at the Western Dairymens' Convention in Woodstock nothing of that kind was said by the men who are the leaders in this work, and who placed the cheese trade of Canada where it is to-day, while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has never had anything to do with it? I venture to say that the people of Canada; I venture to say that the members of this House will agree with me, that the men who assembled at these dairymen's conventions know more about the cheese trade than does the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose it is not necessary for me to repeat that I did not make that assertion on my own knowledge?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, but you said it was stated to you by the leading cheese makers of the country.

Mr. CLANCY. Quite so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I say that the leading cheese makers of this country are represented in the dairymen's conventions in the province of Ontario, and that any cheese makers who do not come to these conventions are not the leading cheese men of this country.

Now, Sir, we are hoping to get over this difficulty and we are prepared this season to try the experiment of central accummulating rooms for the assembling of the cheese for curing purposes. That scheme was laid before these two dairy conventions in Ontario, and it was also laid before the dairy convention of the province of Quebec. It was accepted by the dairymen who were present at these conventions as being a first rate scheme. They endorsed the carrying out of the experiment which is to be carried out this season, and so far were they satisfied with it that I have had application after application from people all over this country asking for information as to how they could carry it out at their own expense if they had to do so, but still more so requesting for information as to how to get the department to carry it out in their particular district.

Now, Sir, I have gone over these facts in general terms, and also to a certain extent in detail. I have laid them before the House because I wish that hon. members and the people of the country generally

should appreciate and understand, that while nobody on the government benches, least of all myself, wish in any way to claim credit for the enormous crops of Canada during the last few years; crops which have been so instrumental in stimulating the trade of this country; nevertheless we do believe, and I venture to say that I am prepared to give proof of it at any time and anywhere: that in Canada to-day, the government through the department over which I have the honour to preside, has been able to do a great deal to help, and to guide, and to direct the work of the farmers of this country, so that that work has been made more profitable to them than it was in days gone by. That is all I do claim and I think I can prove that claim. I believe that the trade returns show it; I believe that the records of the prices obtained for our exported products in the old country markets show it, and therefore I leave the matter in the hands of the House.

Now, Sir, I am not going to delay the House much longer. I am glad to have had the opportunity of saying a few words on this question. We have to-day an apparently clear cut division between the opposite sides of the House. We have the decision of the government that they should not make any changes in the tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite, through the mouth of the leader of the opposition, have put forward an amendment to the motion of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. It seems to me, Sir, that with the record of the last five years of the commerce and trade of Canada; with the record of the material development in the country; with the record of the prosperity which has reigned in every branch of business, in every industry of this country, amongst the great classes of producers—it seems to me that the principle embodied in the saying to let well enough alone, is the one that ought to guide us at the moment. If difficulties arise in the progress of the country, or in the condition of its trade, or its industrial development, and the government can do anything which seems to them likely to help that progress and development, to help consumers as well as producers, it would be no doubt their duty to take the situation into consideration. But with such a record as we have had during the past five years, with people coming into the country by the thousands to make this country their home, and with the productions of the country going out in such enormous quantities and bringing in such magnificent returns to build up this country, it seems to me that it would be a great mistake for us to change the condition of affairs which has brought these magnificent results about. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that nothing that the government has done has brought them about. The government have been in power five years and more. In 1897 we inaugurated a fiscal policy which was signalized by a reduction of the duties, and by a preference which has given us a great advantage in the English market, as it has given our fellow-countrymen in the old land an advantage in our market. The results of this policy seem to be magnificent in any way you look at them; and with this fact before our eyes, I cannot see that it is necessary or that it would be good policy to make a change now. If in the future any change is required, let the future take care of itself; but let the present conditions continue as they are, and I believe the material advancement of the country will go on as it has done so splendidly during the past five years.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to discuss the resolution which is immediately before the House, I will, like a great many others, digress a little to deal with the question of the census, which has been so largely dealt with by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and to answer some of the accusations which have been made by that hon. gentleman. I take some interest in the census, having been myself a chief officer for twenty-two counties in the eastern part of the province of Ontario, and I wish to say emphatically that the twenty-two commissioners under my charge who were brought here to receive their instructions from Mr. St. Denis, were most particularly directed to guard against any inaccuracies in taking the census. They were so carefully directed that that gentleman said to them: 'When you go home to instruct your enumerators, if you find that there is anything that you do not understand, communicate with Mr. Broder; and if he is out of reach, communicate with the department before you do any work. And yet the hon. gentleman charges this sworn body of men with having stuffed the census. It is a poor compliment to pay to 4,239 men in this Dominion, 1,300 of whom were in the province of Ontario, to say that they joined together as one man to stuff the census; and it was a poor compliment to pay to the reverend gentleman whom he quoted to-day to suppose that men under their instructions and guidance would foster anything of that kind. What are the facts of the case? Hon. gentlemen opposite were prophets a few years ago. They prophesied a certain increase in the population of this country; and when accused of spending more money than ought to be spent, their justification was that the population had increased wonderfully. Now, these hon. gentlemen are face to face with their prophesies, and they find that they do not agree with the facts; therefore somebody must be indicted. But I am glad to be able to say that the public have paid very little attention to the accusations of the Minister of Trade and Commence. They fell about as dead as his apologetic thesis fell a few

years ago. What are the facts? The increase in the province of Quebec from 1881 to 1891 was 120,508, while the increase from 1891 to 1901, was 132,444, in round numbers 4,000 more of an increase from the stuffed census to the present census than the previous increase. Now, if the census was stuffed to the extent of 40,000 names, as the hon. gentleman holds, how is it possible for the present census to go so much beyond the natural increase? And when you turn up 'Hansard' and quote the language of the Minister of Agriculture, when he was justifying the issue of that Côté circular, what do we find him saying? He said that the reason for it was that the French population left the province of Quebec and went to the United States. Why, I thought no person was now leaving this country. That was the reason the hon. gentleman gave for the issue of this circular—to reach the people who were leaving the province and going to the United States—a direct bid to stuff the census. I think there was an interview some time ago with Mr. Côté, in which that gentleman gave as a reason why the census of 891 was stuffed, that the enumerators got 3 cents per name. Well, if 3 cents per name induced these gentlemen to stuff the census, I wonder how 5 cents a name works. And when you come to the cost of the census, in 1891 it was not quite $500,000, whereas hon. gentlemen opposite have spent $1,000,000 up to date, and they have a year and a half before their work will be completed. I will give the hon. gentleman this advice, although he will have no census to take again, there is no doubt about that: but if he has, let him appoint his own officials, instead of allowing the premier of Ontario to unload upon him some one he wants to get rid of. That is what has happened. Mr. Blue was over the Mining Bureau of the province of Ontario, and the miners wanted to get rid of him, and they loaded him on to the Minister of Agriculture, and he has spent up to date over $1,000,000. Then, look at the number of men employed to take the census. In 1891 there were some 4,000 odd enumerators, but there are over 8,000 to take the last census. As proof of that I will give you the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture that they appointed an enumerator for each polling sub-division, and there are over 8,000 polling sub-divisions in the Dominion of Canada. Another thing I wish to say—that the hon. gentleman takes evidence ten or eleven years after the fact as proof against men who have taken a solemn affidavit to do a certain piece of work; and the reverend gentleman who sent in the statements which have been read, do not pretend to say that they are a full census of the people. If the hon. gentleman had read to this House the correspondence connected with the documents from which he tried to make out his case, he would find that they condemned himself most strongly. Some of these men gave evidence within three months, and some of these hon. gentlemen here have been hunting for evidence to justify the statement made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. The name generally applied, I believe, to the men who get up a brief is that of jackal for the counsel employed, and the Minister of Agriculture has been acting in this capacity for his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce. These hon. gentlemen had to pull the Minister of Trade and Commerce out of a hole, but it will take more than the Minister of Agriculture to do that.

What are the facts? The exodus is still going on, to the regret of every honest Canadian. And what kind of men are leaving the country? Young men educated in our schools, who are sent not only to our colleges but to our high schools and collegiate institutes in order to be fit for the business of life. These are the men who, finding there is no room for them in our commercial centres, have to go to the United States. After the state has educated them and their parents have made sacrifices to send them to school, they cannot find employment in this country, even in this era of boasted prosperity, and have to go to the United States. There is not a man in this country, who is engaged in business, who does not know but too well that there never was a time in the history of the country when it was so difficult to find business openings for young men of education and ability to make their way in commercial life. Let me cite one of these hon. gentlemen's own witnesses—no doubt an unwilling witness but none the less credible on that account. I hold in my hand the report of the Minister of Education for the province of Ontario. And what does he say regarding our population? All will admit that an indication of the population of the country is the number of its children. And what do we find? We find that the number of children of school age—and that age has not been changed since 1892—in Ontario in 1899 was 586,350 as compared with 595,238 in 1892. In other words, at the end of seven years after 1892, there were 8,838 less school children in the province of Ontario than there were seven years previously. There is one of the hon. gentleman's own witnesses. He may repudiate him if he likes, but there can be no doubt that his statement is a correct one. That is the present position. Let the Minister of Trade and Commerce give a little attention to these figures and see how they square with the explanation he made throughout the country in justification of our increased expenditure.

The Minister of Agriculture has laid a great deal of stress on the encouragement he claims to have given certain enterprises in this country. Does he pretend that it is he who has led the trade of the country in these matters to which the hon. gentleman has referred. If he does, no one will believe

him. Whatever development has taken place has been due to the efforts of our energetic business men who have been using every effort to push trade along. Does he pretend, for instance, that the cold storage under his control is adequate to the requirements of the country ? Let me inform him where some of our cheese is heated. It is not in the factory, but in travelling from one point to another in the country in order to reach the ocean port, and the heating is due to the absence of those cold storage cars which the hon. gentleman is supposed to provide. The cars were not on hand, supplied with this cold storage, and this cheese had to be put into red hot stations, where they had to wait for this cold storage accommodation. The heating did not take place in the factories. This we have on the authority of Professor Robertson and others. I have personal knowledge myself of what I am talking about, and I know that it does not make any difference how good your cheese is, if you get it heated on its way to market you may freeze it as long as you like afterwards, it will not recover its former quality. The hon. gentleman knows well that he started out with one kind of cold storage, and then found he had no ventilation and had to change it. He had to get ventilated cold storage, and that is why the ship-owners do not want to bother with him. They know very well that he does not know exactly what he is going to do.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The cold storage has never been changed but we have supplied ventilation in the holds of steamers.

Mr. BRODER. Why then did the fruit which the hon. gentleman sent out get destroyed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It did not.

Mr. BRODER. Why, the hon. gentleman, in order to explain his failure, told us that over in South Africa they were six years trying to find out how to keep peaches in good condition during shipment, and he is not any more clever than the people in South Africa. He will be six years before he can get a proper system. He is only carrying out the plans laid down by the late Conservative administration, and the gentleman in charge is the same one whom the Conservatives appointed.

The hon. gentleman takes great credit for having tried to help the farmers. But in 1896, when an estimate for cold storage was submitted to the House and when Mr. Foster, who was then acting Minister of Agriculture, wanted these gentlemen to let it go through, they refused, and yet now they talk about their endeavours to promote the interests of the farmers. The hon. gentleman asks us if we ignore the influence of the farmers institutes throughout Ontario. Certainly not, but he must not forget that the agricultural societies do not take so much stock in what he says as he thinks they do. I find in the 'Hansard' of 1902 that Mr. Bennett put the hon. gentleman the following question :

> Is the government aware that at a meeting held on the 5th day of February, instant, in the city of Toronto, the following resolution was passed unanimously by the Shorthorn Breeders Association.
>
> We, the members of the Dominion Shorthorn Breeders Association, at our annual meeting, resolved that the tubercular test is unreliable, unnecessary, and in many cases injurious, and that we urge its discontinuance of the compulsory use of toxine by the Dominion government Department of Agriculture ; and we also fail to see the object now of requiring ninety days quarantine, as there is no contagious disease in Great Britain requiring its enforcement to such a length of time.
>
> In view of the above action, is it the intention of the government to meet the wishes of the said association ?

What did the minister say in reply ? He said :

> It is not the intention of the government to act in the direction indicated by the resolution.

He does not pay much attention to these gentlemen nor do they pay much attention to him. Well, the hon. gentleman afterwards spoke for about a half an hour to these men trying to justify his refusal and they passed a resolution condemning it. So much for these societies view of the administration of the minister, and I think that the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario concurred in their condemnation of his administration. He is not in line with these societies, so that we must just take what he says about these matters with a considerable degree of doubt.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer. The hon. gentleman spoke of the exodus of to-day as being an exodus from south to north, instead of as formerly from north to south. But he omitted to tell us that if he and his friends had had their way in the past, there would have been no north country for any exodus to go to. That country would never have been opened up, and consequently there would be no people seeking it out as a place for settlement. But they are singing quite a different song now from what they did formerly. It was not so very long ago when they said : Let that country go, it is not worth bothering about. Very well, then hon. gentlemen have to admit that there is an increase in trade largely from the products of that country which was opened up through the efforts of the Conservative party. And when you deduct the bullion and ore, and the flour and wheat, which are the products of the North-west and Manitoba, the hon. gentleman's trade shrinks very rapidly. While we are on the subject of quarantine, I may say that the hon. gentleman takes great

credit for having raised the quarantine, or, rather, modified the condition between this country and the United States. I do not know what the hon. gentleman himself says, but his friends on the platform throughout the country say that Hon. Sydney Fisher, a practical farmer, convinced the American people that our cattle were free from disease. But, in the United States the cattle were known at one time to be diseased. Did the Americans convince Hon. Sydney Fisher, the practical farmer, that their cattle were not diseased? He opened the gates irrespective of that fact, and that is one of the reasons that we cannot get the embargo in the British market raised—the hon. gentleman has put that beyond all possibility. In fact, he has abandoned the attempt, knowing the impossibility of it, since he made this arrangement with the United States. He ought to have looked after Canadian interests, and I do not see much benefit to Canadians in sending a twelve or fourteen dollar animal over to the United States for the Americans to fatten and send over to England as worth seventy-five or eighty dollars.

The Liberal party all over this country are singing the praises of the hon. minister as a practical farmer. I question whether he has ever been between the plough tails. I question whether he ever intends to try. But I want to tell the hon. gentleman that in spite of all the boasting of his friends, in spite of all he has said, he cannot show where he has added one article to the curriculum of the agricultural text-books. In the Agriculture Committee, we are dealing with the same subjects that we dealt with in 1896. And you can go a good deal further back. Cato was asked by a person how to get rich and his answer was 'Feed cattle.' 'Feed them how?' 'Feed them moderately.' This was eighteen hundred and fifty years ago, and the hon. gentleman is discussing that question to-day. But this 'practical farmer' of whom his friends say so much does not do anything to fasten the people to the soil. What kind of farmers does he meet? He meets the farmer who gets up at nine o'clock and goes down about three o'clock to see how his bank account stands, not the poor farmer who rises before daylight and ploughs his furrow alone. The poor farmer of small means and in debt is not reached by the hon. gentleman. The man who can take hold and use the propositions laid down by the hon. gentleman is the man who has means to put up buildings, to buy machinery and improve his land. But the poor fellow who is looking for shelter rather than for a comfortable house, who wants to find a place to put his cattle where they will be out of the reach of the storm, is overlooked by the hon. gentleman, though he is a 'practical farmer.' That is one reason why our population is going away from the farm. Free corn, which the hon. gentleman talks so much of, was not intended for the poor fellow I have been speaking of. He can eat Johnny cake, but the bulk of the free corn is for the cattle in the stalls. When this poor fellow puts on his shoulder a bag of grain to go to market, he is overtaken on the way by a full bag of American corn to be sold ahead of him. This is the fellow the hon. gentleman has overlooked. What does the census show? That census must be a cause of thought to every loyal Canadian. We know that it will be impossible to assimilate the foreign element coming into this country unless the natural increase of our population is larger than the census shows. We are up against the fact that the foreign element coming into this country, not assimilated by our own population will never have the true Canadian sentiment that should be shared by all our people. Now, in 1901, we had a rural population of 3,349,055, and an urban population of 2,206,001, that is we had 328,464 more of rural than of urban population. But ten years before, in 1891, we had 3,296,141 rural population and 1,537,098 urban population, or a rural population greater than the urban by 1,759,043. We have increased our total population by 530,427, but our population of farmers has increased by only 52,924, and that included the North-west, where hon. gentlemen claim to have sent in, since 1891, 262,000. In other words, we have put one man on the soil and we have sent 9 to the town. And this under a 'practical farmer.' I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has not ploughed to the end of his furrow yet. His duty is hardly begun. This is a question that every honest Canadian ought to try to solve. It is a serious thing to think that this wide gate is open out of the country, that those who stand at the gate of life are able with less frequency to report a new life in which there may be great possibilities for the future. That question stands for solution not only at the door of the state, but also at the door of the church. You may have volume of trade, but the true assurance of economic prosperity and of social security is in the increase and assimilation of population.

Now I want to devote a few minutes to another matter, which the hon. gentleman touched very lightly. It is a question that I do not wonder he touched lightly. I find he was over in England last summer. I was glad to see he was over there. He made a statement there, which is reported in the Lancashire 'Courier,' while he was speaking before the Board of Trade. He told them that we did not want anything for this preference which we are giving them. The right hon. gentleman who leads the government had already made that statement a few years ago. But that is not the end of it. We see Mr. W. T. R. Preston bobbing up a few days ago at the London Chamber of Commerce, and saying, We do not want anything for this. How are public men in

England, however well inclined they may be to give Canada a preference in the British markets, to go to their people and ask them to make any sacrifices, when the premier of Canada, the Minister of Agriculture and their agents are singing out, We don't want any preference ? It is a difficult task for the public men of England to encourage or advocate a preference to the colonies in face of this Canadian government saying, We don't want it. These gentlemen are not honest in the interests of Canada when they make that statement. They say there is a great deal in sentiment. Well, Sir, if we follow the history of trade in the United States there is very little in sentiment. It is a very strange fact that the trade of the United States for the last forty years has increased and expanded as England's trade and colonial expansion has increased and expanded. The United States' expansion of trade with England has increased as England's has increased. But that is not the history of Canada. These gentlemen should endeavour to put Canada in the same relative position towards England that the United States occupies ; and, Sir, they are not true to the interests of this country when they make no attempt to do so. If there is one thing more than another that renders high protection necessary in Canada it is the conditions of this country. What are they ? As an English writer has said, the conditions which justify protection are, a country with large natural resources undeveloped, a high political and industrial outlook, and late on coming into the markets of industry. That is exactly the position of Canada. We have untold resources undeveloped ; we think we have the prospect of high intellectual and political advancement, and we know we have ability in the markets of industry. Therefore, the duty of Canadians is to stand by these conditions and to make the fiscal policy one that will develop those conditions to the highest extent possible.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—CANADIAN CASUALTIES.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Before the House rises at six o'clock the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden) desires to read an important telegram.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). I have here a message which has been sent from Capetown to His Excellency the Governor General, and as it refers to a press despatch which has been reported to-day in the bulletins, and gives further particulars in reference to it, I thought the House would like to hear it :

Capetown, April 4, 1902.

Governor, Ottawa.

'C' 3963. Following casualties reported. Daschpoort 138, Kleinhardts river, 31st March. 2nd Regiment Canadian Mounted Rifles. Severely wounded, Lt. R. H. Ryan, forearm. Slightly wounded, Lieut. George Baptist McKay, hand ; Lieut. R. F. Markham, arm ; Lieut. W. P. Louden, shoulder. Non-commissioned officers and men killed, 9 ; wounded, 40. Names not yet received.

(Sgd.) CASUALTY.

I may be allowed to add, Mr. Speaker, that while this is very sad news, there is this satisfaction to be taken out of it, that Canadians are maintaining that reputation which they have already earned in South Africa, and that they still prefer death to surrender.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SPRAGUE'S FALLS MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LIMITED.

House again in committee on Bill No. 37 to incorporate the Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Mr. Emmerson.

On section 10,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll). It has been agreed that an amendment shall be made to section 10, which reads as follows :

The company shall not take or hold within its booms any prize or unmarked logs, &c.

The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) suggested that this clause would perhaps come into conflict with the laws of the legislature of New Brunswick, but in looking into the statutes of New Brunswick I find that the only sections which would bear upon this subject are sections 5 and 9 of the Revised Statutes, chap. 133. Section 5 provides :

In any prosecution under this chapter . . . If the justice shall be satisfied upon sufficient evidence that the ownership of such lumber is in the claimant, or any person not being the defendant, he shall order the same to be delivered up to the owner thereof, or his agent, on payment of reasonable charges for keeping the same.

Section 9 says :

The owner of any such lumber may at any reasonable time, by himself or his agent, enter in a peaceable manner upon any mill, mill-pond brow, boom or raft of lumber, in search of any such property he may have lost; any person wilfully preventing such search, shall for each offence forfeit not more than ten, nor less than five pounds, to be paid to the person by whom or on whose account such entry may have been claimed.

These are the only sections that relate to this matter, and this section 10 of the Bill does not conflict with any provincial law, but as the hon. leader of the opposition wanted this matter to be made absolutely clear I have prepared an amendment to this section which reads as follows :

Subject to the provisions of any Act of the legislature of the said province, the company shall not take or hold within its booms any prize or unmarked logs and any person, &c.

Amendment agreed to, Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

ST. LAWRENCE AND NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill No. 39 to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

On section 10,

The company may construct and operate telegraph and telephone lines and establish offices for the transmission of messages for the public and collect tolls for so doing ; and for the purpose of operating such telegraph and telephone lines, the company may enter into a contract with any other company, or may lease the company's lines or any part thereof, and may connect its lines with the lines of any telegraph or telephone company.

Mr. SPROULE. If this is a general power given to this company all along its main line and branches not only for the purposes of the undertaking but also for the purpose of doing a general business it must connect with towns and villages, and before placing its poles on the streets and highways it should obtain the authority of the municipal corporations. We should put the same conditions in this Bill as those we put in a Bill last week and which we put into all telephone and telegraph Bills that we pass.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I think the Railway Act provides for that.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not.

Mr. HYMAN. Probably there is more restriction in this clause than there is in the general sense. It is quite true what the hon. gentleman for Grey says, that they are generally restricted 'for the purposes of the undertaking'; but in this particular instance they are restricted along the whole length of the line of the railway and its branches.

Mr. SPROULE. If you allow them to do a general business they must connect with villages somewhere and then they would depart some distance from their line.

Mr. HYMAN. They are only entitled to construct telegraphs along their line and can only use their own stations I suppose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is the way I understood it at first, but it would seem that the language of the section might empower the company to construct telephone lines elsewhere than on their own property. The section says that they may construct 'along the line of their railway,' and it seems to me that might empower them to construct along the railway but not necessarily on their own property.

Mr. McCARTHY. Suppose the railway line would take a circuitous route and that by cutting across they could save a few miles of poles and wires they should not be deprived of that privilege.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly not, but if they cross a highway they should be subject to having the consent of the municipality, and if they build on private property there should be compensation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I quite agree in that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the clause were made to read 'upon and along their line of railway' it would make it plain.

Mr. HYMAN. There would be no objection to that.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose they lease another line, what power would they have under this Act.

Mr. FRASER. They would take over the power of the company from whom they leased it.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition would cover the ground.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, read a third time, and passed.

STRAIT OF CANSO BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Strait of Canso Bridge Company.—Mr. McLennan.

On subsection C, of section 8,

Mr. SPROULE. Is there anything to provide that tolls shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council ? Does the Railway Act provide this ?

Mr. WADE. There was some doubt in the committee as to whether the Railway Act provided for tolls over a bridge, and therefore these words 'subject to the provisions of the Railway Act' were added to subsection C. in the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to make it clear that the tolls shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council before this Bill becomes law.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. If the words added are not sufficient, we ought to mention that special section of the Railway Act, so as to make it clear that it governs the tolls on the bridge.

Mr. WADE. One of the points raised in the Railway Committee was that, as there was some little doubt, it would be better to provide that the tolls over the bridge should be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. But instead of these words the words 'subject to the Rail-

way Act' were put in, which does not carry out the intention of the committee. I would therefore move that words be added making these tolls subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. It is the intention of the promoters that the Governor in Council should have control over everything.

Mr. SPROULE. I should be disposed to go further and provide that the Governor in Council shall have the power to revise the tolls and lower them if necessary. When we say that the tolls shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, then once they are approved, the company may refuse to lower them although they may prove to be too high. Once these tolls are approved and become law, and the company do not change them, the Governor in Council may not have the power to make any change. Then, what is subject to the Railway Act would only be the railway tolls. It would not apply to foot passengers or vehicles. There must be some provision giving the Governor in Council control of these tolls also.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I might also call attention to the fact that the Railway Act only regulates tolls on the railways. The company fixes the tolls and the Governor in Council approves of them. But bridge tolls, as a rule, have been treated as distinct from railway tolls, and there has been a special clause authorizing the Governor in Council to deal with them.

Mr. WADE. That is all I proposed. I submit that the words in the Bill do not correctly represent what was agreed upon in the committee, and I proposed to substitute the words 'subject to the control of the Governor in Council.' That gives continuing control.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I would suggest that it be made 'control and regulation.'

Mr. WADE. I am free to put that in.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be indefinite. What kind of 'control' is meant?

Mr. WADE. If it is by this government, it will be good control.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Make it 'fix, control and regulate.'

Mr. SPROULE. If the Governor in Council has the power to fix the tolls in the first place as well as to regulate them, that will be all right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Wade moves that the words 'provisions of the Railway Act' be struck out, and the following words be inserted 'the control and regulation of the Governor in Council.'

Mr. SPROULE. I do not like to object, but I do not see why we should not have the carefully considered clause which has been used in other cases. This does not seem to be very clear.

Mr. WADE. Put in both. The object of the company is to have the tolls absolutely under the control of the Governor in Council. I thought I had met the objection of the other side, having adopted the phraseology of the leader of the opposition. But if any hon. gentleman thinks it well to have the tolls subjected to the clause of the Railway Act, then, put that in also.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) does not understand the position taken by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). There is a clause which has been used in the acts governing other bridges, and it is suggested that this clause should be used. The chairman of the Railway Committee is in the House and could inform us about this.

Mr. WADE. It seems doubtful whether the provisions of the Railway Act cover tolls on bridges. But if we make this Bill subject to the Railway Act and add, with regard to this clause, that the tolls shall be subject to the control of the Governor in Council, surely we have it all covered.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. But, as I have pointed out, under the Railway Act, the company fixes the tolls and takes them to the Governor in Council to be approved. But, under the bridge clause, the tolls must be fixed before they commence charging at all. I do not wish to take up time, as we have only an hour and we desire to put through these other Bills. But if you provide that the Governor in Council shall 'fix, control and regulate' the tolls, you make it all right. If we do not put this in satisfactory form now, I fear we shall have it back from the Senate.

Mr. WADE. Where would the hon. gentleman suggest putting in the word 'fix'?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You will have to alter the form of it. If you make it 'charge and collect such tolls upon and for the use of the bridge and railways as shall be fixed and determined by the Governor in Council,' that would cover it.

Mr. WADE. I am quite content.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Make it 'as shall from time to time, be fixed by the Governor in Council.'

Mr. WADE. I move to add these words at the end of the section: 'Such tolls to be fixed and regulated by the Governor in Council.'

Mr. SPROULE. I think we should say from 'time to time.' What would be a reasonable toll to-day, a few years hence might be found very unreasonable, and the Governor in Council ought to have power to compel a reduction of tolls if necessary.

Mr. WADE. They have the power. A railway has to submit its schedule of rates

and classifications to the government, giving their maximum rates, and the government approves of it. But at any time after that, the government has power to alter the classification or to alter the rates. That has been done with railways, and it can be done here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Governor in Council surely can be trusted not to embarrass a company by making arbitrary and unnecessary changes.

Mr. SPROULE. Let us understand whether the government have this power or not, because if not, we shall insist upon the Bill being held over until we can have it amended. If, as the member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) says, the Governor in Council has power to change the rates from time to time, then there can be no reasonable objection to put those words 'from time to time' in the Bill, so that they shall have power to regulate and change the tolls.

Mr. FRASER. If they have that power now under the Railway Act, it is hardly worth while bringing it in here.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. One of the vexed questions under the Railway Act to-day is whether they can change a toll once they have approved of it. There is no authority under the Railway Act to levy a cent for persons or animals crossing the bridge, but only as to freights.

Mr. SPROULE. I move in amendment that the words 'from time to time' be inserted after the word 'regulate.'

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). There doesn't seem to be any great necessity for putting in those words 'from time to time.' If the matter is subject to the Railway Act, it seems to me the Governor in Council has already authority to regulate the tolls from time to time.

Mr. WADE. It may have a weakening effect on the charter. It may be necessary for that company to come to the government and get a rate fixed before they can finance their scheme. If it were known that that rate were subject to change, they might not be able to raise capital sufficient to build the bridge. If you go into the money markets of the world with a scheme to build a bridge, and you show that you have a fixed rate for a certain length of time, the scheme may be enticing; but if it appears on the face of the Bill that these tolls as they exist to-day may be arbitrarily changed to-morrow by the government, that provision would have a deterrent effect on financiers. Therefore, I think if the government has power to fix and regulate tolls, they have power to say that they will fix this toll now for five years, or ten years, or twenty years. We will submit to any provision fixing the tolls for a certain period. I do not like to have the Bill made hard and fast, or made in such a form as will kill the whole scheme. It is hard enough to get money now. The Bill in its present shape passed the Railway Committee unanimously after it was fully discussed. I do not think it is hardly fair that these technical objections should be taken, they can accomplish no good. The hands of the government are entirely free, when the company goes to have its rates fixed. The government is absolutely free to make any rates they think desirable under the circumstances, in order to give such encouragement to the scheme as may be necessary to carry it through.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do you go to the Governor in Council to get your rates fixed before you finance the bridge?

Mr. WADE. Yes, the company may have to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A railway company for example, does not go to the Governor in Council in order to have their rates approved before they finance their scheme. In all these cases you may trust to the Governor in Council being reasonable, that they will not arbitrarily change these rates from year to year. Any railway company is in the same position with regard to fixing its rates. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is reasonable. It may not be in the power of the Governor in Council ever to touch these tolls again, and I think they should have power to change them when they think circumstances require it. It may be that the tolls twenty-five years from now should be very much less than they are now. The Governor in Council must have the right to interfere. My hon. friend says the Governor in Council has the right to interfere as to railways; should he not have the same right in respect to these tolls?

Mr. WADE. There is this difference; in regard to nine-tenths of the railways in the Dominion there is a recognized rate which is the maximum rate that railways are permitted to charge. Therefore, if a railway is being promoted, the parties have the right to assume that they will be permitted to charge the usual maximum rate throughout the Dominion. It is quite a different matter in regard to a bridge, because, a bridge being constructed under circumstances of this sort, there is no arrangement as to the tolls they may be permitted to be charged and in my humble judgment I believe it would be necessary for the parties to go to the Governor in Council before they could finance their scheme and ask what would be the maximum rate they could charge. I do not think that would be unreasonable. The Governor in Council has the power to say: We will fix you this rate unaltered for two or five or ten years but only for that time. The Governor in Council is at liberty to

use his discretion as thinks proper under the circumstances.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) had been in this House a few years ago he would have remembered a discussion which took place in regard to the rates charged on the Victoria Bridge, Montreal. He would remember that it was contended that once the Governor in Council had fixed the rates he could not change them, and notwithstanding the fact that the rates charged then were much too high it was contended that the Governor in Council could not lower them. It is to avoid such a thing as that occurring in the future that we ask for the insertion of this provision. There is another thing which I would like to mention. We have a Minister of Railways and Canals and there are other members of the government who are responsible for looking into railway Bills and Bills of this kind. We should hear from them upon the subject. I am quite sure if the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was here he would agree with us, and put in a clause to regulate the tolls for foot passengers and other traffic.

Mr. WADE. These are the words that he suggests.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me very uncertain what the words are, because some hon. gentlemen say these are not the words that were put in by the committee. I think the hon. member had better accept this amendment, because I think that finally the Bill, if it passes, will pass with this clause in. I do not think it is unreasonable to ask him to accept the clause, and if the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals were here, I am sure he would insist upon it.

Mr. GALLIHER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, if I understand aright the amendment proposed by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that it would practically impose upon the government the duty of regulating the tolls from time to time, not giving them the privilege of doing it, but imposing upon them the duty of doing so. Instead of putting in this clause suggested by way of amendment I believe that if we simply inserted the word 'control' making it read 'subject to the control' it would meet every objection that has been raised, because the word 'control,' in itself, without limitation, means absolute control. If the Governor in Council has the control of these rates, he has the absolute control unless it is limited by legislation and he can fix the rates from time to time.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Here is the Bill prepared by the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) in regard to telephones and in it he places a clause giving the Governor in Council power to regulate tolls, saying that they must be approved by the Governor in Council before they are changed. The clause reads :

> Every by-law fixing and regulating tolls shall be subject to revision by the Governor in Council, from time to time after approval thereof.

Why would he do that if there was no doubt, because this is the same principle ? I have not had as much practical experience as the hon. member for Annapolis has had, but I have always understood that this was one of the vexed questions under the Railway Act, because, when the maximum rate was once fixed the railway companies have never wanted to change. But here, in this proposed telephone Bill, the hon. Minister of Justice proposes that this approval shall be necessary, and I think very wisely. He put it beyond peradventure. I quite agree with the hon. member for Annapolis, and that never struck me until he mentioned it, that it might affect railway companies in making through rates because bridge tolls might be of a nature which would make it extremely difficult for them to carry out their arangements. But, if the hon. gentleman is right in his contention that the Governor in Council always has the right to change railway traffic arrangements and rates after they have once been approved, then there would be nothing in his argument that that might injuriously affect the financing of the company. I do not know whether this is so or not but I do hope that when the Railway Act is consolidated the Minister of Railways and Canals, or parliament, will see to it that that question shall be settled and that the Governor in Council shall not only have the right to approve of the rates, but from time to time to alter them if there is any question about their alteration. I think probably the words that my hon. friend proposes to put in would enable the Governor in Council to change these rates, and I cannot see why, if they are not sufficient he should object to putting in the words 'from time to time' to make it clear.

Mr. WADE. No such provision, as far as I know—of course, I may be entirely wrong about this because I am not familiar with all the bridge Bills that are before the House—but no such provision as is now being sought to be incorporated in this Bill, has been asked for in regard to any other bridge Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes it has.

Mr. WADE. I am told that there has been no such provision proposed, and if I am wrong I will vacate my words. I can see difficulties in the way of putting in the words that are suggested, and these difficulties are to my mind difficulties which may be of much importance to the company. I am willing to assume this position that if any provisions similar to this have been included in the other Bills I will agree to this. I can see where it may be fatal to the

interests of the company and I do not want it to go in unless it has been included in other Bills.

Mr. SPROULE. Let us rise, and report progress and we can find out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. Mr. Fielding). I was not present at the committee when this Bill was discussed. Probably the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has had the matter under consideration and if the usual provisions in the bridge Bills are included in this that is all that is necessary. I would suggest that we proceed with the Bill, reserving this one point.

Subsection C of section 8 allowed to stand.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 52) respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—Hon. Mr. Tisdale.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Canadian Northern Express Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 87) respecting the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker, just before the House rose at six o'clock, I was interrupted in my remarks by the announcement made by the Minister of Militia ; an announcement which I am sure every one in this House received with mingled feelings of regret and pride—regret for the loss of the lives of the brave Canadians, the news of which will darken many a home throughout the land ; and pride, that they died bravely fighting for the British empire. But, Sir, I thought when that announcement was made that it would be well for hon. gentlemen opposite to put up their colours somewhere, and to emulate the example of these brave Canadians. I was proceeding to remark that the American expansion of trade was commensurate with the expansion of English trade and commerce, and I shall read some figures from an American authority to prove the statement I make. I want to say this: That the importance of the trade of the British empire to any country can be easily understood when it is realized that the largest political organization the world has ever seen under civilized government, the British empire, embraces 16,662,-073 square miles containing 387,000,000 of people. The official figures given by the writer to whom I have referred, tell us that one-third of a century ago the American exports to Great Britain amounted to $225,-090,224, and in 1900 they amounted to $533,-819,545 ; an increase in thirty-three years of 137 per cent. During the same period, the American exports to British Africa increased 1,013 per cent; to British Australasia 421 per cent ; to British India, 1,126 per cent, and to British America 322 per cent. In 1900 the American exports to the entire world amounted to $1,394,483,082, of which they shipped to the British dominions $702,070,-802, or in other words, 50·34 of the whole, and to Great Britain alone, they shipped $553,819,454, or 28·28 per cent. During the same year the United States exports to Germany and to all German colonies were 13·43 per cent ; to France and to all French colonies 6·22 per cent ; to Italy 2·31 per cent ; and to Russia three-fourths of one per cent.. I want to say here that while hon. gentlemen opposite say so much about the change in British sentiment and the increased trade in consequence of that change, let me point out that Russia, a country that has been particularly friendly with the United States for thirty years only takes three-quarters of one per cent of the American exports. The Austrian empire only took one-half of one per cent of the export trade of the United States. In other words, the American exports to Great Britain are four times the value of those to Germany ; eight times the value of those to France ; twenty-one times the value of those to Italy; seventy times the value of those to Russia, and a hundred times the value of those to Austria. The American exports to Great Britain are more than double the American exports to Germany, France, Italy, Russia and Austria combined ; one-third greater than to all the continent of Europe ; and more than the American exports to all the rest of the world.

In view of that, I wish to say that the gentlemen who have control of the government of this country to-day, should wake up to the necessity of endeavouring to get control of our share of that great market which is now being occupied by the United States. It is a singular fact that notwithstanding the large area of agricultural lands in the United States, agriculture has ceased to be the dominant industry in that country, and manufacturing has become the domi-

nant industry. Therefore this new Canada of ours, with her broad acres undeveloped, ought to put on her armour and endeavour to take possession of her share in that market. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, while boasting of what has been done in this country, has fallen far short of his duty in failing to take that broad outlook which any man controlling that department should take, and has failed to seize the opportunity which is offered to the Canadian people of assuming the rights that belong to them in that country. It is high time that England, which has been so long looking to Europe and the United States, should reach out her arms to this Canadian colony of hers, which is willing and able to raise the bread that her people require.

There is another matter in this connection of which I wish to speak. While we are boasting so much of the growth of Canadian trade, it is a singular fact that notwithstanding this preference, and since it has been put into full force and effect, the United States has sold to England more in proportion of the very articles we have to sell than Canada has. I will quote the following figures to prove that statement. Great Britain took from Canada in 1901 over £300,000 less in cattle than she did in 1900, while at the same time she took from the United States £700,000 more in 1901 than in 1900. Of sheep and lambs she took from Canada in 1901 £43,000 more than in 1900, and from the United States she took £236,000 more for the same period. Of wheat, meal and flour she took from Canada in 1901 £58,000 more than in 1900, and from the United States £332,000 more. Of Indian corn, from Canada she took in 1901 about £585,000 less than in 1900, and from the United States £2,500 less. During the same period there was a slight increase in her imports of Indian corn from Russia, an increase of £900,000 from Roumania, and over £1,000,000 from the Argentine Republic. Of fresh beef, in the returns Canada is not mentioned and it is therefore assumed that there was practically none imported by Great Britain. Great Britain, however, imported from the United States an increase over 1900 of £700,000. Of mutton, the increase from the Argentine Republic was about £300,000, and from Australasia about £600,000. Of pork, from the United States, Great Britain in 1901 took £260,000. Canada is not given. Of bacon, from the United States Great Britain took in 1901 an increase of £1,800,000, from Denmark an increase of £180,000, and from other countries an increase of £30,000, while the amount from Canada actually decreased by £150,000. Of ham, from the United States she took in 1901 £437,000 more than in 1900, and from other countries £1,650, while from Canada she took £142,100 less. Of butter, Great Britain took from Russia in 1901 £664,582 more than in 1900, and from Denmark, £820,872; Holland, £97,123; the United States, £431,340; and from Canada, £367,242. Of cheese, there is a decrease all along the line. Holland decreased, £42,597; France, £25,000; United States, £466,700; Canada, £91,440. Of fish, the United States increased, £108,300; Norway, £65,000; Portugal, £30,000; Newfoundland, £7,000; Canada decreased, £32,000.

This shows that Great Britain has bought more from other countries on an average than she has from Canada.

The Premier, speaking at Bowmanville in October, 1899, used these words:

> The merchants of England, the men who have to buy articles in the markets of the world no longer go to the United States to make their purchases. They come to Canada and this is the direct result of our preferential tariff.

The merchant in Great Britain wanted to buy cattle in 1901 and he went to the United States for $36,000,000, and to Canada for $7,400,000 worth. To the United States he went for sheep and lambs to the amount of $2,300,000, and to Canada for $475,000. For salted beef he went to the United States for $1,234,635, and to Canada for none. For fresh beef he went to the United States for $33,800,000, and from Canada he took none. For bacon he went to the United States for $46,279,255, and to Canada for $4,607,545. For pork he went to the United States for $3,814,965, and to Canada for none. For hams he went to the United States for $21,000,000, and to Canada for $15,000,000. For butter he went to the United States for $3,400,000, and to Canada for $5,000,000, to Russia for $8,000,000, to France for $8,000,000, and to Denmark for $40,000,000. For cheese he went to the United States for $6,300,000, and to Canada for $18,300,000. For lard he went to the United States for $18,700,000, and to Canada for none. For wheat he went to the United States for $67,000,000, and to Canada for $11,000,000. For wheatmeal and flour he went to the United States for $43,000,000, and to Canada for $3,000,000. For barley he went to the United States for $4,000,000, and to Canada for none. For Indian corn he went to the United States for $29,500,000, and to Canada for $2,300,000. For wood and timber he went to the United States for $3,750,000, and to Canada for $2,300,000. For leather he went to the United States for $16,500,000, and to Canada for none.

Now, I do not understand the force of the argument which the hon. gentlemen opposite attempted to use to prove that this preference has given us an advantage in the English market, in view of the fact that England's trade with these other countries is greater than it is with Canada. These figures disprove the contention of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is time that they woke up to the fact that they are not doing their duty towards this new country with its great resources. There is this difficulty with the preference, so far as the government followers

are concerned, that they seem to have no definite pelicy, and things have come to such a pass that the right hon. gentleman cannot now send out two of his ministers together before the people because they cannot agree the one with the other. One will denounce protection, and the other free trade. He has to send them out singly. If it is a free trade community which has to be approached, the hon. gentleman will say to it: Here is Mr. Fielding, my Finance Minister, he will do for you fellows. If a protection constituency has to be catered to, he will say to it: Here is Mr. Tarte, my Minister of Public Works, he will suit you. Then, when an appeal has to be made to a tariff for revenue locality, he can fall back on his old friend, Sir Richard Cartright, who will instruct his hearers by the hour on the advantages of a revenue tariff. And when he has to court a community where the people do not really know where they stand and what they want, why, why he can choose indiscriminately among the balance of his colleagues, for they themselves are at sea as to where they stand and are prepared to suit themselves to whatever the occasion requires. In fact this is simply an omnibus government, you know, Sir, what kind of a vehicle an omnibus is. It takes in all sorts and sizes of passengers, and you can get anything out of it under the sun, from that omnibus, but a straight deal. Free traders, revenue tariff men, straight protectionists, anything you want, this omnibus government has in stock. It has everything but a settled policy. And so clearly do these hon. gentlemen realize this themselves, that I doubt whether you will ever again catch the hon. the Minister of Finance at a banquet in company with the hon. the Minister of Public Works. Fancy killing a poor fellow in the house of his friends. Yet this was the fate which overtook the Finance Minister the other day in Montreal. He got the breath crushed out of him by his colleague the Minister of Public Works, and the right hon. the Prime Minister dared not side with either. Such was the exhibition which took place down in the city of Montreal, and it is high time that a decisive and a declared policy was given to the country. Yet despite all their diversities of views, these hon. gentlemen can act together as one man when it comes to sharing the spoils. That is the cohesive principle which keeps them together, and which furnishes the country with a spectacle never before witnessed in the history of responsible government.

These hon. gentlemen claim that they have done wonders because they took 2½ per cent off the tariff. Well, if that reduction has done such wonders, why do they not take off 2¼ per cent more and do still greater wonders. Do they believe their own professions ? If they do, they are not faithful to the interests of the country, because if, according to their contention, 2½ per cent reduction on the tariff has brought about this marvellous prosperity, they should go still further, and add to our wealth by making a still further reduction. And when some of their followers get up and preach the protection doctrine in the House, as we have heard them do during this debate, we find the leader of the government, and the Minister of Finance saying to them : Where did you get this doctrine ? This is not according to the text-books which we put into your hands years ago. But these followers of theirs, who declare for protection, know that there is a stronger schoolmaster outside. They know that they have to reckon with public opinion, and they are more afraid of that schoolmaster than of going back on their former principles. What did we see when this government came into power ? We saw an immense phalanx, composed of them and their followers, who were going to fell that foul tree of protection which was ruining the country. But they have not yet succeeded in knocking a chip off it. They brandished their hatchets but did nothing else, except trim off a few branches on one side to give the sun freer play and allow the tree to get the benefit. No one knows better than the Finance Minister that not a chip has been knocked off that tree since this administration came into office. These hon. gentlemen may cut down large trees in the lumber bush but they dare not meddle with this one. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) may brandish his little hatchet as much as he pleases but everybody knows it is rusty and that he has not the slightest expectation of doing any damage with it. What a sorry spectacle we have before us to-day—the spectacle of men who are afraid to declare what their policy and principles are because they might wake up in the morning and find that something else was necessary.

What this government ought to do is to secure in the English market for Canada the place she ought to occupy. If England were to put 4 or 5 cents a bushel on the wheat going to her market, other than the Canadian or colonial grown wheat, that would not only give an increased price to the Canadian producer but it would give him the first place in that market, which means a great deal more than a few cents on a bushel of wheat. It would mean that no matter what this colony might produce, we had a market for it. The first place in the English market is that which we ought to occupy, and that is what we can get if these hon. gentlemen would only set themselves to the task. Any man who follows public opinion in England must see that it is changing rapidly. We already find protective measures strongly advocated there with regard to a great many things. We find that the English farmers, for instance, are being protected by the embargo on cattle. We can see that in many other ways the principle of protection is making headway in the mother country, and hon.

gentlemen opposite should be ready to meet the English people half way in the interests of this country. If they would do this and if the responsibility were thrown upon the colonies of furnishing England with agricultural products, there would be a great increase in the acreage of wheat in this country in the very near future. If our Canadian farmers were aware that that market was there waiting for them, he would set about the task of furnishing it with all the agricultural products it can absorb. If there is one motto more than another that ought to be the watchword of every true Canadian, it is this : 'Back to the soil.' I do not mean that in any narrow, but in the widest possible sense. If we ever want to foster Canadian sentiment in this country, we must in every sense of the word, in our literature, in our trade, get back to the soil, and thus cultivate a true Canadian sentiment, not only in the interests of this country, but of the empire at large.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). In endeavouring, Mr. Speaker, to discharge our duties to our constituents and the Dominion of Canada at large, it seldom happens, unfortunately, that we can discuss any question upon which the different parties in this House entirely agree, but I feel that in the message conveyed to us by the Minister of Militia to-night, a subject is touched on which both sides of this House are heartily in accord. We all join in sympathy and regret that others had been added to the long list of those from Canada who have sacrificed themselves in South Africa for the empire. But also we rejoice that, while this loss has been sustained, we have the consolation of knowing that again the Canadian soldiers have acquitted themselves well in the field and have won for this country added renown. Casting over in my mind the many prominent statesmen who have adorned this country on both sides of politics, I venture to say that no act of theirs has ever brought Canada to the attention of Great Britain or stirred to the same extent the interest in this country of the people of the motherland, as the loyal response of the Canadian people themselves when England entered upon the present war in South Africa, the ready offer of service by our Canadian boys, and their valiant acts upon the field of battle in that far away land.

But it is my duty, my painful duty, to turn from things like this, to speak of the government of the day in this country. And, speaking of war, I am reminded that war always has a tendency to unite factions. The moment a country or a party is attacked from without, the rancor and hostility within that country or party are likely to yield, for the time, at any rate. To-day we have the Liberal party coming against the mountain, or the mountain coming against them in the person of the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The government, as we all know, was in a rather unpleasant position, as touching that good will which should exist among the members of a government. But there are indications to-night that the attack, the very justifiable attack, which the hon. member for North Norfolk made upon the policy of the government has been having the effect, though slowly, of closing up the ranks of the cabinet, and it may have even affected the desirable change of bringing about comparative harmony. We have indication of it to some extent to-day. Since the 17th of March, we have been discussing this question, and with the exception of the speech of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) we have not heard one word from the government until this afternoon, when the hon. Minister of Agriculture spoke, brought into line, no doubt, by the circumstances I have referred to.

I notice that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce opened his very long and very familiar speech the other night by saying that if he had closed his eyes he could have imagined himself back in the old days of twenty-five years ago, and thought he was listening to the Conservative party of that day. Well, Sir, when he listened to the Conservative party of twenty-five years ago, he listened to as able men as it has ever been the happy lot of Canada to possess. And I am glad to tell my hon. friend, and to tell the Liberal party of Canada, that the policy which Sir John Macdonald originated in 1876-78 was so broad, it was so much more than a mere matter of tariff policy, it was so far-reaching in its operation and effects, that it is a policy upon which a progressive, intelligent and patriotic party can stand to-day. I cannot return the compliment which my hon. friend unwittingly paid to us and say that if we had closed our eyes we could imagine we were listening to the oratory with which the Mackenzie administration was defended in 1876, 1877 and 1878. Anyone who listened to the utterances of the speakers on behalf of the Liberal party from 1874 to 1878, would be a very dull man indeed if he did not mark the contrast afforded by the Liberal party of to-day. There were giants in those days on both sides; but where are the giants on that side to-night ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Where, and oh, where ?

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says 'Where, and oh, where, and oh, where ?' When I stand up to address the House upon any public question, the House learns the position I take upon that question, though it be one of the great issues of the day. But when my hon. friend from North Simcoe rises, the question is 'Where, and oh, where, and oh, where ?' We see a peculiar state of things arising from the agitation which

has been created by the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk. The position in which the Liberals find themselves by reason of that speech is not at all pleasant for them. We saw the consternation that was depicted on their faces. But we can imagine that when another Sunday has been passed and the whole matter has been thought over, the government leaders to some extent may recover and next week we may hear from them. But, for the time being, the murmur went round, and the voice of the Liberal party was : We brought this man forth to curse the Conservative party, but behold he has altogether blessed them.

Now, I come to speak for a moment or two of some statements made this afternoon by the Minister of Agriculture. I may say at once that I do not propose to take up much time in discussing the relative merits of the census taking of 1891 and of 1901. It is not a question with the people of this country as to how the census of 1891 was taken ; but the people, realizing that they are living in the twentieth century, are asking what the government of the day is doing, not what was done by another government ten or eleven years ago. I wish to remind my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture that by blackening the character of the gentlemen who took the census in 1891, he gives no certificate, either to the gentlemen who took the census in 1901, nor to the minister who presides over the department under which that census was taken. I was struck with the answer that the hon. gentleman gave to the question as to what steps he took for the purpose of ascertaining that the information he got is correct. I venture to say that such evidence as the Minister of Agriculture placed before this House to show the truth of the statements he made, would not be accepted in any law court of the land. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture, devoting himself to agricultural pursuits, is not aware of what is required in order to constitute reasonable proof in the minds of the people of this country on that point. But I call his attention and the attention of the House to the fact that there is not at present any verification of the census of 1901 ; but on the other hand, we have evidence that the administration flagrantly transgressed in many instances that have already been brought to the attention of the House, and also in respect to the methods that were adopted in sending out circulars to the census takers. There is great reason to suppose that the statements that he made are of no value whatever, and there is great reason to believe that if an investigation such as he has made was instituted in regard to the census of 1901, an even worse showing would be made than he has made regarding the census of 1891. Now I think the Minister of Agriculture is hardly doing himself justice, or doing justice to the government of which he is a member, in trying to make a mountain over these little matters which he supported with such frail evidence. When an hon. gentleman occupying a responsible position tries to grow eloquent over such little petty circumstances as he did when he read statistics uncorroborated by any substantial evidence, it makes one feel that there is not much substance in his arguments. When he goes from climax to climax over the fact that in some lower Canadian households there are as many as 18 children, he hardly gauges correctly the intelligence of the members of this House.

But I pass over that question, and proceed to consider some questions that have been raised by other hon. members. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Sutherland) gave us the other day a very interesting list of the acts of this government during the six years that they have been in power. Well, I am glad he gave us that list. It is not very much to be proud of, if that is all they can show of what they have been doing for the benefit of this country. He might have told us of some other little things they have been doing, but he was probably endeavouring to make the same excuse that the leader of the government made in Toronto when he said that there was nothing to reform. Among the matters for which I notice the Liberal party are disposed to take credit, is the reduction of the postage, or what is called the Penny Postage Act. Now, Mr. Speaker, why should the Liberal party take credit for this penny postage ? Was there much labour involved in changing the rate of postage from 3 cents to 2 cents ? Did it involve much negotiation upon the part of the ministry ? I do not think they claim that it did ; what they claim is that this bright idea originated in the fertile brain of the Postmaster General. But I do not think that claim will stand investigation. If you inquire you will find that the idea originated as far back as 1896 ; when the Chambers of Commerce of the empire met in London, that was one of the articles of their programme which was discussed and endorsed. Coming as it did prominently before the empire in 1896, the year when this government came into power, it is not surprising that the Postmaster General seized upon the opportunity, and that this opportunist government seized upon the opportunity of making the change.

But I desire especially to call attention to some things that this government have not done, and that are matters of extreme urgency indeed. What have they done in regard to the regulation of freight rates ? Has there ever been a greater grievance, a greater iniquity, perpetrated upon the people than the freight rates as they exist today in the Dominion of Canada ? Why, Sir, it is a fact that the shipper for a short haul is compelled to pay, not merely the same as for a long haul, but in many instances even more than a shipper for a long haul. This is a grievance that calls at once for the in-

terference of the government, and they can offer no reasonable excuse for having allowed that grievance to exist so long.

Take the question of national transportation. If there is a matter upon which the great agricultural classes of this country have set their heart and which is of vital importance to them it is this question of transportation. Looking at it in the broader sense, if there is anything that would tend to secure a permanent advantage to the people, if there is anything which is a living question to-day it is the problem, the greatest problem that any one can address himself to, of solving the best means of carrying across this continent and in the direction of the markets of the world the products of the agriculturists and of other producers in this country. The government have practically nothing to do as this session manifestly shows, because the government have nothing to bring down for the consideration of parliament. If there is anything which calls for the attention of parliament, it is this question. Can the hon. gentlemen give us any reason, any excuse, why this matter has not been taken up and discussed by the representatives of the people and parliament, getting upon it the light and intelligence that will result from laying the matter before the public through the newspapers and so bringing to bear upon it the best views of the people? I know, of course, that there is the scheme of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). That has no practical bearing on the case, because we know that the hon. Minister of Public Works persists in announcing that this is only an idea of his own. He does not propose to pledge parliament to it and it cannot be treated as a government scheme. Therefore, we have no general transportation scheme for this country. The result has already begun to be manifested in the fact that the grain of this country which should pass through Canada is passing along American lines and that the grain which is being brought through this country is being taken to American ports for shipment. But, although there is no large scheme of transportation before the people through the instrumentality of the government we have an expenditure of money going on which would almost be sufficient for the inception of this large work and for its carrying out. We have little sums of money, sometimes considerable sums of money, and sometimes large sums of money spent here and there, everywhere, God knows where, because the hon. Minister of Public Works cannot even tell us where the place is; it is not on the map. It is at some hamlet, or some harbour at the mouth of a small creek at which money is spent and spent for what? To promote a summer hotel? But the idea is that it is spent at such places as this for the gratification of the parties locally interested and it is a fraud upon the country that should not prevail If there were some large, comprehensive, intelligible scheme laid down for the development of this country, then, we would not complain, but what I do now complain of is that when an election is coming on, or when an election is contemplated, these moneys are being spent in the various localities, not to serve the public interest, but to demoralize the electors. Am I right in saying so? If you go back just a few months to the eve of this session you have a very significant instance of that. I am glad to see that at this moment the right hon. the leader of the government (Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has returned, because he is one of the gentlemen of whom I wish to speak just now. Speaking of this expenditure of public money here and there where it is totally unjustifiable I want to call the attention of the House to the speeches that were made in Montreal just a few months ago on the eve of an election, and if you pay any attention to the speeches, the eloquent speeches, delivered by the right hon, the leader of the government and the speeches delivered by the hon. Minister of Public Works, you will have a very fair key to the whole situation. These hon. gentlemen vied with each other on that occasion during an election campaign, when they were trying to settle the differences between the rival candidates, in showing the magnificent prospects that would result to the city of Montreal by the contemplated expenditure of money. Mr. Speaker, I submit, that if we are going to have fair, ordinary decency in public life, if we are going to have any pretense of honesty this thing should come to an end and there should be a rule laid down as to the expenditure of public money. It should be expended upon some principle. It is not for me, a young member, to outline that principle, it is not for the opposition to make a policy for the government, but I would suggest for the consideration of the government that there ought not to be money spent upon harbours or on works which have merely a local significance, or which are of mere local benefit in a town or village or township. These matters are intended to be provided for by the township or town or village as the case may be. I submit that if there was a proper policy upon this matter formed, which would not be departed from, laying down that until a work had become a national work in which the people of the country were interested not merely a local municipality or village, then, something like an honest distribution of public funds would be arrived at, and until this is done there must be an unfair and dishonest administration of the people's funds. We also see that this government which has nothing to do and which the right hon. the leader of the government has said has nothing to reform, has allowed this matter of fast Atlantic steamships to still remain in abeyance. I would ask the government which was in such a hurry to come in, which was so anxious to do

better than the old administration what valid excuse it can give to the people for allowing this matter to remain in statu quo until the present day. Can the government plead a rush of business ? There is nothing in this parliament to do except to pass some private Bills in the interest of the railway companies and other corporations of that kind. It is well enough to serve these companies and incidentally it may be in the interest of the people, but when we come to meet here great public measures should be brought before the representatives of the people and I think it would be hard indeed for the government to find an excuse for its delay in this regard. Even in the matter of legislating with reference to the cattle guards question, they have delayed doing so without any reasonable excuse. A year ago we were told by the Minister of Railways that he had not had time for consideration, but a year has passed, nothing has been done, and we are again told that there must be another year's delay. I speak of these matters because they more particularly affect the interests of the farming community. There is indeed a long list of things which the government might reform, but which the government has not reformed, and which apparently the government do not intend to reform.

I have heard it said a good many times in this House by hon. gentlemen on the other side, that you may protect the manufacturers but that you cannot possibly protect the farmers. Well, gentlemen who make such a statement as that have not carefully considered the matter. If they would only look at the Customs Act they would find a long list of agricultural products that were protected under the Conservative government, and which retain a measure of protection to-day. That fact alone is sufficient evidence that you can protect the agriculturists. You can protect them in a direct way by putting a reasonably high duty upon the products of the farm, the garden, the orchard ; upon animals and their products, and upon all things generally which farmers have for sale. There is also an indirect protection which you can give to the farmers, and that indirect protection is given in this way. Wherever you place a duty upon an article which is required by Canadian manufacturers, which forms the raw material of their business, and which article can be supplied by the farmers of Canada, then you protect the farmer to a considerable extent.

We therefore have direct protection and indirect protection for the farmer, and if it is found that more protection is required there is no obstacle whatever in the way of the government giving our farming community that adequate protection. It is idle for the government and their supporters to try to make the farmers believe that the reason why they have not done more for that class of the community, is because they are helpless to protect them. I assert Sir, without fear of successful contradiction, that the government has it in its power to give adequate protection to the Canadian farmer as they can give adequate protection to the Canadian manufacturer.

I shall not take up much time treating of the budget speech because unless you enter into a dry analysis of figures, it is one of those deliverances which do not afford much ground for discussion. I call the attention of the government to the fact, that year after year the budget is losing its old time significance as a declaration of the policy of the party in power, as well as being a financial report. It used to be, as hon. gentlemen can ascertain by looking up 'Hansard,' that before this government came into power—under the Mackenzie government and under the Conservative government—we got a clear and explicit declaration of the policy of the party for the coming twelve months at least, either in the budget speech or the Speech from the Throne. But now the Speech from the Throne enunciates no policy of the government, and the budget speech outlines nothing as to the future except an expression of hope by the Finance Minister that prosperity will continue. We could as well discuss the policy of this administration from the public accounts as from any information that is vouchsafed by the Finance Minister of to-day in his annual financial statement. However, let me draw attention to some of the figures which have been placed before the House. The revenue for the fiscal year 1899-1900 was $51,029,-994.02, and the revenue for the fiscal year ending 1900-1901 was $52,514,701.01. The increased revenue of the one year over the other was therefore $1,484,707, or 2·91 per cent. One would expect that in these abundant times the expenditure would not increase at all events more rapidly than the revenue, but we find that the expenditure for the year 1899-1900 was $52,717,466.84, and the expenditure for the year 1900-1901 was $57,982,866.46, an increased expenditure in the latter year over the former amounting to $5,265,399.62, or 9·98 per cent. Therefore we find ourselves confronted with this result, that our income is increasing at the rate of 3 per cent while our expenditure is increasing at the rate of 10 per cent, in round numbers. And during this prosperous time when the people of the country might reasonably expect that there would be no increase in the public debt, we have the fact staring us in the face that there has been during the fiscal year just closed a net addition of $3,000,000 to the public debt.

We have this promising state of things announced by the Finance Minister, that we may expect by the end of the year which will be closed on the 30th of June next, another $6,000,000 added to the public debt of this country ; and yet the hon. gentleman, who seems to have got into that strain of

mind and that habit of language, says that we have reason to be thankful. He says that we must congratulate ourselves. That there is great reason why not only the government, who are enjoying the fruits of office, but the country and the representatives of the people on this side of the House, should be thankful for this state of things and desirous of its continuance. Thankful for what, Sir ? Thankful for the fact that, in a year when there should not have been one dollar added to the public debt of the country, we have an increase of $3,000,000 ? Thankful for the fact that at a time when, having regard to the revenue, we should not anticipate any increase, there is another $6,000,000 to be added, and that by that time this country will be in debt to the amount of 274½ millions of money ? Why, the hon. gentleman must think that we ought to be thankful for whatever we get. There was a boy, a midshipman, but in reality a midshipmite, who was taunted by his companions about his size. It was suggested by them that he could not perform any great deeds of valour. He wished to prove that he could, and one morning he went out pretty early from the ship, taking with him his gun and a piece of pork. He made a fire and suspended the pork over it, and so attracted a couple of bears. In the meantime he had got up into a tree. He fired a shot at one of the bears, and then he recollected to his dismay that he had left his ammunition at the foot of the tree. The companion bear, after devouring the meat, lay down to sleep, and the poor boy was in agony thinking what would happen when she woke up, because he felt that she would certainly climb the tree and devour him. Finally she did wake up, and he was preparing for the fate that he felt certain awaited him. Then he thought, like some wicked gentlemen when they think they are near their end, that he ought to say a prayer ; but, unfortunately, he had delayed praying too long, and he found it impossible to recollect a prayer. Finally he recollected the grace that had been said in the mess room, and he said : 'For what we are about to receive may the Lord——' and just then a rescue party came in sight and shot the bear, and he was relieved. The grace was never finished. That is what the Minister of Finance wants the people of this country to do. In the face of the public debt increasing by leaps and bounds, he says : 'For what these people are about to receive the Lord make them truly thankful.' But I do not think they will be.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have been so far.

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend says they have been so far. Well, he will be a better judge of that when another general election comes. There are means of carrying by-elections at the command of the government, which even members of the government would not like to have fully investigated or disclosed ; but when it comes to a general election, and these men have to face public opinion and clearly declare their policy, and say whether they stand for protection or free trade, and give an account of their extravagant expenditure of the people's money, I dare say they will find to their cost that the people are not thankful, but that they will be thankful to have them out.

Now, I am going to read from the 'Monetary Times' a few lines to show what this non-political journal thinks of this precious budget. Referring to the figures given by the Finance Minister, it says :—

> This fairly takes away one's breath, the sums are so vast, and the increase so rapid. Yet it is not recorded that Sir Richard Cartwright either swooned or swore, or that any of the old advocates of economy and reduction did else than cheer the minister as he placidly made these announcements on the authority and with the sanction of a Liberal government. And yet, apart from the change of front indicated in the party, these figures challenge the serious attention of every thoughtful citizen. Granted that the country is prosperous, is it wise to set so rapid a pace, and raise to such a height the scale of expenditures, which once raised it will be found almost impossible to lower ? It is well to remember that as the prices of staples rise—and there have been marked advances in price in many lines of recent years—the amount received from customs taxation rises, for it is largely ad valorem. Then, when prices fall, the amount of customs revenue falls. In prosperous times, with a buoyant revenue, is it prudent to spend it all and add so many millions besides to a debt already too large ? For $13 per head or $65 per family for one year's government is a tremendous charge. Giving all due force to the contention that we are a growing country, and must needs provide generously for the public services, this headlong rush forward in taxation and expenditure, seemingly unchecked by bit or bridle, invites reflection on the part of business men and thoughtful citizens. These piping times will not always continue, and the overdrain of to-day hastens the exhaustion of to-morrow. We cry a warning and a halt—before the rush has become a rout in which moderation and prudence lose their meaning and their force. At this rate we know not where we shall end, for, though the minister hints at limits to the tide of prosperity, he apparently sets none to the volume of expenditure.

I call the attention of the members of the government to this fact, that although the Minister of Finance, in his budget this year, seems rather more hopeful than he was last year of a continuance of good times, if we consult the great organs of public opinion or the great financiers, we will not find them sharing that opinion. On the contrary, there are indications that the good times are not likely to continue for very long ; that we are just about coming to the crest of the wave which the Finance Minister spoke of last year, and that we ought to prepare for the time, perhaps before 12 months pass round, when we shall be face to face with another state of affairs.

The London 'Times,' a valuable organ of public opinion, points out that Germany, France and Russia are already beginning to be sensible of a change, and suggests to the people of Britain whether there is not good reason to believe that a change for the worse is likely to set in there as well. Let me call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to the story of Joseph. I would not like to follow in the lead of the First Minister of the province of Ontario and mutilate the Bible, but it seems to me that an edition of special copies of the story of Joseph would be beneficial to the government of this country. That story was not written originally for private circulation or for the Egyptians or Israelites alone, but as a warning to all. It was written for the members of this government as well, in order to give them a lesson of prudence, in order to warn them to lay up in the years of plenty provision for the years of scarcity that are bound to follow. And the government would do well to lay this lesson to heart so as to meet the change which is bound to come very soon; and when that change does come, this country will view the course of the government in a far different spirit from that in which they may be disposed to regard it to-day.

I hear hon. gentlemen on the other side frequently ask what our policy is, as if they did not know. Again we hear hon. gentlemen on that side say that they know all about it. Well, I am not an experienced member of the House and do not propose to outline a policy for the government; and if I did and the government should adopt it, I fear, from the experience we have had that they would not give me the credit, but would assume the authorship themselves. I would like, however, to call attention to certain characteristics of policy and certain conditions which must obtain in this country to form the primitive elements of prosperity. Our great point first should be to get capital and labour. You may analyse all the various elements which go to make up prosperity, and you will find that the basis of them all is capital and labour. These are at the foundation of all commercial prosperity. A policy to be successful must be one which will have the effect of attracting capital and labour. There can be no complete development or utilization of our resources without what is called in the resolution of the hon. the leader of the opposition, a declared policy, and one which will attract sufficient capital and labour into this country to develop our latent resources. And in order to attract capital and labour, you must have two things constantly in your policy. It must contain a reasonable promise of gain and a reasonable assurance of stability. These were wanting in the policy which was in force during the Mackenzie regime. It failed to afford a reasonable return for investment and a reasonable reward for labour, in consequence of which the country was not able to pay its way. Under those conditions it appeared to many, and among other—as we now have it from the hon. member for North Norfolk—to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that some remedy should be adopted to assist the exchequer and afford relief to the suffering people of this country. Unfortunately, however, in their budget of 1876, although they declared that the condition of the country was bad, although they said that the government was not able to pay its way, they refused to make any change. The result was that soon afterwards, they lost the reins of government and a better state of things was inaugurated. The late Sir John Macdonald was the man of the moment. He was the one statesman who, according to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was able in the course of some two hours, between six o'clock in the afternoon and eight o'clock, when the House reassembled after recess, to frame, devise and frame the first of a series of celebrated resolutions. That resolution which he then submitted to the House was in these words:

> I move that the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved that this House regrets His Excellency the Governor General has not been advised to recommend to parliament a measure for a readjustment of the tariff, which would not only aid in alleviating the stagnation of business, deplored in the gracious speech from the Throne, but would also afford fitting encouragement and protection to the struggling manufacturing industries, as well as to the agricultural products of the country.

As it has been understood, Mr. Speaker, that I should not complete my remarks to-night, I would now move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 7, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

IRREGULAR PETITIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. Amongst the petitions which have just been read, those numbered from No. 33 to No. 45 ask for aid for the construction of a bridge over the St. Lawrence river. I have already decided that such petitions are out of order, because they ask for the expenditure of public money. I declare these petitions out of order.

ELECTION PETITION DISMISSED.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Justice Gagné, one of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions pursuant to the Controverted Elections Act, judgment and report in the matter of the petition for the electoral district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, by which said election petition was dismissed.

PRIVATE BILLS.

STRAIT OF CANSO BRIDGE COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Strait of Canso Bridge Company.—Mr. McLennan.

On section 8, subclause (c),

Mr. WADE. When the House rose the other night we were considering an amendment to this clause, and also an amendment to the amendment. Since then I have drafted an amendment which I think will meet the views of hon. gentlemen on the other side who had objection to the section as it stands. I have submitted this amendment to the Minister of Railways, and it meets with his approval. The object is, that while the company has the power to fix the tolls, yet it shall be under the jurisdiction of the government and subject to their approval. I regret that the mover of the amendment to the amendment is not present, because I would wish to ask his permission to withdraw my amendment in order to substitute this one.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member shall have leave to withdraw his amendment ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Let us hear the new amendment first.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Let us hear the amendment that he proposes to substitute.

Mr. WADE. The amendment I propose is as follows :

Provided further that no such tolls shall be levied or taken until the by-law fixing the same has been approved by the Governor in Council and the same published as provided by section 227 of the Railway Act ;

And further provided that such by-law shall be subject to revision as provided by section 228 of the Railway Act; and for the above purpose of approval and revision, said sections 227 and 228 of the Railway Act shall apply mutatis mutandis to any by-law of the company fixing such tolls.

Section 223 of the Railway Act authorizes the company by by-laws to fix railway tolls; section 227 provides that they cannot collect any of these tolls until the same have been approved by the Governor in Council and until they have been published for two weeks in the 'Canada Gazette'; section 228 provides that any toll so fixed or approved by the Governor in Council shall be subject to revision by the Governor in Council. I objected to having the words from 'time to time' appear on the face of the charter——

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Carried, carried.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The proposition of the hon. member gives the company power to fix tolls, but does not give the Railway Committee of the Privy Council power to reduce those tolls without the company's consent.

Mr. WADE. That is provided for in section 228.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I think the section as proposed is all right. The only criticism I would pass upon it would be that it might be put in the form of a clause of eight or ten words to the effect that the right of the company to levy tolls would be subject to the provisions of the Railway Act. However, I have no objection to the clause as it is drawn, for the Railway Committee of the Privy Council will have power to reduce the tolls, and no tolls will be legally recoverable unless the Governor in Council approves of the by-law fixing them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is perfectly correct, that it would be better to have a short clause which would make this undertaking subject to the provisions of the Railway Act ; and it ought to go further and make the undertaking subject to that Act as amended from time to time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would follow.

Mr. WADE. There is a clause in the Bill providing that the Railway Act shall apply to the undertaking. But I would like to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to one or two features of the Railway Act as amended in 1899 with respect to these bridges. There were express provisions made at that time giving power to fix tolls for foot passengers and for carriage passengers ; but inasmuch as the word company in the Railway Act only refers to a railway company, a doubt arose as to whether that would be sufficient to enable the company to fix tolls on this bridge. Therefore it was necessary to put in a clause to make that clear ; and when we throw around it all the safeguards which are applied to railways, I think we have met every objection.

Amendment (Mr. Wade) moved at a former meeting of the committee withdrawn ; amendment now moved agreed to ; Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 49) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of John Westren.—Mr. Campbell.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Canadian Northern Telegraph Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—Mr. Harty.

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 91) respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

QUESTIONS.

ALPHONSE THOMAS, LAPRAIRIE, POSTMASTER—DISMISSAL.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the date of the dismissal of Alphonse Thomas, postmaster, Laprairie, P.Q. ?

2. What is the reason of said dismissal ?

3. Who recommended or asked for said dismissal ?

4. Was any inquiry held before said dismissal, and with what result ?

5. Who recommended the appointment of the new postmaster ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) : I. Mr. Alphonse Thomas, late postmaster of Laprairie, Quebec, was removed from that office on the 1st December, 1901.

2. Mr. Thomas was removed from the postmastership of Laprairie for having used the position which he also held, as caretaker of the Laprairie post office building in endeavouring to extort money from contractors doing work on such building, the accounts for all such work being certified by him. In view of his improper dealings as caretaker, he was considered an unsuitable person for the position of postmaster, and was therefore removed from that office.

3. The charges against the postmaster were presented by Mr. D. Monet, M. P.

4. A very full inquiry into the matter was made by the post office inspector and the correctness of the charges being established, the postmaster was dismissed.

5. The new postmaster of Laprairie was appointed on the nomination of Mr. Monet, M. P.

I.C.R.—St. OCTAVE STATION.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. To whom did the government accord the contract for the construction of the St. Octave station ?

2. Did the government previously call for tenders for the said contract ?

3. What was the amount of the lowest tender ?

4. What is the price mentioned in the contract accorded by the government ?

5. Why was not the lowest tender accepted by the government ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair :

1. To Timothy Landry.

2. Yes. Tenders were called for the said work and several were received.

3. The amount of the lowest tender was $4,500.

4. $4,000.

5. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer, but at a sum lower than his tender, which was considered too high by the department.

CENSUSES.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

What was the total cost of taking the census for 1881 and 1891 respectively ?

What has the census for 1901 cost up to the present date ?

What will be the probable cost to complete it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I beg to reply :—

1881..	$456,904 19
1891..	570,115 54
1901..	986,296 98
About	183,703 02

Making a total of $1,170,000 as the cost of the census of 1901.

ST. LAWRENCE CANAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What amount was expended in paying the employees of the canals on the St. Lawrence during the years 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1901, respectively ?

2. What amount was collected by the government on said canals during the said years ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The amount expended in paying the employees of the canals on the St. Lawrence during the years 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1901 respectively, is as follows :—

Year ending June 30, 1896.. ..	$148,826 35
" " " 1897.. ..	137,543 58
" " " 1898.. ..	145,623 93
" " " 1899.. ..	150,291 28
" " " 1901.. ..	190,848 77

2. The amount collected by the government on the said canals, during the said years is as follows :—

Year ending June 30,	1896.. ..	$120,256	30
" "	1897.. ..	122,437	69
" "	1898.. ..	128,338	31
" "	1899.. ..	141,979	55
" "	1901.. ..	147,637	90

RIFLE RANGES BELOW MONTREAL.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What amount of money has been expended in improvements at the new rifle ranges below Montreal ?
2. To whom has the money been paid ?
3. What amount remains due on the price of the land ?
4. What was the amount of the contract for improvements on said new rifle ranges.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). The answer is :

1. $34,960.50.
2. Lyons & White, Ottawa, for construction, $34,369; Arthur Demers, Montreal, superintending work, $342.50; R. W. Allan, Montreal, superintending work, $249.
3. All the land bought by the department has been paid for. One or two more small parcels may be required, but the matter is under consideration.
4. Main contract for construction, $33,789; store shed, $300; target sheds, extra telephone instruments, extra firing point numbers, &c., $500; fences, 98 cents per rod, estimated at $1,280, total $35,869.

PURCHASE OF HAY FOR WAR OFFICE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What quantity of hay has been purchased since 1899 for the War Office by the government in the province of Quebec ?
2. How much per ton was paid for said hay ?
3. From what parties, firms or companies was said hay purchased ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). This question relating entirely to the business of the Imperial War Office, I am not at liberty to answer.

PAMPHLET 'REGULATIONS FOR RIFLE ASSOCIATION.'

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Morin—asked :

1. Did the Department of Militia and Defence publish, in 1901, a pamphlet entitled 'Regulations for Rifle Associations, with extracts from Musketry Regulations, 1898 ?'
2. Why has the government not yet published the French version of that important pamphlet?
3. Who has charge of the translation of that pamphlet ?
4. Is the government aware that the French language is still spoken in this country ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). The French version of this pamphlet has been published and issued, and the translation was made at the Government Printing Bureau. I beg to lay on the Table of the House copies of both English and French versions.

CENSUS—COST IN EAST AND NORTH SIMCOE.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What was the cost of taking the census in East and North Simcoe, respectively, in 1891 and in 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The following figures will give the answer to the hon. gentleman's question :

	1891.	1901.
East Simcoe..	$2,304 48	$4,465 79
North Simcoe..	1,728 62	2,890 05

THOMAS RICKETTS, POSTMASTER, GILMOUR, ONT.

Mr. CARSCALLEN—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Has Mr. Thomas Ricketts, postmaster of Gilmour, been removed ? If so, when was he removed, and for what reason ?
2. Were any charges made against him or against the management of the office ? If so, by whom, and when ?
3. Was any investigation made into the conduct of the office ? If so, by whom, and what report was made ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). The Gilmour post office has been kept by Mr. Thomas Ricketts, the postmaster, in a public hotel, or boarding house, where liquor was sold. This was considered an unsuitable place and the office was removed. In its removal to a more desirable location, it became necessary to appoint another person to the postmastership, and Mr. Ricketts ceased therefore to be postmaster.

There were no charges against the postmaster personally or against the management of the office apart from the objections to its situation.

An investigation as to the management of the office was not considered necessary, as the information came from a source that was regarded as thoroughly reliable.

SUPREME COURT—LEAVE OF ABSENCE OF JUDGES.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What judges of the Supreme Court of Canada have obtained leave of absence from the government, or from the Department of Justice, during the past five years ?
2. What has been the duration of the leave in each case ?
3. For what reason has leave of absence been granted in each case ?
4. Is it a fact that only one-half of the cases brought before the Supreme Court during the last five years has been heard and adjudicated upon by the full bench ; and if not, then what

proportion of such cases has been judged by the entire court ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) :

1. In 1897, Chief Justice Strong and Mr. Justice Sedgewick. In 1898, 1899 and 1900, none of the judges absented themselves. In 1901, Chief Justice Strong and Mr. Justice Taschereau were absent.

2. In 1897, Chief Justice Strong was absent six months, in 1901, four months; in 1897, Mr. Justice Sedgewick was absent for two months and in 1901, Mr. Justice Taschereau was absent one month.

3. In 1897, Chief Justice Strong was absent to visit England, to be sworn of Her Majesty's Privy Council and to attend the sittings of the Privy Council. In 1901, Chief Justice Strong was absent on account of ill health, and, the same year, to attend the Privy Council. Mr. Justice Sedgewick was absent in 1897 to visit England, and in 1901, Mr. Justice Taschereau was absent to visit the maritime provinces.

4. The number of cases argued in the Supreme Court of Canada, from the 1st of April, 1897, to the 1st of April, 1902, was 494, and in 16 of these cases all the judges sat to hear the argument.

JAPAN EXPOSITION.

Mr. LEMIEUX (by Mr. Talbot) asked :

Is it the intention of the government that Canada shall take part in the Japan Exposition, to be held in 1903 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Mr. Fisher). Yes.

MAIL BETWEEN CACOUNA AND RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Was the contract for carrying the mail between Cacouna and the railway station cancelled by the present government in 1896, and why ?

2. After the cancellation of the said contract, was a new contract entered into for the said transport of the mail for four years at 5½ cents per trip ?

3. After the expiration of this contract, has the carrier had 25 cents per trip without tender or contract ?

4. For how long has the government so paid 25 cents per trip ?

5. Were new tenders asked for this service in the month of February last, such service to commence on the 1st April, 1902 ?

6. Who was the lowest tenderer ?

7. Why was his tender not accepted ?

8. What tender has been accepted ?

9. Is the contract signed ? When will the new service by contract commence ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. The contract for the conveyance of the mails between Cacouna and railway station, contractor, Thomas Dionne, frequency (12 trips in summer, 6 trips in winter), cost $149 per annum, was terminated after three months' notice to the contractor on the 31st of January, 1897, because of not having been awarded after public tender, and as the price was considered too high.

2. Tenders were invited in December, 1896, and a new contract entered into on the 1st of February, 1897, with the lowest tenderer at 16½ cents per trip, estimated at $129 per annum. This contract terminated on the 31st of December, 1900.

4. The service has been performed since the 1st of January, 1901, at 25 cents per trip, the best rate obtainable by the inspector for a temporary service.

5. Tenders were not invited until January last. In the absence of the head of the branch, it cannot be ascertained why tenders were not invited sooner.

7. The department did not feel at liberty to award the contract to the lowest tenderer as he was reported to be mentally unfit for the responsibilities of the position.

8. The next lowest tender was accepted and, on the first instant, sent to the inspector with instructions to execute a contract.

9. The department has not yet learned whether it has been executed. If the hon. gentleman will renew his question at a later date, after a contract has been entered into, full information as to names and amounts of tenders will be given. The department does not think it in the public interest to give particulars of tenders until contracts are executed.

OFFICIAL OBSERVANCE OF THE KING'S BIRTHDAY.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

Is it the intention of the government, as announced in the Liberal press, to introduce a Bill fixing the 24th May as the day of official observance of the King's birthday.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The attention of the government has been called to this subject, but no decision has been reached on it.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Before resuming the course of the argument, I was endeavouring to present to the House when the debate was adjourned on Friday evening, I wish to call attention to a paragraph which appears in the Montreal 'Herald' :

The opposition's story was told by two members in succession, Mr. Broder and Mr. Lennox. Both

told the same story of broken pledges and big expenditures and made the same apologies for the prosperity of the country that have been made by all the Conservative speakers.

Items of this character are not, in themselves, important. But inasmuch as neither the hon. gentleman who preceded me nor myself addressed our arguments in the line spoken of, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact, and also for the reason that we find this organ supporting the government—and it appears, as some one says, a subsidized organ—in this instance, as in some other instances, has referred to arguments as being advanced by this side of the House which were not advanced. We know that conscience makes cowards of us all, and the Liberal party, conscious of their weakness in these matters as well as in a variety of other matters, imagine that the opposition must be talking of this matter even though they do not refer to it.

Now, when I concluded my remarks the other evening, I was referring to the condition of the country in 1878, and was pointing out the deplorable condition in which the country then stood. Canada had in fact reached the parting of the ways; it was more than the parting of the ways, because the government had acknowledged defeat, they had acknowledged that they were unable from the resources of the country, to carry on the affairs of the country. Canada had, in a commercial and industrial sense, actually abandoned the field, and was going backwards. I need not remind the House who came to the rescue on that occasion. He may be an efficient general who, upon the battle field, casts about him to ascertain the position of the enemy, the strength of the enemy, and lines up his own army in an efficient battle array. He is perhaps a brilliant general who, when victory trembles in the balance, rushes to the head of his forces, stays a threatened retreat, and holds them in line. But, Sir, he is a prince of soldiers who, when panic has set in, when confidence has been lost, when the army has commenced to retreat, when all seems lost, comes and rallies the soldiers, stays their retreat, and ultimately, after reorganizing them, leads them on to victory. I need not tell the House who was that man, that father of his country, that saviour of Canada, in 1878.

Now, this newspaper says that I referred to the prosperity of the country, and tried to apologize for it. I do not need to apologize for the success of the country. The success of the country, as is known to every thoughtful Canadian, as is known to every statesman the world around, is owing to two things, and two things alone: To the general prosperity of the commercial world and to the magnificent policy, so far as it relates to Canada, that was inaugurated in 1878. I refer now to the condition of things which succeeded the declaration of policy, and the magnificent campaign that was carried on by the Conservative party, ably led by Sir John A. Macdonald, the greatest Canadian statesman, and one of the greatest statesmen of the British Empire. Almost immediately that declaration of Sir John A. Macdonald reanimated the country. I wish to point out this fact, that you may make your policies what you will, you may argue as you will, but unless you animate a country with hope, unless you can point it to something to be accomplished, you will never succeed in building up a nation. So I cast back the statement of the Minister of Agriculture when he told us, in winding up that somewhat tedious speech of his the other day, as a conclusion of the whole matter, that the future of the country must take care of itself. If that is the theory of the Minister of Agriculture for assisting this country, if that is all he can do for agriculture, if he cannot point to a line of policy which will develop the varied resources of this country, if he cannot adapt himself to changing conditions and map out a line of conduct which will enable us to compete for the commerce of the world with other nations, then I submit that the country will pronounce him not exactly fit for the position he occupies.

Now, after 1878, after the victory that was then achieved, it goes without saying that Sir John A. Macdonald inaugurated the policy upon which he won. The Conservative party, Mr. Speaker, always carried out in the House the policy which they advocated in the country. I tell the hon. gentlemen opposite who talk about standing by the old policy of 1878, and that we stood, and stand, by the old policy of redeeming our pledges made to the people at the time of the elections. We had great success by reason of the national policy introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald, but we had not complete success, and perhaps that admission will give a grain of comfort to the cabinet and their followers. I have said that absolute certainty of the continuance of a policy is essential to its successful operation. After Sir John A. Macdonald inaugurated the policy, what attitude did the opposition of that day assume? Why, Sir, instead of acting like a loyal opposition in the interests of the country, instead of giving the policy a fair trial, they went up and down the country, many of them saying what they did not believe, traducing the policy, and declaring that it would be reversed on the first opportunity, trying to drive the young men out of this country, trying to stem the tide of immigration into this country. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), more unfaithful than most of his party, by his speeches in this House and throughout the country, by his writings in English papers such as the 'Economist' did not cease to vilify the policy and administration of the Conservative party, to disgrace Canada, to deter immigrants from coming here and

to drive away our young men from this country.

I say it is the essence of a policy that it should be stable, and therefore it is little wonder that at the present time these gentlemen can point to some measure of success. They are practically carrying out the policy that was inaugurated by our great Canadian statesman, they have enforced it in a large degree, and to that fact I attribute the prosperity which the country now enjoys; and so far as that policy fails to procure for Canada all the prosperity which she ought to enjoy, it is owing to the fact that they have tinkered with the tariff, and have never risen to the height of realizing its full scope, nor have they adequately carried it out.

I will tell these hon. gentlemen a story, and they have always been fond of American authorities until recently, that was told by Chauncey Depew. He said that some few years ago there was in a village not far from the city of New York an excitement because it had been proclaimed that the end of the world would occur on a certain night at twelve o'clock. It unsettled the minds of the people as uncertainty of the future always does unsettle and unhinge people's minds. Some of the people sold their property at a sacrifice, some abandoned work and on the last day a number of them—and I trust hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will take this lesson to heart—began to pray. Among them was an old shoemaker who had promised a pair of boots to Mrs. Brown for the next day. He prayed fervently, and as it approached twelve o'clock he prayed more fervently still. When it came to twelve o'clock he found that no change had occurred, but he thought that it would be better to pray a little longer. There might be a difficulty about the exact time. He continued praying for perhaps half an hour and then said—and this is the point I wish to impress upon hon. gentlemen opposite as to the necessity of certainty in fiscal matters—O Lord, if the end of the world is coming, let me know right now, but if the end of the world is not coming, O Lord may it please you to say so, because I must have Mrs. Brown's boots ready at twelve o'clock to-morrow; there is nothing that knocks business out like this uncertainty. We have had, therefore, a better state of things since the government came into office in that regard. We have not had a disloyal opposition, but we have had a loyal opposition, not traducing the country but willing to give the government a fair chance to carry on public affairs. We have not had a complaining opposition, but we have had members on ooth sides of the House uniting, whether acknowledging it or not, because the government has not had the candour to acknowledge it, in upbuilding the national policy and the policy of protection in this country, so that with a ready made policy and with a loyal opposition supporting it, taken in conjunction with years of great plenty, we should have comparative success. Now, I wish to refer to some circumstances which are unique in a sense in connection with this debate. We have a decidedly unusual state of things. In the words of the man in the street, 'things are coming our way.' First, we have the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and his speech is yet fresh in our minds. I venture to say that a more significant speech, one of more far-reaching effect, one that is more calculated to shake the confidence of the people of Canada and of the world, for that matter, in the truth and candour of the existing government has not been uttered. Taken in connection with the statement of the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in reference to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and with the utterances of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who is declared to have taken exactly the same line as the hon. member for North Norfolk, it establishes beyond refutation that for a quarter of a century we have had the leading men of the Reform party, the men whom the Reform party looked up to, the men whom they believed to be honest, going about this country proclaiming that which they did not believe to be true and denouncing and defaming the policy in which they actually believed. A more significant state of things has not existed in Canada for a long time. Now, there is more than that. We have what we would expect and what does not trouble my mind at all, and that is a good deal of wrangling in that party over that same speech. We have the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) on the right and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) on the left, who, with the hon. member for North Norfolk, are the leaders of the Liberal party outside of the government, and we have these two hon. gentlemen attacking the hon. member for North Norfolk. At the same time we have the hon. member for Russell attacking and threatening the government. He is getting shaky about the government; he does not know where they stand; and who does know where they stand? Is there a man in Canada, who, if you were to divide that government, knows how many would stand on one side and how many on the other? I do not know. He holds them up—and history repeats itself—as they were held up in 1878 by a contingent from the maritime provinces. He says: Go one step farther and I will denounce you. An hon. member on the other side of the House farther back, on Friday evening did the same thing. So it is all over the House. The hon. member for Russell speaks as if he were in earnest. I do not know whether he is or not. I would believe every word he uttered was perfectly sincere only for one thing, which makes me feel that I do not know where I stand in that regard, and that is the fact

that we had the declaration of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and the avowal of the hon. member for North Norfolk—both of whom proclaimed their convictions in language quite as vehement and certainly more forcible than ever that used by the hon. member for Russell—and yet of these declarations they meant not one word. What are we to understand ? I hope he is sincere. I would rather have him sincere in error than have him take the position of proclaiming one thing and actually believing another. I am sorry that when the whole trend of public opinion has gone thus far any man who has a regard for his public reputation as a politician or a statesman, should announce a policy of free trade in this country. I am sorry that the hon. member for Russell, coming as he does from almost the Capital of Canada, has not advanced beyond the infant stage of political economy. He reminds me of an incident that occurred in the riding of the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock). I regret to say that owing perhaps to the example of that hon. gentleman they have not in conservative households in that riding a high opinion of the virtues of the Liberal party. A lady who belonged to that party, or whose husband did, came to visit at the house of a Tory family, whose name I will not mention, but it is a name well known to some hon. members of this House. She brought with her three little children. When the visitors had departed a little toddling child of the Conservative family went to her mother and said : Mother, is Mrs. Jones a Grit ? The mother said : Yes, I suppose so. The child said : Mother, is that nice little boy a Grit, too ? The mother said : Yes, he is a Grit, too. The child said : Mother, is that dear little baby a Grit, too ? The mother replied : Yes. 'Well,' said the little girl, 'I am very very sorry for the dear little baby.' And so it is with the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). He is yet in the infancy of political economy, and I am very sorry for the dear little hon. member for Russell. But we come to bigger game, and we have on the other side the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who struck out generally in this debate. I have a report of his speech from a good Grit paper, it is a nice report all through, which says :

> The speech of Mr. Richardson for South Grey was finished in thorough fashion by Mr. D. C. Fraser, the big member for Guysborough. He took the tariff and the royalty question, and shook them as a terrier does a rat.

Now is that really what the hon. member for Guysborough did ? What he did does not seem to be quite so big as that, for here is what he said :

> I wish to say in the first place that I do not mean to discuss the admirable essay to which we have just listened. Its moral tone was excellent; indeed it was a joint effort of morality and beet sugar.

That is the magnificent criticism offered by the gentleman who is described as the giant of Guysborough. Even an ordinary man could say as much ? I would remind the hon. member for Guysborough, that the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Richardson) was speaking for the first time in the House of Commons, and I believe that I speak the honest sentiment of every member of this House when I say that a more creditable effort has rarely been listened to than the speech of the hon. member. If, lacking some of the confidence that characterizes some members, he did occasionally refer to notes, it was well that he should do so ; but for the hon. member (Mr. Fraser) to taunt an hon. member on this side because of the moral tone and the moral sentiment of his speech may be good speaking, but I venture to say that it is very bad policy and very bad statesmanship. The hon. member (Mr. Fraser) said something of more importance. He criticised the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition and he said :

> What do you want ? Do you want the policy of 1878 ?

I say yes, and I say no. We do not want the tariff policy of 1878 because we always had that breadth of statesmanship which told us that we must modify and change our tariff with the changing conditions of the country. But if the hon. member asks : Do we want the national policy which tended to the marvellous development of all our resources ; which energized the people, which holds up to them hope, which was as broad as Canada, as broad as the empire, and which was enunciated by Sir John Macdonald in 1878 ; then I answer : Decidedly yes ; and the Conservative party, I am proud to say, stands upon that national policy to-day. I notice that although the member for Guysborough cannot understand the amendment introduced by the leader of the opposition, yet the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) says it is perfectly definite and clear. You would think that these gentlemen on the government benches want us to instruct them in the A B C of commerce and trade matters, in view of the fact that no more definite declaration could be made of the position of a political party than has been made from this side of the House. It is becoming pretty evident to the country that these gentlemen opposite are not honest in their statement that they cannot understand the policy propounded by the Conservative party. It seems to me that these gentlemen ; bankrupt as they seem to be in any concise, clear theory as to the principles upon which this government should be carried on ; having worked upon the conditions they found then in 1878 with the exception of the British preference ; having found now that we have arrived at a stage in the history of this

country when in the nature of things changes must be made ; it seems that these gentlemen are not able and have not the ability or have not the courage to announce a policy for themselves, and so they say from time to time : What is the policy of the Conservative party, and what is the meaning of the declaration of the policy that has been enunciated by Conservatives from session to session. In reply to these gentlemen that it is a definite policy; that it is a policy which so far as one can see, the Reform party has not been able to frame. The fact of its being a policy at all makes it what the Reform party are frequently looking for, what they have not been able to find, and what I venture to say—having regard to their actions in the past—they would not have the courage to enunciate even though they found it, because they want to see the way the wind blows before they declare a policy one way or the other. The policy of the Conservative party is not a patch-work policy ; it is not—If I return to the story of Joseph—a patch-work like Joseph's coat, to be worn one side out or the other side just as happens to suit the exigencies of the case ; with a patch for the Minister of Public Works ; a patch, not very definite in colour, for the Postmaster General ; a patch equally undecided in colour for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ; two patches perhaps—because he has two policies, one in the east and one in the west—two patches for the Minister of Interior ; shreds and patches for the back benches ; with blue ruin all over it here and there by way of adornment for the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and with ornaments of immaculate white to represent the immaculate purity of the hon. leader of the government. The Conservative policy is not that kind of a policy. It is a policy which is well conceived, which is grounded on faith in the country, which is studded with hope throughout, a policy of certainty which has proved beneficent to this country in the past ; not devoid of colour either, for with the inauguration of this policy hope was brought to this country before ; and when the Conservative party comes to power again—and they cannot come too soon for the benefit of the country—a universal Christian emblem will span this country from ocean to ocean, and a rainbow of promise and hope will gladden the hearts of the people of Canada. Well, I do not want to pay too much attention to the hon. member for Guysborough, because I would be enhancing his importance, and perhaps, he has enough of that now ; but he is as good a text to speak from as anybody else, and when I describe him I describe a good many others. The hon. member complained of the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in this language :

> I cannot conceive of the state of mind which would induce the hon. gentleman, who has done so much for the sanctity of the Sabbath and the chastity of the home to make such a speech as he made in the House the other day.

Why cannot he conceive of it? I do not think my hon. friend from Guysborough does himself credit. Can he not understand an hon. gentleman repenting of his wickedness ? Is he at a loss to understand that the hon. member for North Norfolk, after having for eighteen or twenty years proclaimed a doctrine in which he did not believe, might very well be aroused by patriotism or by a desire to do what is fair by his country, to recede from the false position he had occupied, and come to acknowledge fairly and squarely that he had abandoned that life and had determined to lead a better one ? The hon member for Guysborough says : 'I cannot understand the state of mind which would induce the hon. gentleman.' Why, Mr. Speaker, does it require an inducement for a member of this House of Commons to do his duty ? What kind of inducement does the hon. member mean ? I do not know; perhaps he does. Then he says, speaking of the hon. member for North Norfolk, 'a gentleman who has done so much for the sanctity of the Sabbath and the chastity of the home.' God help this country, Mr. Speaker, when the sanctity of the Sabbath depends on hon. members of the Liberal party. They have robbed Providence of the credit of the good crops; they have robbed Providence of the rainfall and the gladdening sunshine, and now they are robbing Providence of the credit for the sanctity of the Sabbath. Why, these hon. gentlemen robbed us of our policy. We have heard of men taking coppers from dead men's eyes; but where will these gentlemen stop when they talk of some man sanctifying the Sabbath, the hon. member for North Norfolk by the mouth of the hon. member for Guysborough ? Then, he speaks of the man who has done so much for the chastity of the home. Well, if I read a line or two from a speech of the hon. member for Guysborough, you will see that the chastity of the home is something that the hon. member for North Norfolk might well give attention to. This is what the hon. member for Guysborough said at Morden in 1899 :

> To such a Liberal who said that the government did not keep its pledges, he would say, look at home. Have you kept the pledges made to your wife before you married her ?

The hon. member for Guysborough is surprised; he cannot understand a state of things like that; and he says : 'Have you kept the pledges you made to your wife when you married her ?' Hon. gentlemen I think generally do. Then he says :

> But what would you think if your wife left you, and went off with another man, and that man an unsanctified tramp ? That woman would be just as vile as the Liberal who turned Tory.

Now, I am not going to forget the reverence which I owe to the sacred name of woman

and wife; but I am going to say that the hon. member for Guysborough pays a poor compliment to the Liberal party in supposing that it does not better understand morality or the sanctity of the Sabbath, or the chastity of the home, when he speaks of that party as one that will go off with an unsanctified tramp. I will leave the hon. member to follow that out; I will not pursue the matter further. When the hon. member for North Norfolk has fought the final battle with the big member for Guysborough, and with the very plucky member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), I think the hon. member for North Norfolk will triumph, though it does not matter particularly to us. I will just illustrate it by something that was said by the hon. member for North Norfolk. He said: There was a great big burly Englishman whose wife used to attempt to thrash him. His neighbours remonstrated with him over the indignity, and his reply was this : 'It pleases she, and it don't hurt I.' And so we will leave these gentlemen to their own way.

I said that things were coming our way. I have thought the matter out, and I will not say that the brains of the Liberal party have left it; but I will say, and say it advisedly, that by the universal assent of this country, two of the ablest men of the Liberal party, the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) have left and abandoned the party completely, as far as their declarations of policy, are concerned. They have not left it so very far with respect to the policy in force; but we must take these gentlemen as we find them declaring that the policy is unfit for the circumstances and conditions of this country.

We have another state of facts showing that things are coming our way. We have the government not able to proclaim a policy. The dissension in the ranks is so manifestly acute that they cannot get close enough together to prepare a policy. We have them getting up in the House here and there, almost to a man, and enunciating this principle : 'I do not believe in free trade or any such dogma as that, as regards my own county, my own territory, or the trade in which I am most interested; but it is quite good enough for the Dominion at large; so long as it keeps these men in power.' We have that principle proclaimed from almost every bench. The thing cannot go on much longer. On Friday night, notwithstanding that magnificent majority which the government possesses, not one man could be got to stand on his feet in defence of the government's position, and we have members threatening the government. We have just the same condition of things as that which existed in 1878, and I warn hon. members of the government that unless they take a leaf of warning from the history of the past, they will repeat the history of 1878 just as soon as the tide of universal prosperity is checked, and will find themselves on the other side of the House.

I am not sufficiently a politician to very much care which side is in power so long as the best interests of the country are looked after, and I would be glad, even at this late hour, if the government would adopt a progressive policy, especially when we have reached a critical stage in our commercial policy and that of the mother country more important than any previous one in the annals of the Dominion or of the great empire to which we belong. Do hon. gentlemen opposite lose sight of the fact that to-day, when we are approaching the ceremonies of the Coronation, at which will be gathered the greatest minds from the different parts of the empire, and when a great conference will take place on the relations between the colonies and Great Britain as a whole—do these hon. gentlemen realize that instead of squabbling among themselves, instead of appearing before the people of Britain as men torn apart by wrangling views, or, as the Minister of Public Works put it, 'fighting like blazes' around the council board, they should at this juncture be united ? Do they understand that at this, the most important juncture in our history, Canada should be represented by a government having a policy upon which all the members of that government are agreed and not by a cabinet divided by internal dissensions. In this respect I charge this government with the greatest omission of duty that has ever disgraced a Canadian administration. If we had, at this juncture, a leader of the government who understood the position of the country, instead of trying to keep back information from the House it would be his policy, in the speech from the Throne and by discussion in the House, to ascertain, from the general consensus of opinion, what is the best proposal to make to the empire at that important conference. He would make it his business to ascertain what is the voice of the people on our commercial policy and be guided by that opinion, but unfortunately these gentlemen have no settled policy as regards the great questions which must come before that colonial conference. Great Britain is now at the end of her free trade policy, she has now come to the point when there must be a change of ways, when she must adopt a new policy, she has come to that point when, as His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales said on returning from his tour around the world, Britain must wake up. And, Mr. Speaker, British public men are waking up. The trend of public discussion is in favour of a radical change. And there is an alertness on the part of the public men of Great Britain and of her business men as well, such as has never before existed, and which is exceptionally favourable to the adoption of a policy that will tend to unite and consolidate this great

empire. Let me refer briefly to the language of the Prince of Wales on this point, as described by 'the Imperial Argus':—

He was equally happy in his allusion to the commercial questions of the day. His remarkable testimony to the impression made upon our colonial brethren by the unaccountable slumbers of Mr. John Bull has attracted wide and deserved attention. It is admirably summed up and illustrated by Mr. Gould in the striking cartoon we publish this month, and the fact that the heir to the throne has found it desirable to add his voice to those of the already numerous critics of our somnolent friend, should convince him, if anything can, that the time has come when he really must 'wake up'—and keep awake.

That advice is equally applicable to this government. The time has come for it to wake up or give place to men competent to manage our affairs. I have another, quotation, which I wish to cite, in order to show the position of matters in Britain at present:

One of the most important discussions of our fiscal system in late years was held on Wednesday under the auspices of the United Empire Trade League, when the Right Hon. James Lowther, Sir Howard Vincent, Lord Masham, and a number of M.P.'s spoke strongly in favour of overhauling a system of taxation which had become inadequate to the requirements of our empire and its changed conditions. Mr. Lowther argued that we need a large revenue from customs duties in justice to our taxpayers, and in the interests of our home and colonial industries. Sir Howard Vincent urged the government, in view of the coming budget, to revise our system so as to relieve the pressure of direct taxation and for the development of commerce within the empire. He stated that the imports of competing manufactured goods was last year over £100,000,000, or ten times the value of the imports in Cobden's day. Our imports from foreign countries were now £413,000,000, and our exports only £197,000,000. The remedy for this inequality, he said, lay in the development of inter-Imperial trade. Canada's magnanimity has been written in gold and in blood, and we offered her nothing for her preferential tariff. We could consolidate the empire on a commercial basis by taxing the foreigner. Sir Howard went on to advocate a duty of 10 per cent on all fully manufactured goods from foreign countries which would yield £6,000,000 a year and 5 per cent on partially manufactured goods which would yield another £4,000,000 a year; also 1s. a quarter on wheat, and 5 per cent on foreign flour, which together, would yield £3,000,000 a year. A resolution supporting the petition in favour of fair trade was carried, and this petition, which is being extensively signed in industrial centres, will shortly be presented to parliament.

And from Liverpool and Cardiff alone, a few days ago, was presented a petition by Mr. James Lowther, bearing 35,000 signatures, praying parliament to impose duties on foreign goods.

So that, if we are to judge by the signs of the times, things are decidedly coming our way; and are decidedly unfavourable to the policy of those who advocte in the House anything approaching free trade.

I come now, Sir, to speak of the address of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, which is pretty familiar to us all. When I come to speak of this distinguished gentleman—at least a gentleman who did occupy so distinguished a position in the past—I approach my subject with great modesty and with a desire, of course, to say nothing personally offensive, but only to discuss his position from a public point of view, and casting about for what may be a reasonable excuse for a gentleman who, the Prime Minister has told us, in 1878 advocated the policy immediately afterwards inaugurated by the Conservative party, and yet, from first to last, denounced that policy—the only charitable construction I can put upon it is something in the line of what is suggested by the hon. gentleman when he talks of closing his eyes. I believe the hon. gentleman has been actually asleep during the past nine or ten years, and that that accounts for the fact that, without a blush or a trace of nervousness, he, unlike the one who sings I cannot sing the old song,' can sing the old song with evident relish. There are a number of instances in which this sort of thing is said to have occurred. For instance, in our asylum we have men and women, who, by reason of infirmity or calamity, live entirely in the sunny past. They are awake, they are alive, but they are not awake or alive to the changes that have taken place for a number of years. But, though I cannot but think that this fairly describes the hon. gentleman, I do not wish to insist too closely upon the parallel. I pass to the story of an old lady who died the other day, a significant and pathetic story—and I submit that the position of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not only peculiar but it is decidely pathetic. This lady, when young, was engaged to be married. She had purchased her trousseau, she had even donned her wedding dress and was awaiting the coming of the bridegroom. But the bridegroom came not. And when it dawned upon her that he was false, that he had not meant it when he told her that he loved her, her mind gave way. What was the result? Ever after that, on the anniversary of the day which had been set for her wedding, she donned her wedding dress, and walked about and waited for the bridegroom to appear. So, after years, when the wedding dress had become out of fashion and was, in fact, but a suggestion of pitiable disappointment, the old lady died. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce parallels that case pretty well. He fell in love with the portfolio of Finance years ago. This was the darling of his ambition. He made overtures to the Grit party and said: That is my ambition; give me that and I will serve you through good and evil report; for that I will abandon my principles and stifle my convictions; give me that and I will follow you where you will. They promised him, and he, like a faithful lover followed

through all the discouragements through which they passed. At last the time came when the party got into power, and then this lover came and demanded the price of his faithfulness. But they said: No; we wish to serve our party by giving this portfolio to another; you are getting old and are not exactly a suitable bridegroom. This was the shock which unnerved him, and which has clouded his memory ever since. He accepted the portfolio of Trade and Commerce, but always since then he has lived in the past. If the hon. gentleman thinks that that reference is not suitable to his taste, then I will recommend him to consider a historic instance, that of Hans Christian Andersen, the great Dane who made himself illustrious as a writer of children's stories. Andersen had a great apprehension that he might be buried alive, and I think that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, perhaps, has reason to fear that, living in the past as he does, he also might be buried alive. To prevent the dreadful fate he feared, Andersen had pinned upon his clothing when he retired at night a paper bearing these words: 'I am not dead, I am only in a trance.' I trust the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce may have an awakening sooner or later—and before it is too late. Talking of slumbering, I do not think that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is really one whit more completely asleep than are a majority of the members of this government to the actual condition of things existing to-day. I can give no more apt illustration of what I think will be the historical verdict upon the attitude of the Reform party of to-day, and of the government in particular, to the condition of the country, than is to be found in the well-known volume, 'Looking Backward.' You remember, Mr. Speaker, the instance, how a gentleman, returning to his house after being out for the evening, retired to a cell he had constructed for himself underground in order to be away from the disturbances of the house and the street. He had been celebrating 'Declaration Day'—this was in the city of Boston, in the United States. That night the building above was destroyed and communication with the cell was cut off. The rest of the story will be sufficiently described in what I read:

And now (says the Dr.) 'can you tell me a little more explicitly when it was that you fell into that sleep, the date, I mean.' 'Why, last night, of course; I said so, did'nt I? that is unless I have overslept an entire day. Great heavens! that cannot be possible; and yet I have an odd sensation of having slept a long time. It was was Decoration Day that I went to sleep.'

'Decoration Day?'

'Yes, Monday, the 30th.' 'Pardon me, the 30th of what?'

'Why, of this month of course, unless I have slept into June, but that cannot be.'

'This is the month of September.'

'September! You don't mean that I have slept since May! God in heaven! Why it is incredible.'

'We shall see,' replied my companion; 'you say it was May 30 when you went to sleep?'

'Yes.'

'May I ask what year?'

I stared blankly at him, incapable of speech, for some moments.

'Of what year?' I feebly echoed at last. 'Yes, of what year, if you please? After you have told me that I shall be able to tell you how long you have slept.'

'It was the year 1887,' I said.

My companion insisted that I should take another draft from the glass, and felt my pulse. He said:

'Your appearance is that of a young man of barely 30, and your bodily condition seems not greatly different from that of one just roused from a somewhat too long and profound sleep, and yet this is the 10th of September, in the year 2000, and you have slept exactly one hundred and 13 years, three months and eleven days.'

Now, I do not quote this for the amusement of the House, I quote it because it points a moral, and because we are at a crisies in the affairs of Canada. As the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been writing epitaphs in order to denounce the Conservative party, perhaps it might not be improper for me to sketch an epitaph for the hon. minister himself. I regret that if the people of Canada were to erect a monument to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, they could not, I fear, unless he repents, consistently engrave upon his monument any such legend as that which is engraved on the monument to the memory of the late Alexander Mackenzie: 'Duty was his law, conscience was his ruler.' But on second thought, I do not think it would be well to erect a monument to the hon. minister, I think it would be better that a tablet to his memory should decorate the halls of this chamber, in order that it might be a warning to young Liberals in future to be careful as to whom they accept as their guide. So I venture to suggest that a tablet be erected to the memory of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to be placed on the southern wall of this chamber. What can we engrave upon it with any due regard to consistency? We will, I think engrave two pillars of stone. We will make one grand and graceful column dedicated 'Protection.' We will also have a crumbling rock inscribed with 'Free Trade,' and on that we will place the figure of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, leaning against the pillar designated protection. We will place in his hand a flag and on it the legends unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union, political union, annexation to the United States, and absorption in the United States. We will have the hon. gentleman, as aforetime, looking to Washington, and near him the figure of a man, not in particularly good humour—a figure representative of a gentleman named Cook,—and this figure pointing menacingly to the Minister of

Trade and Commerce. In his hand he will hold a scroll on which is written these pregnant words of the great Scotchman Carlyle :

> Judgment for evil thing is many times delayed, some day or two, some century or two ; but it is sure as life, it is sure as death.

We will sketch too the returning Canadians, those who have been expatriated by acts of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. At the foot of the column we will have a volume of the 'Economist', published in England, containing calumnies of this country penned by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. What more would you have ? I have said enough. We will put that slab over on the southern wall, to remain a warning to all Liberals in the future not again to allow themselves to be betrayed as they have been by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce ; and on this slab the legend 'Corruption wins not more than honesty.'

History will do the rest, I think, for my hon. friend, I need not say more—further than to add that as he is now gracefully gliding away from the scene of his labours. I could hope, I could pray, that he may not persist in his sins. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman will take warning, even at this late hour, after having sacrificed the interests of his country to his ambition, having neglected the voice of conscience, I commend to him something more from the pen of Thomas Carlyle :

> Dost thou think that there is therefore no justice ? It is what the fool hath said in his heart. It is what the wise in all times, were wise, because they deemed and knew for ever not to be. I tell thee again there is nothing else but justice. . . . . My friend if thou hadst all the artillery of Woolwich trundling at thy back in support of an unjust thing ; and infinite bonfires visibly awaited ahead of thee to blaze centuries long for thy victory on behalf of it, I would advise thee to call 'halt,' to fling down thy baton, and say, 'In God's name, No !' Thy 'success ?' Poor devil, what will thy success amount to ? If the thing is unjust thou hast not succeeded ; no, not though bonfires blazed from north to south, and bells rang, and editors wrote leading articles, and the just thing lay trampled out of sight, to all mortal eyes an abolished and annihilated thing. Success ? In few years thou wilt be dead and dark,—all cold, eyeless, deaf ; no blaze of bonfires, ding-dong of bells or leading articles visible or audible to thee again at all for ever ; what kind of success is that ?

I will for a few moments point to the position in which we stand as regards trade. The position in which we stand as regards trade matters largely turns upon the position of Great Britain. Having read a good deal lately as to the trend of public feeling in Great Britain, I must admit that we have to adopt one of two alternatives, and Canada had better wake up to the fact as soon as possible. We have either to have a closer union between the members of the British empire, or we shall have to see that empire decline in power. One of these two alternatives is facing the men of Great Britain, and I am glad to see that there is a likelihood that Britain will wake up to the position, and will adopt, not a policy which will dismember the empire, but one which will consolidate it, and lead ultimately to commercial unity.

Now, it is pointed out by very prominent writers that there are only three great world powers, Great Britain, the Russian empire and the United States. Germany is making such rapid advances in commerce that the chances are that if Great Britain does not adopt a policy that will preserve her trade to her own people and that will prevent the inroads of foreign trade at no distant date the supremacy of Great Britain in commerce will be a thing of the past ; and commercial supremacy is the foundation of national supremacy. So that, we are confronted with this position, that it is all important that Great Britain should adopt the policy which would secure the union of the various parts of the British empire upon a commercial basis. Happily for Great Britain and happily for Canada there is at the present time a statesman representing the colonies who not only realizes the position of affairs but who has frequently enunciated his views and who has the determination, the hope and the ambition to bring about the commercial, and perhaps the national union of all parts of the British empire. Mr. Chamberlain said many years ago :

> If I were to ask myself the oft repeated question, whether this empire is destined to follow the empires of antiquity and to perish, and the memory of it to be forgotten, or whether we are to sink like some of our rivals into a condition of mediocrity or obscurity I confess my answer would depend not so much upon what may be done or said by the population of these small islands, but rather upon the eventual determination of that greater Britain which forms, in space at any rate, the larger portion of the empire—and upon the arrangements which they may make to bind us together in closer union.

I refer to two or three lines of an article in the contemporary 'Review.' The writer says :

> One by one the other nations gave up free trade velleities—to their own destruction, as we prophesied at the time—but none the less they have thriven on protection, nay, they have managed to give a fillip to native agriculture as well, while creating trade and industry. Nor have they stopped there; they gradually wrested many of our foreign trade outlets from us, they are now fighting us in our colonies and are invading even our home markets with their wares, while narrowing their own frontiers to ours. We know that trade is bloodless war ; yet we have laid aside our weapons, defensive and offensive, and are become inactive spectators of the premature decay of the vital forces of the nation and the empire.

After pointing out the tendency of the times, and referring particularly to the position

of German trade and the utterances of German statesmen, he continues :

The time has undoubtedly come when we shall have to reconsider our attitude towards our foreign industrial competitors, our fellow subjects beyond the seas, and our whole commercial policy as well. Economic and political reasons render a change indispensable; from the insular no less than the imperial point of view a radical reform seems called for. And even military considerations bear out this conclusion; for we began by sacrificing our agriculture, the source of our food supplies in war time, for the purpose of futhering our industry, and now we are offering up our industry at the shrine of a theory which is no longer tenable.

I also refer to a line or two from an article on the Outlook of British Commerce in the 'Empire Review.' The writer deals with an article that was published by Mr. Carnegie. He says :

Need we despair then, because our political ideals have not yet so completely matured as to enable the stupendous resources we command to be systematically organized and methodically developed ? The personal element, Mr. Carnegie states we still enjoy, the 'dogged endurance,' 'the ambition to excel,' 'the will, to do or die.' Possessing these supreme qualities and controlling some 400 millions of people inhabiting nearly one fourth of the land surface of the globe, with every physical advantage and geograph cal opportunity that man can desire, so far from being pessimists, we ought to feel and understand that both in the matter of numbers and natural resources we hold all the winning cards in the great game for commercial supremacy. It only remains to decide how we must play them.

Then he goes on :

This in itself would be a source of congratulation to us were it not for the fact that our accumulative powers as a nation are now being attacked. The industrial armies of the United States are accumulating wealth more rapidly than we, and consequently the time must very shortly arrive when their bankers and financiers will be able to undersell us just as their producers and manufacturers have already done.

How then are we to protect ourselves ? Obviously by the same means that have been employed to raise the states of the American Union to their present magnificent position. Whilst the 'forty-five countries' of America have joined forces, established free trade amongst themselves, and thereby created a compact industrial army of immense strength, the fifty odd countries, colonies and dependencies which make up the British empire—with a population and territory of far greater magnitude than the United States,—are not only disunited in their political and commercial principles, but they are actually in many respects working against each other, and thereby making the way for the commercial and political ascendency of our more powerful neighbours. It is to the question of 'national unity' that we must turn our attention, a unity first of trade principle, which will prevent the sacrifice of our own commerce and that of some of our dependencies and colonies to a theory which, however advantageous when originally introduced, is unquestionably out of date and injurious when considered in relation to the developments in transport, production, and international state-aided competition with which we are now face to face. Unqualified free trade is not only misleading as a theory, but is, when considered from the political standpoint, a mischievous and dangerous principle which we cannot too quickly abandon if we desire to hold our own.

Then, he sums up in this way :

I do not think— –

Referring to Mr. Carnegie :

——we need disturb ourselves much about the loss of prestige, for just as a short rest enables the exhausted frame to quickly regain its accustomed strength, so will a period of peace and prosperity restore power and confidence to the holders of British stock; but the question of our stationary commerce is a more serious matter, and one of those unpalatable facts which it seems impossible to explain away. The other great nations of the earth are rapidly overtaking us in the volume of commodities—raw and manufactured—which their enormous territories and expanding populations enable them to so readily produce. And if we are to hold our own in the great struggle for possession of the world's markets now in progress, we must think how we can augument the land, labour, and natural resources at our disposal. Impossible as this may seem at first glance, a moments consideration at once opens our eyes to Great Britain's coming strength—our colonies. When will the dwellers in the motherland understand that their brothers beyond the seas, are not only strong in all they require, but are anxious and proud to place that strength at the disposal of the empire ?

That, this government has sacrificed our interests by the policy of preferential trade, making us less able to give something in return for concessions we might receive, is evident to any reasonable mind. That this government has postponed the accomplishment of that commercial unity of the empire which is to be the grandest achievement of this century, is also perfectly evident. Did Australia made a jug-handled bargain for trade with Great Britain ? Not at all. Is there a doubt about the loyalty of the Australians ? The history of recent years refutes that suggestion. When the Australians came to deal with Great Britain they dealt upon a business basis like men, and they would not sacrifice their rights. I charge that no government has the right to give away a dollar of the money of the people. That money in the hands of the government is a sacred trust. And when you come to give it, not to Britain or to the empire, but to British manufacturers, then I say that kindness begins at home, and it is the duty of patriotic Canadians to think of their own country. I condemn this government directly and squarely for their action with regard to the preferential duty. When we adopted confederation we made a step towards the unity of the empire, and as Mr. Chamberlain has said, we laid the foundation for confederation in Australia which is again a stepping stone towards the unity of the whole empire. But when this government introduced its preferential trade principle they took a retrograde movement, because they put a stumbling

block in the way of mutual trade concessions within the empire, and they delayed if that be possible the realization of that great hope. I do not know that I will weary the House further reading extracts, although I have a long array of matters that I believe would be reasonably improving to the members of the government. I would judge from their dumbness; from what lawyers call, the studied silence with 'malice aforethought', that they have not been studying up these great questions or else they would be prepared to enlighten public opinion. Are they the leaders of this country or not?

An hon. MEMBER. Never.

Mr. LENNOX. I believe that remark is perfectly true.

Mr. HENDERSON. Another convert.

Mr. LENNOX. Another convert, and there are converts all along the line. I feel, Sir, that this country is to some extent alive to the important questions that are being discussed in Great Britain, and her colonies, and I need not weary the House by proceeding further upon that matter. I will close by saying: that speaking, not from a political standpoint at all, I do trust that when the leader of this government goes to Great Britain and meets there the great men assembled, he will not allow any personal consideration or any love for that dead dogma of free trade, or Cobdenism to interfere with the intelligent discharge of his public duties as regards our own great country. I do urge him, that although he has not seen fit to lay before the people any large scheme to be discussed at this colonial conference, he will take the matter seriously in mind. But, whether he does or not, I can say to the members of this House and to the people of the country, that the time is coming when there are no two courses open, when Britain has to adopt the course that will unite all the parts of the empire within one broad circle. In doing so, I believe that the master minds of those great colonies will unite loyally with statesmen of Britain working out a scheme which will tend to cement the British empire, and more than verify the grand traditions of that empire. I said that things were coming our way. I think I have with some measure of success established that fact in detail. What does our way point to? Our way points to the rapid accumulation of capital and to the development of well paid labour. It points to the development in this country of great industrial energy; it points to a simultaneous concurrent advance of all our varied interests and to the development of our great natural resources. It points to Canada for Canadians; and the empire—the empire for Canadians and Britons—for us all. It points to commercial unity; comparative immunity from attack; mutual defence, if attacked, to ability to defend, and to the upbuilding of the greatest, grandest nation that the world has ever seen—a nation so grand and so majestic that the wisest statesmen of a quarter of a century ago did not even conceive of it. It points to one united empire, possessing within itself illimitable resources for every station and condition of life, and a wealth, if not beyond the wildest dreams of avarice, yet almost illimitable, wealth in everything that tends to make a nation great, contented, prosperous and free. This, I predict, is going to be the grand accomplishment of this century—the grand accomplishment of the early years of this century. I look for it; I believe in it. There are difficulties in the way, I admit. There are difficulties from without, such as the jealousies of other nations; and there are difficulties from within, such as internal jealousies and want of loyalty. But there are no difficulties which cannot be overcome; and when in the early days of this century—ay, within the lifetime of our present Sovereign—there will be secured this grand unity of the empire, and the world around, then, with a new meaning, a new fervour and a renewed loyalty will ascend from hundreds of millions of loyal British subjects the anthem and the prayer, 'God bless King Edward the Seventh! God save our gracious King!'

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis). Mr. Speaker, I feel at this period of the debate that I owe the House an apology for rising to my feet to take part in the discussion; but, Sir, the matters that have been placed before the House, the questions that have been raised and the issues that have been provoked are of such a nature that I feel that I cannot, in justice to the constituency I have the honour to represent, remain entirely quiet. I fear, however, that a great disappointment is in store for the House, after listening to the able speech which has just been delivered. I fear that I shall not be able to engage the attention of the House for half the time the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has done. Neither must you expect me, in view of my proportions, to float on the sunbeams or waltz on the rainbows as he has done; but I shall have to keep myself upon terra firma. There are some sentences in his speech which have disappointed me. You know I am a bit of an optimist. I look with confidence at the great prosperity of Canada. I thought that we were now on the crest of the wave, and that it was going to continue. But I find that I was all wrong. I find that there will be no prosperity in the Dominion of Canada until the great Liberal-Conservative party has again come into power; and then I sigh to myself and say, 'How long, electors, oh, how long will this great hour delay?' Royalty in England the other day commanded Britons to awake, and yet they slumbered on; the even tenor of their way was not disturbed. But, Sir, the stentorian voice of the hon. member for South Simcoe

(Mr. Lennox) has commanded Britons to awake ; and I dare to prophesy that a wave of insomnia will spread over that land which will enhance the price of narcotics twofold. I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman has been content with exterminating the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) the giant of Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). It is true he did not quite demolish the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, but he left history to complete the job ; the gigantic form of the hon. member for Guysborough has shrunken to mean proportions ; while the hon. member for North Norfolk is on his knees crawling across the House, and begging for admission to the ranks of the opposition.

It would be presumption on my part to endeavour to follow the line of argument of the hon. gentleman who has preceded me. Therefore, I will try to address myself in a quiet way to matters which I conceive to be of interest, not only to my constituents, but to the country at large. There is a sharp and clear issue before the House. I cannot say that it is raised by the resolution which has been moved by the hon. leader of the opposition ; but certainly it has been presented to us by hon. gentlemen on each side of the House. That issuse is : Shall there—or shall there not—be a greater measure of protection in the Dominion of Canada ? Protection, as I understand it, and as I believe the country understands it, and as I believe everybody will admit, is protection for the manufacturers. Now, Sir, in all well-considered measures that may be presented by a government, or passed by parliament, the underlying principle is that the greatest amount of good shall be accomplished to the greatest number of people, and the least possible harm shall be done. Taking that as the platform from which we must consider this question, it is well for us to consider how many people are interested in this question on the one side or the other—how many are manufacturers, and how many are found in other occupations and other conditions of life ? I have been at some pains to get some data on this point. I have been examining the census of 1891, which I have been told and led to believe is not quite reliable. I find myself unable from that census to ascertain the exact number of the different trades and industries, because they have not been grouped ; but I have obtained sufficient data for my argument. There are 1,659,355 represented as being persons having an occupation. Of these 790,210 are agriculturists, fishermen, and miners. Domestic and personal servants are 246,183, those in manufacturing and mechanical industries are 320,001 ; profesions, 63,280 ; trade and transportation, 186,695 ; non-productive, 52,986 ; or a total of 1,659,355. But I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that while under the head of manufactures we have 320,000, that heading includes not only manufacturers in the strict sense of the term, but all mechanical industries, including, so far as I am able to discover, lumbermen, carpenters, blacksmiths, shoemakers, machinists, plumbers, engineers, firemen, and thousands of other people. So that it is safe for us to say that of the 320,000, not more are real or genuine manufacturers than 160,000 ; and I am further borne out in this conclusion by the fact that when I turn to the trade and navigation returns and look at the exports for the year 1901, I find that in them there were : products of the mine, $40,000,000 ; products of the fisheries, $10,000,000 ; products of the forest, $30,000,000 ; animals and their products, $85,000,000 ; agricultural products, $38,000,000 ; manuufactures, $17,000,000. So that we have a grand total of exports, amounting to $191,000,000, of the products of Canada, as against only $17,000,000 of her manufactures. I am only dealing with these figures for the purpose of giving prominence to my point, that when we come to deal with the interests of the people of Canada, we must deal with them relatively, and formulate and adopt a policy which will accomplish the greatest amount of good to the largest number of people. And when we have, upon one hand, a population representing anywhere from 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the whole people, as compared with a population, on the other hand, representing only 10 per cent to 15 per cent, it is our duty to consider as paramount the interests of the larger percentage. That being so, is it not proper that we should, in formulating our policy, consider the interests of the agriculturists, the miners, the fishermen, the lumbermen, the labourers, the professional men and all the others, as well as the interests of the manufacturers. But there are many hon. gentlemen on the other side who seem to imagine that there is but one class in this Dominion which should be considered. I have read the resolution proposed by the hon. the leader of the opposition :

> This House, regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory, is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries, as will at all times secure the Canadian market for the Canadians.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WADE. Some hon. gentlemen cheer this. Well, I will pause to hear whether they will say 'hear, hear' after I have made a few remarks further on this point. I would like to know how the hon. the leader of the opposition proposes to protect the interests of the farmer. I am speaking now more particularly with regard to the farmers of the maritime provinces, because I am more familiar with their conditions than with

those of the farmers of the western provinces. I would like to understand how my hon. friend proposes to protect the interests of the farmers of the maritime provinces or of our miners, lumbermen or fishermen. I make bold to say that in the whole tariff list there is but one solitary item which has the slightest bearing upon the interests of the farmers down by the sea. I refer to the item of hams and bacon. Prince Edward Island, to a considerable extent, and New Brunswick, to a smaller extent, do produce hams and bacons, and the duties upon these articles may afford them some satisfaction, but leaving these products aside, and taking all the other agricultural articles, I defy any gentleman opposite to show how our farmers in the eastern provinces are benefited by the tariff in the slightest degree.

I have here a list of all the dutiable articles of farm produce. I have gone through the tariff as carefully as possible, and will read the result, though, of course, I may possibly have omitted something. That list comprises :

> Animals, except for improvement of stock ; live hogs, bacons, hams and shoulders, beans, salt beef, butter, cheese, cider, cracked corn and wheat, cranberries, plums and quinces, cucumbers, dried vegetables, eggs, flour and meal, fowls, fruit (raspberries), other berries, hay, meats, milk foods, pickles, potatoes, sheepskins.

That is the list. Take the lower provinces, the only competition which the farmer of Nova Scotia to-day has to meet is the competition of the Prince Edward Islander who comes there with ham, bacon, turnips, potatoes and oats, and sells huge quantities of them and the Ontario farmer whose butter, cheese, beef, mutton and lamb and poultry come to us in striking competition. These are the only people we have to compete with ; there is no competition from the outside at all. Who ever heard of such a thing in the maritime provinces as the importation of any of these articles from the United States, or any other foreign country?

Then I come to the miners. Will some hon. gentleman on the other side be good enough to inform me where the miner is protected ? Every article that enters into his daily consumption is taxed, and taxed heavily, and there is not a solitary thing which he can produce which can be protected beyond those we have on the tariff at present.

But before leaving the farmers, let me refer for a moment to something an hon. and very fair minded gentleman on the other side said during this debate. He said that we had given protection to the farmers because we had not repealed these duties. Why, in the name of all that is reasonnable, if there be any stray corners in the Dominion—and I presume there are some in Ontario and New Brunswick and in Prince Edward Island, as I have said—where the farmers draw some measure of comfort from our tariff should we withdraw from these farmers consideration ? Must we take that from them and give them nothing in return ? Is it only the interests of the manufacturers that are to be considered ? That idea I contend is not a good one.

The same remark applies to the fishermen and the day labourers and to other walks in life.

We are told that we must prevent Canada being made a slaughter market for American manufacturers. Well, this with us down in Nova Scotia is a tender point. It was prophesied when the scheme of confederation was first mooted, that its effect would be to destroy our infant manufactures. The result has verified that prophesy, because the larger manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec came down to Nova Scotia with their goods and under sold our men, and the result was that nearly every factory in Nova Scotia was closed up. Nor did the competition stop there. Nearly the whole of our wholesale dry goods business was closed up by the fact that the larger houses in Ontario and Quebec doing an immense business, were able to come down there and under-sell our men and force them to close their doors. Any man within the sound of my voice, who is at all familiar with the conditions in Nova Scotia, knows what I say to be true, knows that we were obliged, in consequence of the union with these other provinces, to almost entirely change our conditions of life. We did do so. We have changed them, and we are now upon another sound basis and prepared to stand by things as they are.

But there is one idea that suggests itself to my mind with regard to this slaughter market, and which I have never heard come from hon. gentlemen on the other side. Suppose I am correct in my statement that 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the population of Canada are non-manufacturers, and suppose that they are correct in their statement that American manufacturers are making a slaughter market of the Dominion, that the Americans are selling here hundreds of millions of dollars worth of manufactured goods at slaughter prices, is it not self-evident that 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the people of Canada are consequently getting the goods cheaper than do the American people, living in the country where they are manufactured ? I think that idea is commencing to dawn upon the American public. I believe they now begin to see that the very goods that are sold in Canada for a certain figure they are obliged to buy at a largely advanced price. In other words, the manufacturers of the United States who have been able to build this tariff wall ; have been able to say : 'This territory is ours, and we may charge such prices as we see fit, and then we will go into the markets of the world, and, having the advantage of wresting from our own people these extravagant prices to place ourselves in a position to compete upon more advantageous terms with the outside world.'

Take the matter of locomotives; take the matter of steel bridges; of steel rails or railway cars. These are being sold by the United States manufacturers in Spain, in Egypt, in India, and in other foreign markets; and I undertake to say that the manufacturers are selling these goods in those markets at lower prices than they are selling them at in their own market. Let me give another illustration of the working of this high tariff. Cross Lake Huron from the Ontario side, and what do you see? You see Canadian lumber going in there and paying a duty of $2 a thousand feet, and selling at the same price as the American article. It is bought by the Standard Oil Company. In their great works they are using I do not know how many millions of feet every year, making it into boxes for the shipment of their products to all parts of the world. Why do they use Canadian lumber? Because when they ship out this lumber thus made into boxes, they receive a rebate of 90 per cent of duty paid, or $1.80 per thousand, giving them just that much advantage. Who, then, gets the advantage of this high tariff wall? The great monopolists, such as the Standard Oil Company, are the parties who reap the benefit of it. Not only the Standard Oil Company, but other large manufacturers are using enormous quantities of Canadian lumber and getting the rebate in this way. I only mention this to illustrate the fact that the people are being deceived by this idea of high protection. It is not the producer who is always benefited; it is not the consumer who is always injured, provided that that consumer is a big corporation that can control its affairs in the manner I have indicated.

I do not intend to weary the House by speaking on this question. But I think it is my duty to say this, and to say it forcibly, that, while there are differences of opinion on this side as to what should be the exact tariff, there are all interests represented here. There are men representing constituencies who would be delighted to have certain industries protected; there are men who would like to have the broadest measure of free trade. And all have a perfect right to stand here and urge, each one, the interest of the constituency he represents with the utmost vigour. But, I am thankful to say that, on this side of the House, we have a body of men who are willing to 'give and take,' and we are all united upon a tariff which will result in the greatest measure of good to all. There is no man to-day who says that Canada can have absolute free trade. We know that a revenue must be raised, and we know that that revenue can only be raised—or ought only to be raised, that is, it is better that it should be raised—by a tariff. Therefore, it is our duty to meet and agree upon such a tariff as will accomplish this result, and that we have done. Now, gentlemen, on the other side say that we have falsified our promises.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WADE. An hon. gentleman on the other side says 'Hear, hear.' They said that before 1900. They went to the people and said that. And what answer did they receive? Surely that should have satisfied them. But it does not appear to have satisfied them. The cry of 'Canada for the Canadians,' reverberated through these halls years ago. It was a master hand that first penned that phrase, and he used it to good advantage. But, when we came into power in 1896, and when this government simply carried out in 1897 the pledges it had given to the country, what was the first position taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side? They said: You are going to ruin all the industries of Canada. Then this great wail went up from Montreal, and we were to have soup kitchens everywhere from Nova Scotia to Vancouver to feed the starving people who would be thrown out of employment by the government's policy. But this did not materialize. The record of this parliament teems with the speeches made by the hon. gentlemen of the other side prophsying these doleful things. And when they found that, not only were the factories not closed, but that business had been given a fillip, that the manufacturers were increasing and that business people had more confidence, what then? Why they simply turned about and said: These are our garments that you have stolen; this is our tariff. And they have continued that cry, until this session. But, this winter, they come forward and say: Oh, this is not right; we must now have a declared policy. A 'declared' policy, mark you. Last winter, they wanted a 'pronounced' policy, and with that demand they met the electors of Nova Scotia. With what result? With the result that the leader of the opposition in the parliament of Nova Scotia is fortunate enough to have one man to second his resolutions. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), a gentleman for whom I have the greatest respect, organized this campaign in the province of Nova Scotia. He went to demand that 'pronounced policy,' first, I believe, to the county of Lunenburg, a county in which, in spite of all our efforts in 1900, my hon. and genial friend Col. Kaulbach, was returned with a majority of something over 230. But when this 'pronounced policy' was put before the people of that magnificent county in terms which only the leader of the opposition could employ, what was the result? The result was that they did not want very much of that 'pronounced policy,' and the supporters of the Liberal government were returned with a majority of over 700. The next place this 'pronounced policy' was used, I believe, was the county of Annapolis. I happened to

be passing on a train and saw my hon. friend addressing a large crowd at Middleton. I regretted that I had not time to stay to hear him, but was compelled to go on, having business further down the line. I was able to squeeze into this House with a majority of 152. But when the people of Annapolis had digested that 'pronounced policy,' the candidates of the Liberal party were returned with majorities of about 500. So the matter ran all over the province of Nova Scotia. And we have come back here 'pronounced policy.' Somebody says there has been a mistake, that that resolution last winter was a mistake, that there was something wrong about it. I fancy it was the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who suggested that they had better call it now 'a declared policy.' So now we have got a 'declared policy,' and upon that these gentlemen are going to the country again.

It does not seem to me, Sir, that it is about time that our friends on the other side roused themselves to a realization of the fact that it does not belong to them exclusively to cry, 'Canada for the Canadians.' Have we not just as much right as they have to cry 'Canada for the Canadians?' We may differ from them in our policy, but surely they will be just enough to admit that in adopting this policy we have done that which we deemed and what has proved best in the interest of Canada. I say, it is somewhat impertinent on their part to arrogate to themselves the sole right of shouting, 'Canada for the Canadians.' It is on a par with the position that they took years gone by when they arrogated to themselves the whole of the loyalty in the Dominion of Canada. You will remember that after the speech made by our leader in Montreal, after the elections of 1896, there was a general expression of surprise in the English papers at the sentiments of that speech. Why, they said, 'this man is loyal to the empire.' It was a matter of surprise to them. Why? Because the Conservative papers of Canada had so frequently and for so many years declared that the whole Liberal party were annexationists, that they were, in the words of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, looking to Washington, that they were traitors to the empire—and the English press was surprised to see how false those statements had been. I say that is something of which the Conservative party ought to be ashamed. No man need to stand on the floor of parliament or elsewhere in this country and declare that he is loyal. For my part I consider that the self-proclaimed loyalist, the self-proclaimed patriot, is a man that needs watching. Every man is supposed to be loyal in this whole empire; and the individual who declares that any party is disloyal, or that any group of citizens is disloyal, that man himself is disloyal to the best interests of Canada.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I should be considered failing in my duty if I did not say something on the apple question; and as it is now nearly six o'clock, I beg to call your attention to the fact.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

Mr. WADE. Mr. Speaker, it would not be necessary for me to have made any remarks, certainly not any extended remarks, in regard to the fruit industry, but for certain somewhat extraordinary statements which were made here a few days ago by the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith). Last session there was considerable discussion in regard to the fruit business in the Annapolis valley in the province of Nova Scotia. I wish to say here that in any discussion I propose to engage in concerning that industry I would like to lift it beyond the pale of party politics. This is a great industry, one of the most important in my native province and in the constituency I have the honour to represent, and I do think, Sir, that we can best serve the interests of the fruit growers of Nova Scotia as well as the fruit growers of the whole of the Dominion of Canada if we approach the discussion of the matters that are of interest to them, from a non-political standpoint. I, therefore, wish to say that I regret that the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth were not free from political considerations, and that he endeavoured to cast upon the government the burden of all the misfortunes that are attendant upon the present conditions in regard to the fruit industry. He made some remarks that I believe will be regarded as somewhat startling. In the first place he informed the House that Nova Scotia this year had the only good crop of apples grown in the country. This is rather a remarkable statement coming from the hon. gentleman who lives in a part of this Dominion, which at the time when the Annapolis valley was first producing apples in abundance his county was traversed only by the aborigines. The crop of the Annapolis valley was barely an average one. It was good. It was strikingly good, but to have this hon. gentleman publish to the world that this great industry which was established by the French away back in 1600 and odd that its first good crop was last year is rather discouraging. Then, he blames the government for all the difficulties in connection with the transhipment of apples. He says the people there are dissatisfied, and that they are censuring the government. He attempts to, and does read resolutions from fruit growers associations and boards of trade to support—but which entirely failed to support—his charge, and then he tells us about the sad condition

of affairs in Annapolis valley. That was rather startling, it was amusing to hear the hon. gentleman talk about the sad condition of affairs in the Annapolis valley where the people this year have put into their pockets over a million dollars as the outcome of their orchards. Then he cites as his authority for all this dissatisfaction, Mr. Peter Innes. Mr. Peter Innes is a very estimable Scotch gentleman. It would be well for me to say who Peter Innes is, because he is the authority that is taken by the hon. member for South Wentworth to represent the true state of feeling in the Annapolis valley. I wish to preface my remarks by saying that it is absolutely incorrect to say that there is the slightest dissatisfaction with the government in the Annapolis valley, and by the Annapolis valley I mean the counties of Annapolis, King's and Hants, in regard to either the apple business or the transportation question concerning it. Now, Mr. Peter Innes was for a number of years the manager of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, now the Dominion Atlantic Railway. That railway to-day is the only outlet for the valley to the sea coast where the apples are transhipped to the steamers. During this regime the farmers and fruit growers of the Annapolis valley claimed that his heart was as adamant towards them. The rates that he demanded were extortionate and they continued in that way until he ceased to be manager and another man took the rein of affairs. Then he became a grand reformer. These rates were ridiculously high. He demanded that they should be cut down at once. And what is the explanation he gave? He says :—In the days when I managed the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, apples were a luxury ; now they are a necessity. In the same way the hon. member for South Wentworth stood by the late government when they did nothing for the farmers, virtually, when they did nothing for the fruit growers, and supported them, having no fault to find with them whatever. But when his party was defeated, when his government was turned from power and when the present administration took upon itself the reins of government, the hon. member for South Wentworth became a great reformer. He demands everything from the government now and he is not willing to give them that credit which they deserve. To read his speech and to listen to his remarks one would suppose that it was the bounden duty of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) to go down through the province of Nova Scotia, to go to the ports of Halifax, St. John and Montreal and there, himself, see to it that the apples were stored on board the steamers that were properly ventilated, to see that they were properly stowed on the steamers and to accompany the ships on their voyage across the Atlantic ocean. I say that the government cannot undertake such a duty or responsibility as that. We might with equal justice demand that the hon. member for South Wentworth should assume responsibility for that Mr. Onderdonk, from Ontario, who went down to the valley last year, purchased on credit some $80,000 worth of fruit, stored it in a warehouse and then gave a bill of sale of that fruit to his creditors by which the farmers were robbed of $80,000 of their money. I say that all the farmers and fruit growers ask is that the government of the Dominion of Canada shall aid them as far as they can in securing proper transportation of their fruit from this side to the other side. Then the hon. gentleman made another statement here. I am sorry he made it because it is not correct. He says :

> Within the last twenty-four hours there has been a deputation of Nova Scotia fruit growers in this House to protest against the condition of things and complain that the government have neglected their duty.

I had the privilege of coming from the province of Nova Scotia in company with and conversing with them from the time we left Halifax until we arrived here. I secured a vast amount of useful information from them. I had the pleasure of going with that delegation to a conference with the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), the deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and not only is the statement that they complained of the action of the government untrue, but Mr. Ralph Eaton, the foremost orchardist in the lower provinces, after making a very exhaustive speech in connection with this matter, took occasion to say that he was grateful to the government for what they have done in connection with the agricultural interests, that he was grateful to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and that he knew that they had his entire sympathy and that he was prepared to do anything and everything he could for them. That is the true situation with regard to the great fruit industry in the Annapolis valley.

Now, Sir, who is he who will be bold enough to say, that the government can come in and remedy all these evils that are existing ? Any man who knows aught about this matter knows, that all the government can do is to grant a subsidy in order to ensure the rapid and proper transit of fruit from the province of Nova Scotia, or from the Dominion of Canada to the other side of the Atlantic. This they have done. Last year and for a number of years they have been giving this subsidy to the Furness-Whithy Company. There was some discussion about the matter last year, and more stringent provisions were incorporated in the contract that was entered into between the government and that steamship company. Last year the company agreed to give the following service—I am reading from the contract :

The contractors will on the 1st of July next, after the date of these presents, place on the route between the Port of St. John, in the province of New Brunswick and the port of London in England, the following steamers :—The 'Evangeline,' the 'Loyalist' and the 'Dahomey'; and with these or with other good steamers sanctioned by the minister, maintained for the period of one year a regular service between these ports at fixed dates at regular intervals of not over fifteen days.

The balance of this contract was carefully drawn. It was supposed by the fruit owners that if these ships, or ships of a like character, could be employed in that trade, the business woud be properly served. I believe that if those ships had been employed and if the stowage of the fruit had been properly attended to there would have been no complaint and no dissatisfaction. In fact, I have here on my brief statements from the leading orchardists in that province supporting that contention, but I am sorry to say that the Furness-Whithy Company did not carry out their contract. In the first place, they were careless about the handling of the fruit from the cars to the steamer. In the next place, they piled the fruit sometimes eleven tiers deep in their steamers with the result, as any body would know—there being no intervening dunnage between the barrels—that the whole pressure of eight or nine barrels coming on the lower ones would spring the bilges of the barrels and bruised nearly every apple in them. Any lawyer knows that the persons who held bills of lading from these steamers would be in a position to maintain an action for damages against the company, but what could the government do ? There is only one thing the government could do and that was, to withhold from that steamship company the subsidy, and we are told that the subsidy has been withheld. But this is not all that this Furness-Whithy Company did. They ran these three splendid steamers for a part of the year; they sold two of them, withdrew the third from the service, and filled their places with inferior steamers without first getting the sanction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce as provided for by this contract. That is the cause of complaint throughout the Annapolis valley—not against the government, but against this Furness-Whithy Company which has violated its contract.

What can the government do ? All that they can do is to withhold from the company the balance of the subsidy that has not been paid. I have not approached this matter, Sir, in any controversial spirit, and neither has the hon. Dr. Borden, the representative of King's county, nor Dr. Russell, the representative of Hants. But, after listening to what has been stated by these representatives of the fruit growers, we have had conferences with the minister and we have asked him, in order to secure the proper carrying out of such provisions as we deem necessary, that in the next contract which is entered into between the government and any company that is to carry this fruit from Canada to the other side, certain stipulations shall be incorporated in that contract. The conditions that we have asked for and which meet with the approval of the representatives of the fruit growers are these :

That if the fruit trade, in the opinion of the minister requires it, the minister would insist upon the company increasing the service to intervals of every ten days instead of fifteen days. Such steamships when carrying fruit shall be run at an average of twelve knots an hour.

Many people have demanded that the steamers shall be run at a higher rate of speed, but after a great deal of discussion it was shown that a steamer running at twelve knots an hour will make the trip in something less than ten days, and that is considered to be all that is necessary.

Said steamships when carrying fruit shall be ventilated by forced draft in the most effective manner, to the satisfaction of the Minister, and so as to secure as uniform and cool a temperature as possible. And the Minister may require the company to instal in and upon such steamships theographs to record the temperature.

The handling, loading, stowage and unloading of fruit shall be under the supervision of an officer appointed or named by the Minister, if he deems it desirable.

Said steamships shall not carry between any decks more than five tiers of barrels of apples, that is, there shall not be resting on any one tier of barrels of apples more than four others, unless the same is arranged in such a manner as to relieve the barrels of the extra weight.

I may say in this connection, that the dangerous months in the transhipment of fruit are the months of September and October. During the month of September the temperature between the port of Halifax and the port of London averages something over 59 degrees—I think it is 59·7. During the month of October the temperature averages slightly over 58 degrees. Now, the fruit growers are of opinion that without any cool air chambers and without any refrigeration, but with simply forced draft taking the cool air from outside and circulating it through the vessel, there can be a temperature maintained of about 60 degrees, which is all that is necessary in order to carry the fruit without any loss or damage. That is what they are asking. They are asking simply that these conditions shall be imposed upon the parties to whom the Dominion subsidy is granted. If the subsidy which is now granted is too small, then we make bold to ask the government to make it somewhat larger; and if we are met by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) in the spirit in which he has met all applications on behalf of the agriculturists of this country, then we have every reason to believe that our request will be granted and that the fruit growers of the Annapolis valley will be satisfied with the

result. At any rate, our people are willing to give this forced draft air circulation a fair trial for a year or two, and then if it proves not to be efficient they will come back to parliament and say: We were mistaken, and we ask to have something else done. I submit that it is not fair, in view of what has been done by the Minister of Agriculture, in view of the interest that has been taken by himself personally and by the government in this matter, to censure him or to censure the government, or to say that there is the slightest dissatisfaction with the minister or with the government so far as the people in the valley of the Annapolis are concerned.

There is one other question which is of somewhat vital importance to the people there, and that is the question of railway freight rates on apples. The statement was made by this same delegation to the Minister of Railways; or rather it was at a hearing before him, and what they desired was placed before him by myself in a letter. They are asking that the classification so far as apples are concerned shall be changed. It is now 'three' and 'five,' and they ask that it shall be made 'five' and 'eight,' the same as flour. Of course, the request for a change in the classification of fruits on a railway is a matter of great importance, because that classification is made for the whole Dominion, and we could scarcely hope that the fruit growers of the Annapolis valley could of themselves come here and secure a classification for the whole Dominion unless they were supported. I requested the Minister of Railways to forward this application of mine to the different transportation companies interested; and, after receiving their replies, I hope that other agricultural societies interested throughout the province of Ontario would take the matter up and press the government for this change. I believe that what they ask is fair and reasonable. I can see no reason why apples should not be carried at as low a rate as flour. That is the whole apple question, and a correct statement of the feelings of the people in the county of Annapolis. Last winter there was an Act passed here in reference to apple inspection. That Act has given a great deal of satisfaction. I do not care to discuss it to-night. There is a good deal of divergence of opinion as to whether certain amendments should be made to that Act this year or not; but the consensus of opinion is that we had better try it for another year to see how it works. It is a step in the right direction, and the people are grateful to the Minister of Agriculture, who introduced it. So much for the apple question.

There are one or two other matters which I would like to say a few words about. I wish to remark upon some of the statements made by the hon. leader of the opposition when he moved the resolution now under discussion. I will not dwell as long as I intended to upon that matter, but there are some things I must refer to. There were two statements made by the hon. leader of the opposition which struck me most forcibly. He stated that it was necessary for us to have a declared policy, notwithstanding the fact that we have a declared policy which we have been acting upon for five years, a policy which has stood the test of a vehement political contest and has come off with flying colours; and why does he say so? Because, he asks, 'without it how can we expect men to put their money into the industries of the country with any confidence'? Surely the hon. gentleman must have forgotten himself for a moment when he made this remark. Afraid to put their money into the industries of the Dominion of Canada! Why, Sir, to-day we have men tumbing over each other to secure the industrial and other stocks of the Dominion of Canada. In the province of Nova Scotia this year I have seen property after property sell at 4 or 5 or 6 or even 10 times what they would have sold for in 1897. We have the great industries in the province of Nova Scotia developed as no man had any idea a few years ago that they would be developed. Look at the great Dominion Coal Company. I remember when the premier of Nova Scotia, our present Finance Minister, introduced the legislation of 1894 which brought into existence that great corporation; and what was he met with? The Conservative press of the province of Nova Scotia united in saying that he was handing over the coal mines of Nova Scotia to American speculators, who would close them up and destroy our whole coal industry. A short time previous to that the whole revenue derived by the province from minerals amounted to $120,000. To-day the revenue from the same source has reached over half a million dollars. We have seen the value of the stock of the Dominion Coal Company rushing up 10, 15, sometimes 20 points in a day. And yet the hon. gentleman tells us that people will have no confidence in our industries. Look at the record of the Dominion Steel Company and the Nova Scotia Steel Company. Look at the fact that capitalists have been coming from the United States to buy our railroads. Some gentlemen say that they are coming over to buy everything we have. And yet the hon. leader of the opposition says that in consequence of this policy of ours no one has any confidence in the industries of the Dominion of Canada. Never since the Dominion has been a Dominion has there been even a percentage of the confidence that the financial world has in Canada to-day. It was only a few years ago, I remember it well, when, if you went into the financial markets of New York with a scheme, no matter how tempting it might be, the mo-

ment you mentioned that it was from Nova Scotia, that moment you were turned down and never considered. But to-day, 'Nova Scotia' is the gilt-edged scheme that takes. I am free to admit that the great iron and steel industry of Cape Breton has been fostered to a certain extent by this government. The government has given it a bonus, and properly so. Cape Breton island is the great storehouse of the mineral wealth of this Dominion. We are not in a position to estimate what the future holds for that island. The people of Cape Breton have for years contributed their part towards the building up of manufactures and it was but a measure of justice to grant the bounty on iron in order to give their industries a start.

Another thing seemed to trouble the hon. leader of the opposition. He told us that unless we changed our policy and adopted a declared policy, we should become a pastoral and agricultural people. When he said that, it did convey some horrors to my mind. I would not like to live in a purely pastoral community. I think the only animal I have that I could lead to pastures green has seen some thirty winters. I would not cut much of a figure with a shepherd's crook. I believe the hon. leader of the opposition is one ahead of me, because I understand that he has a cow. In this connection I was looking at Ely's Political Economy,' in which he tells us :

> When hunting tribes begin to domesticate animals they enter usually upon the pastoral stage. The earliest chapters of the Bible give us vivid pictures of peoples living in this period of economic development.

He goes on to cite from the Scriptures a passage which, if reports be true with regard to certain dissensions on the other side, would, with a slight change of the names of the principal parties, be appropriate to this occasion. He cites from the 13th chapter of Genesis these words :

> Abram was very rich in cattle, in silver and in gold. . . . . And Lot also, which went with Abram, had flocks, and herds, and tents. And the land was not able to bear them, that they might dwell together : for their substance was great, so that they could not dwell together. And there was a strife between the herdmen of Abram's cattle and the herdmen of Lot's cattle. . . . . And Abram said unto Lot, Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee and between my herdmen and thy herdmen. Is not the whole land before thee ? Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me : If thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left.

If my information is correct, this has an application to-day ; though I am prepared to learn that I have been misinformed. But it is rather a startling proposition to us members down by the sea to be told that we have to become a pastoral people—we with our great fishing industry, our great mining industry, our great farming and lumbering industries, our great steel industry—unless, forsooth, we have a 'declared' policy. We have been living in hopes and have now the almost certain assurance that our old ship building industry—the wooden ship building industry—will, in the near future, be revived in the form of steel ship building, and to-day I am informed that there is in the province of Nova Scotia a representative of one of the largest and most influential ship building firms on the Clyde, who is there for the purpose of arranging for the building of steamships in that province. Why should we not build steel ships ? We have there all that is necessary. We have inexhaustible mines of coal and iron and all the things necessary in order to produce steel cheaper than it can be produced anywhere else in the world. I am informed on the very best authority that before August of this year the Dominion Steel Company will be producing 1,000 tons of steel per day which will yield to that company a profit of $8,000 per day, or over $2,000,000 net profit per year. Yet we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that if we do not resort to tariff tinkering, we are going to become a pastoral people.

Mr. LAVELL. Does that include the bounty ?

Mr. WADE. That includes the bounty, and the people of Cape Breton are very grateful for that bounty, and I repeat that the giving of it was only what they deserved. They have given bounties to manufacturers, and were entitled to receive from the government some recognition, and they have received it. And in consequence of that bounty, this great industry has been built up in their midst, which has not only benefited Cape Breton and Nova Scotia but the whole Dominion, and is lifting the Dominion into the gaze of the world to-day as the possibly greatest steel and iron producer in the world.

And I say that the bounties which have been given to create this industry has been one of the wisest provisions ever made by any government of Canada.

Mr. HACKETT. Is that steel suitable for the making of steel rails ?

Mr. WADE. I never made a steel rail in my life, but I believe it will make the very best kind of steel rails. However, if the hon. gentleman has any doubts he can go down there and have a steel rail made and see how it works.

I wish to refer to some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). I believe that the House looks upon the hon. member as one of the ablest men who sits on that side. Certainly his speeches are very clear and forcible. I believe that he has been in advance of his party all along, because in 1891 he discovered and declared that the national policy was a delusion and a snare and that what Canada required was a large measure of free

trade. And the other night, after he had spoken for an hour or two, he came to the conclusion that he had not much, if any, fault to find with the present tariff, and that we should be grateful for it to the government. His actual words were :—

Although I am prepared to say this, as a protectionist, that I am not altogether disposed to find much fault in the gross with present system, which is very fair in its effects, and it has done a great deal to maintain the interests of the country.

When we find one of the leading members on the other side giving such an endorsation of the policy and tariff of the government, we need not worry very much about what some of the others opposite may say. I might go on and quote further from the remarks of the hon. gentleman in the same connection, but he fell into one serious error. He declared that every man in this House was a protectionist, to some extent or other. That is absolutely not correct. There are men on this side who are protectionists to a certain degree and there are others who wish to be free traders as far as they possibly can. They have to meet upon a ground of compromise. And if a readjustment of the tariff has to take place in the future, I suppose that a compromise will be necessary. And when that readjustment takes place, I wish to say that if I then have the honour to be in this House, I shall be here asking for a further reduction in the duty on kerosine oil and some reduction in the duties upon tobacco and sundry other things, and I believe that we will all have to meet each other in the spirit of mutual compromise and do the best we can to satisfy each other, consistently with serving the best interests of the country.

The hon. leader of the opposition made some reference to reciprocity and retaliation. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) said that all good things were going the way of hon. gentlemen opposite, and he instanced the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who believes in reciprocity and retaliation. But the leader of the opposition took good care to declare that he did not believe in reciprocity or retaliation, and his words in this connection are somewhat peculiar. He said :—

I am not prepared to say that we want reciprocity in natural products with the United States at the present time. In that I disagree with my hon. friend from North Norfolk. There was a period during which such reciprocity was desirable, and during which it would have been a benefit to this country. That period may or may not have passed away. That period probably has passed. What I object to, in any principle of reciprocity of tariffs or retaliation of tariffs, is, that it may bind us to put our tariff down.

That is what was troubling the leader of the opposition. He thinks that reciprocity or retaliation, one or the other, may cause us to lower our tariff in the future and so admit American goods. There is no spirit, I believe, in Canada to-day in favour of reciprocity. I believe that this Dominion has grown until it has become so lusty that we do not care whether we have reciprocity or not. We feel that we can live without our neighbours to the south. There was a period in the past when it seemed to us in Nova Scotia to be our only salvation. But happily that moment has passed away. When the hon. Minister of Finance was premier of Nova Scotia he inaugurated and carried through such a policy as placed that province on a basis of independence to the United States, and to-day we are prepared to meet the United States on a fair basis, but we are not going to plead for reciprocity now because we can live without them. At the same time I doubt whether it would be wise for us to throw down the gauntlet and say we are going to inaugurate a policy of retaliation. It is not necessary that we should do so, it is not seemly or dignified or statesmanlike. We must meet the conditions as they arrive, and I believe that the present condition will be remedied by the Americans themselves. They are beginning to feel that the consumers of the United States are being bled by the manufacturers, while 85 per cent of our people are being benefited by getting goods cheaper in consequence.

I wish to say a word or two with regard to the Intercolonial Railway, directing my remarks to one or two statements made by hon. gentlemen on the other side. These gentlemen have asserted that this is the only railway in the Dominion of Canada that is not paying to-day. Does any of these hon. gentlemen speak for the Conservative party ? And is he prepared to urge the government to impose the condition that will make the Intercolonial Railway a commercial success—that is to increase the freight rates to make them equal to those of other roads ? Is there a man on the other side who will take that stand ? If that is done, the Intercolonial Railway can be made a paying concern. But I believe the country will back me up when I say that we are under great obligations to the present Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) for the change that has taken place in the administration of that road. It is but a few years ago when the service on that road was most wretched, such a service as the travelling public would not submit to to-day. The deficit of the road—then some 863 miles in operation—was larger than the deficit to-day. Everybody knows that the deficit can be wiped out if you make the service less efficient than it should be. To-day, we are operating over 1,300 miles of railway on the Intercolonial Railway system. We have a service on that road that cannot be excelled on the continent, I do not care where you go—a perfect road bed, magnificent engines, beautiful parlour cars, a splendid dining car service, and every possible convenience.

It is known by every one that the freight rates upon that road are very low, lower than a commercial rate. But, Sir, who is profiting by that low rate ? Do not let it be supposed for a moment that the maritime provinces are profiting by it. I tell you that the upper provinces profit most by it, because it enables them to bring their products down to the maritime provinces and sell them in competition with those of the people there. Now, as to this deficit, let me point out one or two items. For instance, the fuel in 1896 cost $408,861, and in 1901 the fuel cost $973,268, an increase of $564,407. The repairs in 1896 cost $815,044, and in 1901 this item amounted to $1,322,001, a difference of $507,957. These two items alone represent an increase of $1,072,364. Then there is the difference in wages. Of course, there had to be an increase in the wages bill with the increased mileage. In 1896 the wages bill amounted to $863,057, less than in 1901.

An hon. MEMBER. Wages have gone up, too.

Mr. WADE. I was just going to remark, that, in consequence of the increase of wages in other vocations, occasioned by the great wave of prosperity that has swept over this Dominion, the Intercolonial Railway is obliged to pay larger wages. We find that the increase of expense in running that road was $1,925,000. But, Sir, upon the other side we have an increase in earnings of $1,993,000. Therefore, while the cost of running the road has been increased, the earnings of the road have been increased still more. In connection with this matter of the Intercolonial Railway, I have a word to say which may not be pleasing to the government. There must, in the near future, be a largely increased expenditure upon that road. I am going to ask the government to take this matter into serious consideration. The bridges upon that road were built years ago when the locomotives were not half the weight that they are to-day. As a matter of simple precaution a large expenditure should be made in the way of strengthening these bridges. I believe the country will bear the government out if they undertake this expenditure.

Now, a word as to public works. This Dominion is in its progressive stage, its stage of development. I believe the most important portfolio in the government to-day is that of Public Works. Fortunately for the Dominion, we have as the holder of that portfolio a progressive man, a courageous man, a man who is intelligent enough to see the wants of the country and who will push forward to accomplish what is necessary in order to develop our resources. Let me for a moment, contrast the policy of the late government in this connection with the policy of the present government, taking examples from the county I have the honour to represent. I will select only two places, both on the Bay of Fundy shore. One is Margaretville. At that point, the late government had built a breakwater. A storm came and damaged it, and the government refused to rebuild it, allowing it to go down. And what was the reason given ? The reason given was that a majority of the people in that section refused to vote for the government. But since this government came into power, and while the county was represented by my predecessor, who was an opponent of the Liberal party, this government rebuilt this work, and the country round about is in a state of great prosperity in consequence. Then there is the case of Parker's Cove. In 1890, the government commenced the erection of a pier. Previous to that time, I am perfectly certain there were not $500 worth of fish sold from that hamlet in a year. But, during the summer and spring when this pier was under construction, the fishermen were able to take advantage of it, and that year their sales of fish amounted to between $5,000 and $6,000. Next year, when the first section of the pier was completed, their sales amounted to between $15,000 and $16,000. To-day, tenders are called for a contract to add a hundred feet to the length of the wharf and also an 'L' of fifty feet, to complete it; and the best authorities tell me that, when it is done, the sale from that community will amount to between $50,000 and $60,000. There is a direct result of public works. And when a government that can get the money as cheaply as the government of Canada can, expends its money in works of that sort, I think it is accomplishing a great good. The other night I had the honour to present a petition from the counties of Annapolis, King's and Hants, and the counties on the other side of the Bay of Fundy, asking for the construction of a harbour of refuge upon the Bay of Fundy on the south side. There is no spot where a vessel can be sheltered if caught in a storm on that shore. In 1894, the member then representing Annapolis brought this matter to the notice of the House and urged the case upon the government of that day. In that he was warmly supported by the representative of King's, the present Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Borden). But nothing came of it. I am going to urge upon the government that steps be taken to inquire into this matter during the recess, and I am going to try to convince the government that they should construct this much-needed work. Had the work been constructed years ago, it would have saved the government of this country almost as much as the construction would cost. I believe that all the counties on both sides of the Bay of Fundy are interested in this work. I may say there are a few things in the county of Annapolis that I am going to ask for, amongst others an ice pier and bridge on the Annapolis river. I ask for these things with confi-

dence, because I know that it is the policy of the government to expend whatever money is necessary in the construction of these works. While hon. gentlemen on the other side are worrying and fretting because the expenditure is so high, and getting up past the $60,000,000 mark, I hope to live to see the day—and say this advisedly—when the expenditures of the Dominion of Canada will exceed $100,000,000 per year; and when these expenditures have exceeded $100,000,000 per year, then the prosperity of Canada will have been fairly started.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why not do it now?

Mr. WADE. Because I fear it would give the hon. gentleman the nightmare. You know, Sir, I have the greatest consideration for hon. gentlemen on the other side, because they have always treated me with great kindness, coming here as a young and inexperienced man, and I would not like to advocate anything that would be shocking to their sensibilities.

There is only one other question that I wish to deal with, and I will be very brief. I was somewhat shocked the other day when an hon. gentleman on this side of the House told us that Great Britain had done nothing for Canada, and was doing nothing for Canada. When we stop to consider that we have thousands of miles of seaboard bounded by two oceans, that we have three or four thousand miles of boundary line, upon the other side of which there is a powerful and an aggressive nation, when we consider that our present position is due and largely attributable to the fact that we are living under the British flag, I say it ill becomes any one to state that Great Britain has done nothing for us. If the United States to-morrow encroached upon our territory or invaded our rights, what would be the assistance that we would call to our aid? Would it not be the British army and the British fleet? How many million pounds sterling would it take to settle the trouble? And, Sir, under the present arrangement who would pay for it? The British taxpayer in the British islands, he is the man that would pay for it. I have under my hand here a few figures showing the expenses of maintaining the army and navy of the British empire, which amounts to £53,000,000 per year. Of that, some of the self-governing colonies pay a portion:—

	Imperial.	Local.	
Cape Colony	£30,000	£220,000	
Natal..	6,837	60,186	
Canada	Nil.	491,736	
Australia	126,000	587,000	
			£1,521,759

The burden of this expense which protects this whole empire, is thrown almost entirely upon the British taxpayer. I have clipped an item from a Conservative paper bearing out what I am saying:

A Canadian from the west who has just been spending a few weeks with his relatives in England says it is very painful for a Canadian to realize the crushing burden of taxation which has fallen on struggling people in Britain, and the uncomplaining way in which they face it, while we Canadians have practically not touched the burden at all, though it is, as it were, for our sakes, as colonials looking to Britain for defence, that it is being incurred. We think the great majority of Canadians feel exactly as this man does, or would do so if brought, as he has been, face to face with the facts.

Sir, I believe that the day is not far distant when, as a matter of simple justice and right, the people of the Dominion of Canada will say: We wish to share a portion of this burden, we wish to have a voice in controlling the destiny of the empire, and its policy towards other nations. A great deal has been said on the other side of the House as to the position taken by our honoured leader with regard to the preference that is given to Great Britain. I am but a young politician, and cannot suppose that my words will carry very much weight; but I do wish to say that the statement made by the right hon. gentleman in Great Britain with regard to that preference, sounded the key note of true imperialism. I believe history will prove that this is the case. Further than that, I believe that statement, acted upon as it has been, was the means of provoking—I should not say provoking—was the means of engendering the first spark of national spirit we have ever had in the Dominion of Canada. There is a national spirit abroad in the Dominion of Canada to-day, and that national spirit we upon this side of the House do not claim, belongs exclusively to ourselves. We say that that spirit is abroad on the other side of the House and on the other side of politics as well as it is on this side.

Now, Sir, I wish to conclude my imperfect remarks, and in doing so I would like to touch for a moment upon a ground where there can be no difference of politics. I refer to the South African war. I wish to pay a tribute to the noble men, the Canadian heroes of Hart's River, those men who chose death rather than surrender. They have added lustre to the name of Canada that will be as enduring as time. With such deeds before us, and with the records of the other contingents that have gone to Africa, may we not regardless of political party, feel proud to-day that we can call ourselves Canadians? I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the attention which you have accorded me, and I apologize for the time I have taken up.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). While the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) was speaking, and his friends about him were hanging so intently upon every word that fell from his lips, I could not help thinking that the innermost feeling in the hearts of every one of them, if they had the faintest sense of logic, was 'almost thou

persuadest me to be a protectionist.' The hon. gentleman commenced his remarks by giving us a tabulated statement of the people of Canada engaged in the various industries. He showed that those engaged in agriculture were about 790,000; whereas those engaged in manufacturing industries were about 320,000; and he drew the conclusion that it was a monstrous absurdity that we in this country should endeavour to protect a minority of simply 10 to 15 per cent against an overwhelming majority of 80 to 90 per cent. Surely when the hon. gentleman was speaking he must have spoken unwittingly, or he would not otherwise have given this House such a conclusive proof of the sublimest ignorance of the first doctrines of protection. Surely the hon. gentleman must understand that in this country every line of industry, every occupation, is so interested in all the others, that the ramifications of business are so intricate and so widespread, that you cannot benefit any industry without benefiting all others as well; and it is equally true that you cannot injure any industry in this country without injuring all others as well.

Now, we on this side of the House take a broader view than that of my hon. friend. We take the broad view of national protection for every industry, and while I would agree with him in the principle he laid down that legislation should be based on the principle of doing the greatest good to the greatest number, we say that by adopting a protective policy it is perfectly competent for this House to do the greatest good to the greatest number. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the duty of this House is to protect one solitary industry and that is the mining industry of Cape Breton. I was rather surprised that in the course of his remarks my hon. friend admitted that not only were our miners protected but that the bonus system had helped Cape Breton, Nova Scotia and the whole of the Dominion. Nobody on this side of the House takes any exception to the bonus system, but we do take particular exception to an hon. gentleman discussing a question about which he is so profoundly ignorant. Surely that hon. gentleman must be aware that if the bonus to the mining industry of Cape Breton and of Nova Scotia were doubled it would be of no effect unless its permanency were assured. The Conservative party lays down the principle which the hon. gentlemen are beginning to understand that it is just as essential that the protection given to any industry shall be a complete and adequate protection for the time being as it is that that protection shall be a constant protection so that those who engage in that industry need not be afraid that every session they may have all their stocks and profits swept away, but shall know that the government is going to give that industry the protection it requires. My hon. friend, in speaking of his friends on the other side of the House, said that some were protectionists to a certain degree, that some were free traders to a certain degree, that there would probably be a revision of the tariff and he presumed that a compromise would be necessary. If words such as these were uttered by the Finance Minister of the country, it would have a most injurious effect on the industry of this country. If the manufacturers of this country and the capitalists of adjoining countries are given to understand that the revision of the tariff is not to be considered as a matter of principle but is to be entirely a matter of party advantage, of compromise between the free traders and the protectionists, it will be a sad day for the industries of Canada. The hon. gentleman in referring to the remarks made by the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith) the other day was good enough to prove up to the hilt everything that my hon. friend said, so that it will not be necessary for me to do more than merely call the attention of the House to the proof he gave of the remarks of the hon. member for South Wentworth. The charge made by the hon. member for South Wentworth was that the government had not done its duty, had not done what it should have done for the fruit growers of the Annapolis district and my hon. friend read resolutions passed by different associations in that part of the country, which resolutions entirely bore out what he said. But, the hon. member for Annapolis said that he, himself, was perfectly aware of the complaints that were made. He said that the ministers could do nothing except to give a bonus to some line of steamships to induce it to assist in the transportation of fruit from the Annapolis valley, and then in five minutes he read a suggestion that he had drawn up that he had left with the minister and, if practical effect had been given to these suggestions these grievances would have been removed. The very statement shows that the minister, requiring to have some matters called to his attention, although five years in office, has failed to grasp the necessities of the case and that he has failed to do what he might have done. The hon. gentleman, in triumph, speaking of the policy which he and his friends opposite are supporting, referred to the late provincial elections in the province of Nova Scotia, and he said that although at the last election the policy of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in this House was well known, and I dispute the fact that that policy was well known or was laid before the people of Nova Scotia, the government swept that province by an overwhelming majority. As the people of Nova Scotia vote on local, not on Dominion issues, surely the hon. gentleman would not have us believe that the premier of Nova Scotia is such a wholly unimportant factor in the national life that it is a matter of indifference what he thinks, so long as

the views of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads this House, are in accord with those of the majority of the people. We claim in the province of Ontario to have disassociated provincial politics from Dominion politics and we hope that when the election comes on in the near future the people of Ontario will condemn the present administration on its own acts and not on the acts of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman concluded his speech by a reference to the subject of imperial defence and he gave us some very interesting figures in connection with that. I would like to speak at length on that subject. I would like to call attention to the fact that while many of the colonies are contributing very largely of their means to assist the home government, the Dominion of Canada not only contributes nothing but even declines to consider the question at the approaching meeting of the colonial premiers. But, though I would like to discuss this question I feel that on this particular night it would be utterly out of place in the shadow of the disaster which has fallen on our friends in arms in South Africa and I would prefer to postpone my remarks to another day. As this debate has proceeded, as day followed day and speech succeeded speech. though many passing impressions have faded away I believe one deepseated and abiding conviction has been left on the minds of the hon. gentlemen in this House and on the minds of the people of this country and it is that from the time the world dawned to the commencement of this debate there never were such varied, such grotesque, such bewildering opinions on any political questions advanced before any body of men as those advanced by the hon. gentlemen opposite in the progress of this debate. I have listened carefully and patiently to the speeches as they fell from the lips of the hon. gentlemen opposite and I have studied with some care the 'Hansard' report of these speeches in order to see if I could discover any theory, any feeling, any idea, any determination in common on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and after some consideration it seems a fair conclusion to be drawn that one can find a common theory, a feeling, an idea, a determination. I believe that a fair rendering of these speeches of the hon. gentlemen opposite, is that it is the theory of free trade. Their idea is that free trade is pretty nearly played out. I think they have the feeling that it is about time to abandon free trade and seek some other refuge, probably the protective harbour and it is abundantly clear that there is a determination, no matter what the government may do, no matter how the hon. gentlemen may differ or how the people suffer and that determination is to keep the government in power at any and all costs. I believe that for years back the hon. gentlemen opposite have been kneeling before the shrine of the goddess of free trade, that they have been sadly and grudgingly making sacrifices on the altar of free trade and that while they are inquiring in their own hearts if these sacrifices are really necessary, their minds are beginning to be enlightened by the irresistible logic of facts. They see the conclusive results which have flowed from the application of protective principles and while their hearts were faltering their minds were suggesting that it was well to leave this falling shrine and seek the temple of protection over and beyond. Their consciences politically stifled in their dying throes urged them to set aside all that they honestly believed to be in the interests of the country and so the hon. gentlemen opposite separated by these conflicting forces present the variance which we see to-day. It is said that the hon. member for Victoria, Nova Scotia (Hon. Mr. Ross) whom I see before me now, and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) are still kneeling before the altars of free trade.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I have not spoken yet.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have not said that the hon. gentleman has spoken in this debate. But we know his opinions perfectly well, and if the hon. gentleman has left that altar I will be very happy to withdraw my remarks and to say that he has ceased to believe in the doctrines of free trade. But, until the hon. gentleman does contradict me, I will assume that he still retains the opinions he has so frequently and eloquently expressed. I repeat that the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) and the hon. gentleman for Russell (Mr. Edwards) are still worshipping at the altar of free trade. But there are other gentlemen on that side who differ from them. We have for example the hon. gentleman for Vancouver (Mr. Smith); the hon. gentleman for Westminster (Mr. Morrison); the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) who are still worshipping there, but with one eye on the altar of free trade they are casting another eye over their shoulders to watch the procession of all the peoples of the world marching into the temple of protection on the other side of the road. We have others, such as the hon. gentleman for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) who has not only looked over his shoulder, but is turning around and is blindly groping to find his way into the temple of protection. So we find that among these hon. gentlemen there are all sorts and varieties of opinion on this interesting question. But, Sir, whatever the varieties of opinion may be among these gentlemen, there are one or two respects in which their ideas touching protection differ entirely from the ideas on that subject held by hon. gentlemen on this side. We on this side of the House believe in a national protection. We believe in the protection of every industry in the Dominion of Can-

ada. We believe that it is possible to protect every industry, and we say that under such a policy as the Conservative party inaugurated and maintained, and under such a policy as it will maintain if again called to take the reins of power, every industry in this country will be protected; every artisan, every employee, every labourer in this country will be protected, and we say that the goal of our policy is to see not only capital protected, but that every free labouring man who is willing to do an honest day's work in Canada shall have an honest day's work to do, and an honest day's wage for him at the close of the day. But, hon. gentlemen opposite, as against our ideas of national protection, have a sectional, a local, an individual idea of protection. I appeal to the speeches we have heard from these hon. gentlemen to prove this. The hon. gentleman for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is a free trader, but he believes in the protection of horses. The hon. gentleman from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) is a free trader, but he believes in the protection of lumber and lead. The hon. gentlemen from Vancouver (Mr. Smith) and from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) are free traders, but they believe in the protection of labour. The hon. gentleman from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) is a protectionist, and he believes in the protection of everything except the woollen industry apparently. And so as we go along the line we find that almost every gentleman on the other side of the House believes in the protection of a particular industry in which he personally, or the constituency which he represents happens to be interested.

Now, Sir, if ours is a national protection and hon. gentlemen opposite are advocating a local, or sectional, or individual protection, are we not justified in saying that ours is a patriotic protection while theirs is a purely selfish protection. Perhaps, Sir, this is the reason why hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have been ready and willing for the past twenty-five years, not only in this House but wherever they may be, to advocate the cause of protection, whereas hon. gentlemen opposite advocate their cause in such a way that no man in the Dominion of Canada knows to-day what the position of the government is on this question. Let me give practical proof of what I state; that no person in this country can say to-day where the government is on the question of tariff reform. I start first with the Liberal platform adopted by the party convention in 1893. I have no intention of reading the whole of this interesting document, but one or two sentences on the subject of protection are germane to the matter in hand. I find it laid down as a plank in the Liberal platform :

> That the tariff shall be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessaries of life, and shall be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

I find also that the Liberal party there assembled in convention said this :

> We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based upon that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

That was the platform of the party which came into power in 1896. In 1897, the following year, it was the duty of that party to lay a tariff before this House. Their position was this : They came before the people as advocates of free trade; they had supplanted a government which was avowedly a protectionist government. They had on the one hand the tariff laid down by the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie in 1877; a free trade tariff; a tariff framed by that noble man who told us what he professed, and was prepared if necessary to suffer for his belief. Looking at the tariff of 1877 and the tariff of 1894—opposites as two tariffs could be—it became the duty of the present government to frame their tariff, and in 1897 they brought their tariff down. If these hon. gentlemen had adhered to the principle which they laid down at the convention of 1893, the tariff of 1877 is the tariff to which the tariff of 1897 would have been most closely assimilated. But I find that in this Liberal tariff of 1877, there are only four pages all told of dutiable goods, whereas in the Liberal tariff of 1897 they have been spun out to twenty-nine pages. I find that in this tariff of 1877, there were thirty-two items of specific duties besides sugar and tobacco—specific duties that have been condemned by hon. gentlemen opposite from the day the Conservative party came into power in 1878 even down to this date. And yet on a reference to the tariff framed and carried out by that grand old Liberal, Alex. Mackenzie, who lived and died a free trader, we find among the small number of items in his tariff that there were thirty-two items bearing specific duties, besides sugar and tobacco. There were twelve items of this tariff of 1877 bearing 25 per cent; twenty-one items bearing 10 per cent and thirty-one items bearing 5 per cent. There you have the whole tariff of 1877. I do not for a moment contend that this government when it came into power were bound to pass exactly the tariff of 1877. The Minister of Customs would be the first one to consider the point if I did not admit that the circumstances of this country had changed, and that a tariff that might be reasonable in 1877 would be admitted to be a monstrous tariff twenty years later. I admit that. But there must be an underlying principle even under a tariff, and I merely call attention to the fact that a certain principle underlaid one tariff to which these gentlemen were bound according to their pledges, and there was an altogether different principle underlying the Conservative tariff of 1894, which they did follow. I have taken a glance

through the Liberal tariff of 1897, and I have compared the tariff of 1897 with the tariff of 1894. Certain changes of course were made in the tariff of 1894, while the late government was in power, and certain changes have been made since 1897 in the tariff by the present administration, but these are immaterial since it is a question of principle I am discussing. I have therefore taken the two tariffs, the Conservative tariff of 1894 passed by a Conservative administration giving what they thought was proper protection to the various industries. I then take the tariff of 1897 passed by a Reform administration giving what they honestly believed—because of course they must have intended to carry out their pledges to the people of this country—giving what they honestly believed a tariff so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible on all the necessaries of life and from which the principle of protection had been wholly expunged. I find in looking through the Liberal tariff of 1897 that a number of classes of articles are grouped together. The first class is, 'ales, beers, wines and liquors.' There are ten items in that class and this free trade administration, not considering that they came under the head of necessaries of life, left the duty on all of these articles as it was in the tariff of 1894, save one and they raised that. The next class is, 'agriculture, animals and dairy products.' There were ninety-three items under this class, in the tariff of 1894, and these hon. gentlemen opposite who contend that it is impossible to protect the farmer or to protect any products of the farm might well have relieved all these ninety-three items from any duties, if these gentlemen believed what they professed.

But I find, on comparing the 1894 tariff with the 1897 tariff, that out of these 93 items 81 remained unchanged, 5 were decreased, 6 were increased, and one was changed from specific to ad valorem, the result being, I think, about the same. The next class is fish and the products of the fisheries, of which there are 19 items. Every one bore a heavy taxation under the Conservative regime, and not a single one in the whole 19 was reduced under the able generalship of the Finance Minister, although he comes from a fishing province. The next class is books and paper—18 items; 12 unchanged, 6 changed. Class 5, chemicals and drugs—14 items; 9 unchanged; 4 increased, 1 lowered. Class 6, opium—3 items, all unchanged. Class 7—colours, paints, oils, varnishes, &c.—21 items ; 14 unchanged, 3 increased, 4 decreased. Class 8—coal—2 items; 1 unchanged and 1 decreased. Class 9—earthenware, cements, slate and stoneware—20 items ; 11 unchanged, 1 increased, 3 decreased; 5 changed from specific to ad valorem. Class 10—glass and glassware—11 items; 5 unchanged, 3 increased, 3 changed from specific to ad valorem, probably increased. Class II—leather, rubber and manufactures of—11 items; 8 unchanged, 3 increased. Class 12—metals and manufactures of—99 items. The wording of these items was so changed that not being conversant with them I have left out the 99 items. But this I may say, that bonusing would afford a tremendous protection outside of the tariff protection, and perhaps the last item of the class will shed a light on the spirit in which all the changes were made, the last item being goods not otherwise provided for, on which the duty was raised from 27½ per cent under the 1894 tariff to 30 per cent under the 1897 tariff. The next item is class 13, vehicles; 4 items; 3 unchanged, 1 changed slightly, so that it lets shoddy buggies come into this country. Class 14—manufactures of wood, cane and cork; 19 items; 14 unchanged, 1 decreased, 3 increased, 1 compromised, but it discriminates against Canadian wood. Class 15—jewellery and material therefor—8 items; 6 unchanged, 1 increased, 1 decreased. Class 16—minerals—3 items; no change. Class 17, musical instruments—2 items; 1 unchanged, 1 partly raised and partly lowered. Class 18—textiles, hats, furs, &c.—51 items; 22 unchanged, 17 increased, 6 decreased, 6 readjustments. Class 19—sundries—26 items; 21 unchanged, 3 decreased, 1 increased, 1 new. Class 20—sugar, syrups and molasses—7 items; 1 unchanged, 6 raised. Class 21—tobacco and manufactures of—5 items; 5 increased. Class 22, unenumerated goods—1 item, unchanged. The sum total of all this is that, excluding the manufactures of iron, some 99 items, there were in the tariff some 348 items, of which 244 were untouched, 54 were increased, 34 were decreased, and the remaining 16 were adjusted between specific and ad valorem; I cannot say whether these were increased or decreased. And that, hon. gentlemen opposite profess, is the carrying out of their promise to the country to lower the tariff, to bring about freer trade, and to entirely expunge from the tariff the radically unsound principle of protection.

But let us see how it has worked out in actual practice. When hon. gentlemen opposite sat down to frame this tariff, I presume the Minister of Finance would be a leading spirit at the board. The Minister of Finance is a life-long free trader; he has had no hesitation in announcing that fact to the House again and again; and so, as an ardent free trader coming from the province of Nova Scotia, he sat down at the board to see that his native province secured those benefits of free trade which he had advocated so long and so eloquently. How did he do it ? There were three great industries in the province of Nova Scotia—the fishing industry, the coal industry, and the iron industry. In the fishing industry there were 19 items, not one of which was changed; on coal there was a duty of 50 cents a ton and he left it at that, affording ample protection; and in the iron industry

the miners were given bonuses which I need not comment upon, since the hon. gentleman who has preceded me (Mr. Wade) has admitted that owing to the bonuses the iron manufactures of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton have attained a success which they could not possibly have attained without those bonuses. We have here a practical proof that the Finance Minister, the head of the board, was careful to see that a full measure of protection was given to his own province. Of course, the Minister of Customs, from the province of Ontario sat down at the board. I presume he must have done so, because Ontario had some items increased and some left alone. The wicked Tories in passing the tariff of 1894, thought that 25 per cent was a sufficient protection on biscuits, and the Reform government thought the same in 1897. But on sweetened biscuits the Tories in 1894 thought 25 per cent was sufficient, but the Reform government in 1897 did not, and they increased the duty to 27½ per cent. On pickles the Reformers in the old tariff of 1877 thought 17½ per cent a sufficient protection; in the tariff of 1894 the wicked Tories increased the rate to 35 per cent, and in 1897 the Reform Minister of Customs did not cut that down, but left it as it was. On jellies and jams there was a duty under the tariff of 1877 of 17½ per cent; the Tories in 1894 made it 3 cents per pound, but the Reform free trade government in 1897 increased it to 3¼ per pound. Then, somebody, I presume, was looking after the interests of the farmers on that board.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What did the Tory government make the duties on those articles in 1895 ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I think they raised the duties in 1895.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It would be fair to say that.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have no objection to saying that they did. But it is a question of principle I am discussing, not the question of a paltry change of 1 per cent or 2 per cent. It seems impossible for hon. gentlemen opposite, even ministers of the Crown, to consider these questions on any higher ground than a paltry 1 per cent or 2 per cent a pound on jellies, jams or pickles. We on this side of the House are prepared to discuss this matter as a question of principle; and if the government came into power pledged to remove the principle of protection, they did not do it if they imposed a higher duty than what the Conservative government considered sufficient in 1894. I am quite prepared to admit that in some cases the duties were raised in 1895, but precious good care was taken that they were not put back in 1897.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is that correct ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I think so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman should remember that there was 33⅓ per cent taken off all the articles he has enumerated, large amounts of which come from Great Britain.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am coming to the question of the preference; the hon. gentleman need not think that I am going to evade it. But the hon. gentleman must understand that when the duty is raised, it is raised against all the world except one country, and he and his friends claim that there are patriotic reasons why this should be the case. He took precious good care to protect himself against all other countries. The hon. gentleman specially disapproved of what was done in 1895, and if the preference had not been given, he would not have put the duty so high in 1897.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did he say so ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. The hon. gentleman takes precious care not to say so. He called attention to the fact that although apparently the duty is as high as three-quarters of a cent a pound, it is less on account of the preference, but if the preference had not been given would the hon. gentleman have raised the duty ? I pause for a reply. The hon. gentleman declines to answer. Then the raise was made because the preference was given, and the hon. gentleman stands in the position of having to admit that he first raised the duty and then gave a preference, so as to give an advantage nominally to England without hurting the manufacturers here, on that particular article, to the extent of a single dime.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What was the duty in 1895 ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am not discussing 1895 tariff but the facts of the two governments on two different occasions. It is a matter of utter indifference to me what was done by either subsequently. I am mentioning what was done at a particular time, and the government of 1894 was either right or wrong in the tariff it brought down, and so was the government of 1897. If the hon. gentleman will look at the duties in the tariff affecting the agricultural community, he will find that they were not maintained. The hon. Minister of Customs has in this House again and again condemned the tariff of 1894. I am not saying that he condemned it with regard to jams, jellies, pickles and preserves, but he condemned it, as a whole, yet we find that practically he adopted that tariff when he came into power, except to amend it in certain respects, and in each of these he invariably amended it for the worse.

We find several reductions made with regard to agricultural products. The duty on wheat was reduced from fifteen to twelve cents a bushel, on wheat flour from seventy-five to sixty cents per bushel ; but on bis-

cuits not sweetened the duty remained as it was, 25 per cent and on biscuits not sweetened at 27½ per cent. Corn was admitted free, and the duty on corn meal, I believe, was reduced. I suppose perhaps that one reason why corn was admitted free was because the ministry held the idea, which was advanced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) and others in this House, that it was impossible to protect the farmers. Whether or not that statement be correct, it has certainly been made again and again throughout this budget debate, and I would judge that the only reason why the Minister of Customs representing Ontario—which is to a large extent an agricultural province—allowed the duties on agricultural products to be cut while those on manufactured goods were so religiously maintained, was that he and his colleagues thought it was impossible to protect the farmer. Allow me for a moment to consider that question: We had an object-lesson in 1888, 1889 and 1890. In 1888 bacon and hams and Canadian pork were imported to the extent of 31,000,000 pounds, and in 1889 to the extent of 33,000,000 pounds. Representations were then made to the government of that day that the Canadian farmer was having his home market made a slaughter market for the Americans, and the duty was increased. The next year the 33,000,000 pounds of importations fell off to 17,000,000 pounds, in 1891 they fell off to 13,000,000 pounds, and in 1892 they dwindled down to 6,900,000 pounds. So you see there, Sir, a distinct object lesson. You see there an instance in which the Americans were making Canada a slaughter market, and when, after their tariff was increased and our farmers were protected, their importations fell off to a very considerable amount. Sometimes protection may work in favour of the farmer in a way that may not appear at first sight. In the riding I have the honour to represent we have the Rathbun Company establishment, one of the largest manufacturing concerns in the country. And at a public meeting held some years ago the head of that company, Mr. Rathbun, speaking on the subject of protection, pointed out that just as long as we lay along side the United States—a country which is liable to such sudden fluctuations in its currency and to sudden panics in its markets—it was absolutely necessary that we should have a distinct protection on products raised by Canadian farmers. Only a few months ago previous there was a panic in Chicago. The price of pork had fallen a great deal lower than it could be raised for, and Mr. Rathbun could have purchased in Chicago all the pork that he required for his shanties at a lower price than he could have got it from the farmers of Hastings, had there been no duty. But the duty was there, and he told his audience that, on account of the duty, there was no object in his buying at Chicago, but he said; had it not been for the duty I would have bought my pork at Chicago where I could have got it the cheapest. Then turning to the farmers who were standing around, and whom he knew by name, he said, addressing one of them in particular: You brought your pork down to my establishment at Deseronto to sell last fall as usual, but had I purchased at Chicago I would have declined to buy. Having no other market you would have been obliged to take it home again, and the result would have been you would have had to suffer a heavy loss simply because you had no market at home. There is an object lesson to show how our farmers can be protected. If they cannot be protected as these hon. gentlemen say, why do they leave all these items on the tariff? Or do they simply wish the farmers to believe that something is being done for them when in reality nothing can be done? The hon. gentleman who preceded me admitted that while the farmers in his part of the country could not be protected, there might be some in some parts of the country to whom the duties on certain items afforded some protection. But we have it admitted by the Minister of Customs that the farmers have been protected, and that in Nova Scotia itself they can be and are protected.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) What about the fishermen?

Mr. NORTHRUP. If my hon. friend will look into the tariff he will find that there are some nineteen items connected with the fishing industry, the duties on which are precisely the same as those in the tariff of 1894. He will find that, from numbers 104 to 122, all fish products, there is protection on every one of them.

Hon. gentlemen opposite must remember that protection can be indirect as well as direct. If it be true, as my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) has said—and I quite agree with him on that point—that the bounty given by the government to the iron industries in Cape Breton and Nova Scotia has resulted in an immense amount of capital being brought into and expended in that country, surely that affords protection to the farmer by providing him with a home market right at his door, where he can sell his products. In that respect the farmer of Nova Scotia is probably better protected than the farmer of Ontario, and the fishermen in Nova Scotia enjoys a similar protection because he too finds the local market at his doors, which owes its existence to that bounty, apart from the advantage that he gets from the tariff. But hon. gentlemen opposite are so welded to the doctrine of free trade that they close their eyes to the object lessons which are visible on every hand. Their great difficulty is that they take one item standing by itself and do not see how the tariff on

that item is directly going to benefit the particular persons interested. But a tariff on a different thing altogether may give an indirect protection to other interests. Let me give an illustration. The hon. members for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) and Vancouver (Mr. Smith) stands up here, as the representatives of labour, and declare themselves free traders. Nevertheless they believe in protection to labour, that being the only local industry which they are interested in having protected. But surely if they are consistent, they will say: We are here to protect labour, and we find that labour in Peterborough and Cornwall and other great manufacturing centres is losing its occupation, and therefore, without discussing the duty on woollen or other manufactures, we turn to the government to urge them that it is their duty to see that the particular classes of labour in these places are protected. They, however, take the same short-sighted sectional view, and merely ask direct protection to labour in the way of excluding the Chinese, while as a matter of fact, if they would only look over this great country from one end to the other, they would find that ten times the protection would be given labour by a tariff properly applied than by keeping out a few Chinese.

I have a list here of certain items that have been imported into this country, and this perhaps may throw a little light on the question as to whether the tariff really does assist those engaged in the production of any particular article.

Take the item of biscuits, in 1897 biscuits to the value of $41,877,000 were imported, and in 1901 only $28,871,000 worth. Indian corn in 1897, we imported to the extent of $1,230,000, and in 1901 to the extent of $6,-647,000. Breadstuffs in 1897 we imported to the extent of $1,895,000 worth, and in 1901 to the extent of $8,070,000. Collars and cuffs, on which the duty was decreased, in 1897 we imported to the value of $39,152, and in 1901 to the extent of $89,075. Thus in 1901, when the duty was reduced, the imports increased. Cottons and manufactures of cotton, in 1897 we imported $7,609,-000 worth, and in 1901, $12,301.899 worth. And we hear to-day the cries of woe from the cotton industry.

In provisions, the increase was from $702,000 in 1887 to $2,345,000 in 1901. In wool manufactures the increase is from $8,056,000 to $11,357,000. Yet we wonder at the cries to Heaven from the woollen manufacturers. But I notice as a rather singular feature, looking at the public returns that, while our exports have increased very largely, as hon. gentlemen can rightly claim, yet, if we take the trouble to go through the various classes of exports, we find that the greater bulk of the increased exports is in lines with which hon. gentlemen opposite cannot even claim to have anything to do. Our exports of home produce which, in 1887 were $123,959,000, and, in 1901 were $177,431,000, an increase in favour of last year of $53,471,000. But exports of products of the fisheries—they have been amply protected, but precisely as under the old government—increased $406,000. The export of minerals increased form $11,000,000 to $40,000,000 an increase of $29,000,000. But of this $24,000,000 came from the Yukon. And hon. gentlemen opposite will not say that they discovered the Yukon. I hardly think that, in the light of the events of the present day, they will say that to their management of the Yukon is attributable any of the success of that country. The exports of the products of the forest decreased by about $1,000,000. Animals and their products increased $16,000,-000. But the duties on these items are the same as they were under the late government. The exports of agricultural products increased for $17,000,000 to $24,000,-000. Hon. gentlemen opposite know perfectly well that that is owing to the better harvests we have had, particularly in Manitoba and the North-west, and also to increase in prices, so that the same number of bushels exported would show a vast increase in value. The export of manufactures increased $16,000,000. Add these together—the mines, the animals and their products, agriculture products, and manufactures and you find a total increase of $57,940,000. The total increase of exports of home products, as I have shown, is only $53,471,000. This shows that you must have a shortage of $4,000,000 in other items. But there is one respect in which there was not a shortage. And in speaking of this I shall say all I intend to say, it is the subject of the census which has been so much discussed. At page 296 of the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce last year, I find one export the growth of which I was astonished to see. In 1897, when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, the settlers effects exported from this country amounted to $1,008,000. The following year, the export of settlers' effects was less by $15,000. But in 1899—I suppose the new tariff had begun to work—the export of settlers' effects amounted to $1,051,000 ; in 1900 it was $1,165,000 and in 1901, it was $1,212,000. That is to say, last year the export of settlers' effects was over $200,000 more than 1897. That proves one of two things. Hon. gentlemen opposite may argue as much as they please about the exodus being stopped, but, if $200,000 more in value of settlers' effects left this country in 1901 than 1897, it is as sure as the heaven above us that either a wealthier class of people are going out and taking more property with them, or a larger number of poor people are going. I do not pretend to say which horn of the dilemma hon. gentlemen opposite should occupy ; but it would strike one outside of this House as somewhat audacious for an hon. gentleman to stand up here and say that the exodus is practically

stopped when we find that there is an increase of $200,000, equal to 20 per cent, in the export of settlers' effects.

Mr. TAYLOR. According to his own report.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Yes, according to the official report. I have spoken longer than I intended to. But there is one other subject to which I wish to refer for a moment. In the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition a reference is made to the desire for a preferential tariff between the various parts of the empire. I think that on this point there is a clear conflict of opinion between hon. gentlemen opposite and ourselves. I think that we can discuss this question without imputing disloyalty to hon. gentlemen who differ from us. But hon. gentlemen opposite have their idea of how to display their loyalty and we have ours. We think that they are wholly wrong and are making an absurd display of loyalty, but we can express our difference without imputing disloyalty to them, and nothing is further from my thought. We on this side are prepared to admit that all the subjects of this glorious empire should, as far as possible, deal with one another and give one another a preference as against outsiders. And we are prepared, in any case, to give a preference to our fellow subjects in England, or Australia, or any where as against the people outside the empire. But there are people in the Conservative ranks so blind as not to be able to see that a man who represents a Canadian constituency, for instance, West Peterborough, is bound to vote in this House to give a preference to the manufacturer and the workmen in Yorkshire at the expense of the manufacturer and the workmen in Peterborough, so that the manufacturer in Yorkshire may manufacture more and the manufacturer in Peterborough less, and the employees in Yorkshire have more work and the workman in Peterborough lose his occupation altogether. They are all British subjects and we are willing to give fair play to them all. But, if we must protect one, we hold that charity begins at home and we would protect the Canadian first. But hon. gentlemen tell us that this preferential tariff was given to the mother land as a matter of gratitude—that she had done so much for us that the least we could do was to give some return. I would be the last man to say that the mother land has not done much for us ; I say that we owe her more than we are likely ever to repay. But we have all laughed at the American humorist who was so anxious to put down the war in his country that he was ready to sacrifice all his wife's relations. Has not the government gone a step further than Artemus Ward? The government come to us and say: 'The people of Canada owe a debt to the mother country for what she has done for them ; we cannot pay anything ourselves, we cannot even pay the expenses of our own contingents going to take part in fighting the battles of the empire ; but we will make the cotton manufacturers and the woollen manufacturers pay for it by putting them at a disadvantage as compared with the Yorkshire cotton and woollen manufacturers, and that will square Canada's debt with the empire. If we, the people of Canada owe anything to the mother country, let us all contribute to the paying of it, and not lay the whole burden upon those who happen to be in business and to be injured by the tariff. That would be a strong enough case, even if this preference were confined to the mother land. But as a matter of fact, we find that only 25 per cent of the labour necessary to produce the goods has to be done in Great Britain to entitle them to the preference. We find one after another of the gentlemen in this House testifying that, according to his own knowledge, goods manufactured in Germany and other countries are brought to England and are there merely finished or even merely parcelled and sent out as English goods and brought into Canada under the preference of 33⅓ per cent, thus giving the Germans a preference that the Ministry would not dare to propose to give them directly. If there is to be a preference to the mother country, whatever percentage it may be, let it be for goods manufactured wholly in England, and then no outsider will get the benefit. I think it does not require any elucidation to convince the House that there is an honest difference between hon. gentlemen opposite and us on that question. And I sincerely trust that, when the premier goes, as he will go, to the old country, to attend the meeting of the Colonial premiers, where we know he will maintain the honour of this country in a manner that will be gratifying to all good Canadians irrespective of party, he will consider these questions, that he will consider the subject of preferential trade and will devote his ability to doing what he can to make such arrangements that, whatever others may do, Canada may prosper at home and may have a place of honour in the empire by bearing the share of the burden which properly devolves upon her.

Mr. H. A. WARD (East Durham). I desire, like other members of this House who have spoken before me, to congratulate the House and the country upon the prosperity that Canada is at present enjoying; but I cannot subscribe to the doctrine which has been promulgated by the Minister of Finance and his colleagues, that that prosperity is altogether owing to the beneficent government that at present holds the reins of power. I desire to point out that there is another party in this country, and there has been for a great many years another party in this country, which has, in my humble judgment, accomplished something in the interest of the Dominion ; and I think it

would have been only just for hon. gentlemen opposite to give some credit to the Conservative party for some of its achievements since confederation. Now, I do not propose to offer an excuse, as some hon. gentlemen have taunted us with doing, for the prosperity we enjoy; but I do propose to offer some reasons why that prosperity exists, and why it is not altogether due to hon. gentlemen opposite. I would not for a moment detract from the credit which is due to the fathers of confederation, and those members of the Liberal party among them who did their share in welding together the four great provinces and laying the foundation of the nation. But I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that after confederation something was done by the Conservative party to enlarge the boundaries of the Dominion and to make her the nation she is at this time, and to put Canada in such a position that hon gentlemen opposite, on coming into power, found government made easy. Now, I am not going to weary the House with many figures, but I desire briefly to point out some of the achievements of the Conservative administration since confederation. First was the acquisition of the North-west Territories and Rupert's land, that was, I think, if the Year-book does not lie, accomplished by a Conservative administration. We have also the admission of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island into confederation; and I think we can fairly claim that up to 1873 the Conservatives did accomplish something in the interests of the country by welding the different provinces into a nation.

Now I regret that I have to refer to a remark which, if I am credibly informed, was made by the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) during the recent election in West Durham. I understand that when he was speaking at a little village called Newtonville shortly before the election, he made the astounding statement that all the great works in the interest of this country had been initiated and carried out by the Reform party. Following the example of other members of the government, he claims that nothing has been done by the Conservative party. Now it was in 1873 that a Reform administration came into power for the first time since confederation, under the leadership of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. I have looked through the Year-book to find, during the five years of their administration, if any important Act was placed on the Statute-book in the interest of the country at large, but I have looked in vain. There were, it is true, three Indian treaties signed during that time, a government was provided for the North-west Territories and a Lieutenant Governor appointed, and there was a large fire in the city of St. John. I think these are the only three matters of importance, or the only events that took place during the administration of our hon. friends opposite. The Pacific Railway, the surveys for which had been commenced during the administration of Sir John A. Macdonald, were, it is true, continued during Mr. Mackenzie's administration. But what is the history of the Pacific Railway during those five years? It is, I think, a history of delay, of exaggeration of what that railway was likely to cost, and of embarrassment generally of the construction of that great work. We all know how that party came into power. It was because the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald had propounded a scheme for building that railway by a private company. When the Conservatives came into power in 1878, acting up to their pledges that they would introduce a protective policy, the national policy was brought into existence by the government of Sir John A. Macdonald. That national policy, I claim, though I am not going to bring forward figures to prove it, because that has been amply done by other hon. gentlemen who have preceded me—that policy, I claim has done more to place Canada in the position she occupies to-day and to provide hon. gentlemen opposite with so large a revenue to expend, than any other act of any administration since confederation. After the national policy came the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I think no hon. gentleman on either side of the House will deny that the accomplishment of that great work has been other than beneficial to this country. The speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite and their leaders in the House at that time, show that they were afraid to attempt that work even as a government work, that they were utterly incredulous that the railway could be built in twelve years time, which I believe was the period fixed, but that they asserted it would take an infinitely longer time, and a very much larger sum of money than was eventually expended in the construction of that work. On the 1st of October, 1880, the contract was made for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; on May 2, 1881, the first sod was turned, and on November 7, 1885, the last spike was driven. That shows what Canada accomplished under a government that was alive to the necessities of the country.

Now I wish briefly to point out that it is the opinion of Conservatives at least, that something was done by Conservative administrations since confederation to place the country in the position it occupies to-day, and to enable hon. gentlemen opposite to pose, as they are doing, as successful administrators. Let me refer for a moment to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade). He paid considerable attention to a previous speech of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith). I think he should have remembered that that hon. gentleman is one of the greatest authorities in Ontario in respect to fruit

growing, to which subject the hon. member for Annapolis devoted a considerable portion of his speech. I think it was only due to that hon. gentleman, especially as he was not here, that the hon. member for Annapolis should have quoted the remarks of the hon. member for South Wentworth correctly. The hon. member for Annapolis stated that the hon. member for South Wentworth had, in his speech called attention to the fact that for the first time in the history of the Annapolis valley they had a good crop this last year. I do not think my hon. friend made any such statement and I will read the remarks that he really did make in that connection.

In Nova Scotia they had this year the only good crop of apples grown in the country, and the apple growers of the Annapolis Valley, who had a crop that should have brought them in a million dollars, have lost $300,000 on last year's crop, because of the want of proper ventilation on these steamers.

I waited anxiously for the hon. gentleman to answer the gravamen of the charge made by the hon. member for South Wentworth, but in the whole course of his speech he made no reference to that and confined himself to making a quotation of my hon. friend's speech which does not appear at all. The hon. member for Annapolis put up a straw man in order that he might knock it down again. He stated that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House frequently said that we owed nothing to the mother country. I have never heard any hon. gentleman on this side of the House make any such statement and the only thing I can remember which the hon. gentleman might have been referring to was the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), who on one occasion said that we owed Britain nothing but forgiveness. I think that must been in the hon. gentleman's mind and that he had nothing whatever to quote as against any hon. gentleman on this side of the House.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ward) excuse me? In the absence of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade), I might say that he had reference to a speech made on this side of the House by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). He was quoting something from what he said when that charge was made. He made no reference to any hon. gentleman on that side of the House in commenting on the remark that Canada did not owe much to Great Britain.

Mr. WARD. I am sorry that the hon. member for Annapolis is not here. Not having heard the statement referred to by the hon. member for Victoria, N.S., I can say nothing about it. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, in the course of his long speech in this House, which was characterized by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as being a very ingenious speech, made some of those remarkable statements which usually pervade that hon. gentleman's speeches. It was an amusing feature of the debate when the hon. gentleman welcomed back old friends. He no doubt felt that his old friends or enemies were coming back and that they would make themselves felt in this House, as they did in 1878. His speech on this occasion and the recklessness of the figures he produced recalled the speech which he made in 1890, when he made an attack on the farmers of the province of Ontario, in order to make a point against the national policy and when he endeavoured to show that half of the farms in Ontario were mortgaged for half of what they were worth. That statement was founded upon returns from thirteen different registry offices which he had received from different registrars, and his argument from that statement was, that each concession of which he had returns at that time, was mortgaged to the extent of $96,000. One hon. gentleman on this side of the House produced a statement some days afterwards to show that in the county that he represented at least there was only an indebtedness of $67,000 for each concession, and it was pointed out on that occasion that if the hon. gentleman who made the statement had had any knowledge whatever of the registry laws of the province of Ontario he would never have based the statement on such evidence as he laid before the House. Every lawyer who is practising knows, and the hon. gentleman should have known, that about half the mortgages that appear upon the registry books have been already discharged and that the discharges are in the hands of the loan companies who hold the mortgages at the present time upon these lands. These mortgages are not discharged upon the registry books. There is no way in which the registrars can give correct statements of mortgages existing against these lands, and it was a matter of surprise to me at that time and to many members of this House, that the hon. gentleman should have made such a charge against the farmers on such false premises. The hon. gentleman stated at that time that these mortgages might have been very much larger, owing to interest accumulations. It was pointed out to him at that time that these mortgages had been receiving payments. It was quoted to him from the returns of the loan companies at that time that the payments had been eminently satisfactory during that very year and that mortgages had been reduced rather than increased during the time of which the hon. gentleman was speaking. The hon. gentleman charged the administration with neglecting their duty because they had not at that time, or previous to that time, provided some machinery by which it could be known what was the actual indebtedness

of the farmers on account of mortgages in this province. The hon. gentleman has been in power six years and I have not heard that he has taken any step in that direction. I think his figures were so effectually contradicted at the time that he thought no particular advantage could be derived from his taking such a step. The hon. gentleman is endowed with a considerable sense of humour and he showed that humour when he offered his advice to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in regard to the proper way to protect the farmers. I think he said that certain bounties should be given to each farmer for every product he raised. Surely the hon. gentleman had not forgotten that during the Conservative administration duties were raised on the products of the farm, that protection was given to the farmer by the Conservative administration, which raised these duties and enabled many farmers to go into mixed farming, thereby saving their financial lives. That was due to a Conservative administration, and if the hon. gentleman has forgotten it, the farmers in my neighbourhood at least have not forgotten it, and they have taken advantage of the protection given to them by the Conservative government. The hon. gentleman, when he indulges in unconscious humour, is still brighter than when he attempts real humour. He has found great fault with the Conservative expenditure of $38,000,000, and at the same time he accused every camp follower of the Conservative government of making hundreds of thousands of dollars out of the Conservative administration of that day.

If it were possible for camp followers of the Conservatives to make large sums of money by corrupt means out of an expenditure of $38,000,000 annually, did it strike the Minister of Trade and Commerce that it must have been a perfect Godsend to the camp followers of the Liberals when they increased the expenditure to $57,000,000 a year. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was the only man on the treasury benches who had made any attempt to excuse the increased expenditure by the Liberal government. His only excuse was that there were some cross entries on each side which would reduce that expenditure by about $5,000,000, and he instanced the expenditure on the Yukon. But the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) must have forgotten that there were cross entries of the same character during the Conservative administration, and that there were expenditures in the Yukon I might almost say since confederation from which Conservative governments absolutely received no return. There has been a large expenditure in that country for years but until these hon. gentlemen who are so fortunate came into power, there never has been any return to the treasury from the Yukon territory. The excuse offered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce does not in any way alter the position of matters, and the government of the day ought to be condemned for having raised that expenditure to so high a rate without justification, and in utter defiance of the pledges they made to the people before they came into power. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) had a good deal to say about the corruption of the Conservative government, but surely he has not forgotten that there were some little scandals during the short time he occupied the position of Finance Minister from 1873 to 1878. There were then some rumours about the Fort Francis lock, and the Neebing hotel, and the purchase of steel rails some seven or eight years in advance of the time they were required. All these things seem to have escaped the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he could think of nothing except the terrible corruption that he alleged existed under Conservative rule.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words, if the House will pardon me, in reference to the sad though glorious news that has come to us during the last day or two from South Africa. Let me pay a brief tribute to the memory of two of the men who fell so gloriously fighting for the empire on the veldt of South Africa. One of these men came from my own town and is the son of a particular friend of mine ; the other was captain in the regiment of which I have the honour to be major. Captain Milligan was a good soldier in every sense of the word. He represented Canada at Wimbledon and Bisley, and he was in every way fitted for the duty which he volunteered to perform for his country in South Africa. Canada mourns two brave men in the two soldiers of whom I speak. I desire to pay this tribute to their memory and to express my sympathy with their relatives and friends who are bereaved by their sad loss. It will be a consolation to them to know that these two gentlemen met so glorious a death.

As regards the resolution proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition, I shall have much pleasure in supporting it. The Conservative party in Canada since 1878 have been consistent protectionists. They have nailed their colours to the mast, and in pronouncing for a declared policy of protection they are simply following the policy which was inaugurated in 1878 and bequeathed to them by their grand old chieftain Sir John A. Macdonald.

Mr. JAMES KENDREY (West Peterborough). Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up much of the time of the House in dwelling on the issues which have been submitted to us in the course of this debate on the budget. Under the policy formulated by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1878, which built up the industries and increased the wealth of this country, the industries of Canada were

prosperous, and in so far as that policy has been departed from by the present government it has proved disastrous to our home manufacturers, and to the labouring men of Canada. I call the attention of the House to certain Canadian industries which are suffering seriously, because of what is called the preferential tariff of this government. It is all very well for these gentlemen opposite to be loyal, and loyalty is a good thing in its place, but as a Canadian I maintain that we should be loyal to our own people first. But, Sir, while these gentlemen opposite have been loyal to the people of England, they have not been loyal to the citizens of Canada, or at all events to a great number of them. I remember some years ago when this preferential tariff was first brought up in the House, I was amongst the first to condemn in the strongest language I could this so-called preference. Remember that this is not a preference given to England or given to the empire, but it is a preference which is given to the English manufacturer against the Canadian manufacturer, and to the English workingman against the Canadian workingman. So long as I have a voice in this House I shall oppose any such preference which can only be worked out at the expense of our fellow Canadians. Much as I would wish to, it will be rather difficult for me or for any one else, to follow the views enunciated on the trade question by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House from the ministers down, because the views expressed by them differ so materially one from the other. One of these hon. gentlemen supporting the government declares that he is a free trader; another declares that he is a protectionist; one is a broad protectionist and another is a limited protectionist, and so we have ranged in the support of the present ministry a heterogeneous lot covering all kinds of protectionists and all kinds of free traders. Again we have some of the ministers travelling through the country making statements on trade matters which are entirely incorrect. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) speaking at Blackstock in West Durham is thus reported in the Toronto 'Globe' of January 11th:

> He thought 23⅓ per cent was enough to pay the manufacturer for his goods. He ventured to say that if the woollen manufacturers would take counsel among themselves; throw out inadequate machinery and apply themselves to newer and better methods of manufacture they would be able to face competition without adding further to the burdens of the rest of the people of this country.

I take exception to this language, because the statements are not correct and in fact the minister (Hon. Mr. Fisher) plainly shows that he knows nothing about the woollen industry. If the government had the interest of this country at heart, they would send a commission of competent gentlemen—because they are very fond of appointing commissions—to go through the country and find out the wants of the country; but they have not done so. The woollen manufacturers and the people working in the woollen mills are just as much entitled to fair treatment as the people in Nova Scotia who are well protected. It seems that this government has class legislation; it legislates for one part of the country against another part. There is no part of this country that has suffered more than the province of Ontario, and there is class legislation against that province. No gentleman in this House knows that better than the Minister of Customs. Deputation after deputation came here and laid its case before the government—the cotton manufacturers, the woollen manufacturers and the agricultural implement manufacturers. I sympathize with the agricultural implement makers of this country. I think they ought to have a fair measure of protection. Last year over $2,000,000 worth of agricultural implements came in from the United States. If the government were looking after the interests of this country, they should have looked after that industry. With 2 or 3 per cent more duty we would have been able to keep that $2,000,000 in this country instead of sending it to the United States. The Minister of the Interior stated in Manitoba that if the woollen manufacturers of this country were not able to live on 23⅓ per cent, they ought to shut down their places. We have as highly skilled labour in this country as is to be found in any other part of the world. The statement has been made by one or two gentlemen on the other side of the House that the Canadian mills were not equipped with up-to-date machinery; but these hon. gentlemen make statements that they do not know anything about. A great many of us have all our capital locked up in this industry, and it is a pretty hard thing if you have a government that legislates away all our interest. We are not put on the same footing as other manufacturers of this country. Go back 150 years, and you will find that the government of England protected the woollen industry to such an extent that it would not allow any wool to come into the country. The great woollen industry of England was built up by protection. In this country we are not able to manufacture as they do in the United States, where each mill makes a specialty of one line of goods; but we have to diversify our manufactures in order to keep our plants going. Since the preference came into effect, our woollen industry has been much worse off than ever. Large quantities of German goods come into this country under the preference as English goods, although hardly any English work has been done on them. These are statements which I am prepared to prove. I object to that preference because it is class legislation. It strikes at one particular class of

people. And we have the Minister of Agriculture saying that our factories are not properly equipped, and the Minister of Interior saying that 23½ per cent is enough protection. If it is enough for one class of manufactures why is it not enough for others ? Yet other manufactures have protection running all the way from 25 to 35 per cent. The woollen industry in Canada to-day is paralyzed. It is smaller to-day than it has been for 20 years. There are 40 sets of cards, over 200 looms, and over 7,000 spindles less in operation to-day than there were in 1899. These figures do not include the mills which are at present idle. It is worthy of a passing note that of the half-dozen mills burnt down in the last year or so not one has been re-built. These facts in themselves should be sufficient to convince the government that they have brought disaster on an industry which was once one of the most prosperous and promising in the country. Up to the time the preferential tariff came in the woollen manufactures of this country possibly did not increase as much as they would have done in times of good trade. We have had good trade in the last few years, and under the old conditions there would have been double the amount of machinery running in this country than there is, and we would hardly have been able to keep up with the demand. We have presented our case to the government, and the government has given us no relief. In several parts of the country, at Hespeler, Galt, Cornwall and Sherbrooke, our hands have left and gone to the United States. In the United States, with their high tariff they are able to pay larger wages than we could pay. Over 100 men out of my mill have left and gone to the United States, and I have had some skilled labour for twenty years, some for fifteen, some for ten. They went because they could get higher wages there. This makes it very hard for the woollen manufacturer in this country. It is impossible for him to compete, if the manufacturer on the other side of the line are able to draw away his best labour, while on the other hand, there is the English preference against him—a preference in favour of the British manufacturer and against the Canadian. The government say they have given this preference to England. They have not given it to England, but only to a few manufacturers in England. It is a preference to English labourers and English capitalists as against Canadians. I think those who have invested their money in Canada are entitled to fair play. And where are the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who will invest a dollar in the woollen business of this country ? You could not get them to take any stock in such an industry at all.

I wish to call attention to an article which appeared in the Toronto 'Sun,' of March 26, 1902. It refers to the Cornwall mill. It states that it is notorious throughout the trade that this factory was built thirty years ago, and that the machinery has not been replaced and is now out of date. I do not know where this paper got its information, but some two years or two years and a half ago I was asked to go down and investigate that property and report on its condition, the reason being that they wanted me to take an interest in the business and also take the general managership along with the concern, of which I am at the head to-day. Under ordinary conditions I would have accepted. But, after inspecting the property, although I found that the mill was as well equipped as half the mills in the United States, or as half the mills in England, I found that what had closed it down was the preference. I said : So long as we have the preference I will not invest a dollar in any mill in this country. And that is the reason I did not take hold of it. I do not believe in the newspapers making such statements such as I have just quoted. But we find the Minister of Agriculture making statements of a similar kind. Instead of doing that, the government should have employed somebody to investigate the condition of the woollen industry. No minister or member of this House has a right to make statements concerning an important industry like this without knowing the facts. There is another point to be considered. A mill that would cost $100,000 in England would cost $140,000 in Canada, owing to the duties and the freight. There is, thus, the item of interest always against the Canadian mill. And this is due to conditions imposed by the government. Then, also, there is the question of labour. I say that in this country we pay from 40 to 50 per cent more than they do in the English mills. I went there and investigated their conditions; and I want to say that I hope never to see the conditions in this country that exist in England even to-day. Whether we are employers of labour or not, we wish to see our workmen get a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. But if this preference is continued, we shall be obliged to lower our wages. The government are legislating against the labour of this country and are driving out Canadians. I know, as a matter of fact, many workers who have left this country, driven out by this preference. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) also knows that many have been driven away. I think that the hon. gentleman is well informed concerning the condition of the woollen industry in this country and knows that mills from one end of the country to the other are about closed down. Within the the last six or seven years not a mill has paid any interest on the investment. For some time we had bad trade conditions, but now, trade is good, business is expanding in every other line. But the woollen industry is paralyzed. Had the tariff conditions remained unchanged, had we been given a fair show, our trade would

have been all right. The collar industry is about in the same condition, I believe. The manufacturers of agricultural implements, I understand, are not given satisfactory conditions, and I, for one, would be glad to see them put on a basis to enable them to keep out this $2,000,000 worth of machinery which is imported into this country, and make that much more in Canada. I do not say that we ought to have high duties, but they should be fair duties, duties that would enable us to compete and to pay the working people good wages. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the smuggling of textile goods of German, Austrian, and French manufacture, which are said to be finished in England and brought into Canada. If the Minister of Customs will send his inspectors to Peterborough, I think I have a good deal of information that I could give them on that line. I do not wish to make any statements here to the detriment of anybody in particular, but there are certain goods imported by wholesale houses here which are sent to Canadian establishments merely to be finished, and the finishing of which amounts scarcely to any work at all. There is probably not 5 per cent of the cost added to these goods by the work done on them. But they are coming in case after case, by the hundreds of pieces, while our woollen industry is being paralyzed.

Mr. WRIGHT. What class of goods does the hon. gentleman refer to ?

Mr. KENDREY. Woollen goods.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman mean all kinds of woollen goods, such as cashmeres as well as tweeds ?

Mr. KENDREY. I am not speaking of cashmere.

Mr. WRIGHT. They are woollen goods, and I wanted to know to what particular kinds of goods the hon. gentleman was referring.

Mr. KENDREY. I am referring to serges and goods of that kind used for ladies dresses, and so forth. I come now to another point with reference to the wool of this country. Never in our history was the Canadian wool so cheap as it is to-day. It is only worth some 12 or 13 cents a pound, so that our farmers hardly get anything for their wool. That shows the effect which this preference against our woollen manufacturers is having on our native wool. Take the western wool which is a good wool, and which can be worked up in all the woollen mills of this country, at present there is no profit on it. Some years ago our western farmers grew a finer grade of wool, but as they are not able to get paying prices for it, they are now only growing the coarser grades. The preference, therefore, by paralyzing one-half the woollen mills, is hurting the native wool of the country. I remember well that in 1896, when I had my election my oponents attacked the national policy simply because wool was so cheap, but to-day it is several cents a pound cheaper than it ever was. Thus you will see, Sir, that the prosperity of the woollen manufacturing industry of this country is identical with that of our farmers. Take the town of Cornwall and a number of other towns, which I could name, which, in years gone by, granted exemption from taxes for ten years and twenty years in order to build up this woollen manufacturing industry. To-day they find that all their sacrifices have been in vain, because this government is legislating to kill the very industries to which these municipalities gave exemptions from taxes for the purpose of aiding in their establishment. Just as soon as this preference came into effect in 1899, our woollen mills began to shut down. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) told us how things were prospering down there, how property doubled in value, but that is only in one part of the country, and the reason is evident. It is because we have given the particular industry of that section the heaviest form of protection—a bounty of $7 per ton on their iron and steel. I think that it is unfair to give such an advantage to one province without giving an equal advantage to the other provinces. In the province of Ontario you will find nearly three-fourths of the whole machinery of the woollen industry of this Dominion. But a number of these mills have shut down and more will have to close in the next year or two, and all because of the preference we have given the English manufacturer. That preference has done more to paralyze the woollen business than any other. There are some industries that of course are not affected by it at all. Take, for instance, the wooden ware and furniture and boots and shoes and food products, and other industries of that kind, they send their products into the British market, and consequently can hold their own here against the preferential tariff. But the woollen industry has to meet the full force of British competition. That is an industry which the British manufacturers for long years have made peculiarly their own—so much so that they can face competition even in those parts of the world where a high protective tariff is in force. I did expect that the government would have applied some remedy to that particular industry. They certainly should have done so, for as Canadians they should have taken care not to legislate against any particular Canadian industry. If they were alive to our interests, they would have sent around commissioners to examine into this question. Deputation after deputation has waited on this government for years to show the condition of the trade, and surely it was an elementary duty of the government to send some one or some number of gentle-

men to examine and see in what position that industry was before legislating it out of existence. I have nothing further to add except to say that so long as I hold a seat in this House, I shall condemn any preference that does not work to the benefit of Canadians.

Mr. WRIGHT. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the woollen machinery cost 40 per cent more in this country than in the old country.

Mr. KENDREY. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. And also that the woollen manufacturers in Canada were paying much higher wages to their men than are the English manufacturers ?

Mr. KENDREY. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is that the case with reference to the American manufacturers ?

Mr. KENDREY. No, the Americans are paying higher wages than we can afford to pay under the conditions existing here.

Mr. WRIGHT. Supposing you find upon your counter a piece of tweed or worsted which is of English manufacture, how are you to know whether it is all English manufacture or whether one portion was made in Germany.

Mr. KENDREY. Within the last six or seven weeks there was a fire in Toronto, and one of the establishments was burned down. They consequently sent me these goods to finish and dye, and that is the reason why I know all about it. I do not wish to hurt the people in that business or take this as a personal matter, but as the hon. gentleman has put the question I tell him that I know exactly where the goods come from.

Mr. WRIGHT. Then do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that these goods he referred to were partially made in the old country and were finished here in Canada ?

Mr. KENDREY. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. They were not imported from Germany to England and finished there, and then brought over here as English goods ?

Mr. KENDREY. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, there are some questions that I might answer, but I do not think it would be hardly fair to these people to do so. I said to the Minister of Customs that I would give him such information of that kind as I deemed it right to give. I do not wish to stand up here and be cross-questioned by the hon. gentleman, but I would be willing to give to the Minister of Customs that information.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Minister of Customs, the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 8, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That from this date to the end of the Session Government Orders have precedence on Thursdays immediately after Questions to be put by members.

Motion agreed to.

ACCOMMODATION FOR COMMITTEES.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to bring to the attention of the government the fact that the committee room in the tower used by the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, is entirely too small for the needs of that committee ; and, as the old railway committee room has been vacated since the new one has been finished, and is comparatively idle, I think we ought to be allowed to use that room, which is not occupied except on days when the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization does not usually sit, and therefore it seems to me that it could be used by that committee without inconvenience to any other.

Mr. A. CAMPBELL (Kent). That would hardly do. The Banking and Commerce Committee meets there, also the Public Accounts Committee, and I understand that the Senate Railway Committee is going to meet there. So that I think that room will be fairly occupied for the rest of the session.

Mr. SPROULE. The Banking and Commerce Committee could surely use the Private Bill's Committee room, which is vacant most of the time. I think the Public Accounts Committee is not so large that it could not use the tower room conveniently.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The Public Accounts Committee is large and usually has a number of witnesses, and I would not like to take the step recommended by the hon. gentleman if it would interfere with the meetings of that committee. With regard to the Senate, I hope that arrangements may be come to under which the Senate Railway Committee

can use the Railway Committee room on alternate days. There are no reasons why we should not come to a friendly understanding and avoid any difficulty. If several committees are called on the same day, of course there may be confusion, but the chairmen of the respective committees can easily arrange so as to prevent any trouble of that kind.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). A good deal has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, regarding the increased expenditure of this country, and that is a subject which perhaps has not been dealt with on this side as fully as it might be. In view of what these hon. gentlemen opposite have said and in view also of the feeling which, I am free to admit, may exist to some extent in the minds of sincere believers in Liberal principles and firm supporters of this government, that we have not been faithful to the instructions given to us or to the platform of 1893, I would like this afternoon to tax the patience of the House somewhat by entering into the details and giving figures bearing on our expenditure. I know that it is not very pleasant for the House to have to listen to a long array of figures, nor is it at all agreeable to me to enter into these somewhat dry details, and I shall endeavour to be as brief as possible and weary the House as little as I possibly can in this respect.

Some hon. members of the opposition have charged my hon. colleague the Finance Minister with not having put his case fairly, but to my mind he gave us an honest, clear and fair statement. In fact I think that he put the case which might be urged against the government in a stronger light than was necessary. He informed the House that he anticipated having to add some millions to the public debt this year. I think that, in stating the amount he did he took the view of one who was anxious to present rather the least hopeful view of the future, and thus, like a wise financier, err on the safe side by giving a forecast which would be more likely to result in an agreeable disappointment to the people than the reverse. I am in hopes, judging by the trade returns and the financial situation, as I view it, that our expenditure will fall short of the figures mentioned by the Minister of Finance, and that it will be found that my hon. colleague, in his budget speech, presented a case against the government stronger than the facts would warrant.

My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, gave us a statement of the increases under the various heads of expenditure, but there he stopped. He did not enter into any comparisons. He made no allowance for the altered condition of affairs at present compared with those of the years preceding this administration. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Osler) also referred to the increase of expenditure in a general way. It is, however, very easy to make general statements, but much more difficult to particularize. I have taken the trouble to scrutinize the various expenditures, and at the risk of wearying the House, I propose to give the results of my researches, and I am convinced I shall be able to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of all fair-minded men, that comparing service with service, and taking into account the rapid development of the country during the last five years, its great increase in population—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And the wonderful activity which has prevailed in our industrial life, the financial record of this government compares very favourably with that of its predecessors. I hear cheers from hon. gentlemen opposite, rather derisive in their nature. In view of the argument advanced by the leader of the opposition that the increase in our population was as great during the last five year decade of Conservative administration as during the succeeding five years of this government, it becomes necessary for me to consider carefully this question of our increase in population. I think I shall be able to prove conclusively that the result of the last census redounds to the credit of the present administration. Leaving aside the two arguments—that the census of 1891 was stuffed and that the census of 1901 was improperly taken—and assuming, for the purpose of my argument, that both censuses were correct, I propose to show that during the last five years of the census decade, the progress of this country was much more rapid than it was during the first five years, and the natural and inevitable conclusion must be that in the latter half of the decade there was a greater increase in population than in the former. The following figures will bear out this contention. I am addressing myself to fair-minded men, to whom I think I can prove beyond doubt that the increase of population during the last decade must have taken place almost wholly within the last five years during which the Liberal party were in power.

What figures shall I give, by what shall I measure ? Let me take the trade of the country, and what do I find ? I find it shows the following results in the two periods I have mentioned :

		1891.	1896.	1901.
Aggregate Foreign trade	$	218,384,934	239,025,360	386,903,157
Total imports	"	119,967,838	118,011,508	190,415,525
Total exports	"	98,471,296	121,013,852	196,487,632
Total exports, Canadian farm produce	"	39,634,599	50,591,002	80,276,797
Total exports, Canadian manufactures	"	6,296,249	9,365,384	16,012,208
Circulation of bank and Dominion notes	"	53,359,085	57,562,703	76,790,931
Discounts in chartered banks	"	202,692,481	224,507,301	318,240,549
Deposits in chartered and savings banks	"	193,015,474	245,029,143	390,949,482
Railways, freight carried by	Tons.	21,753,021	24,266,825	36,999,371
Railway gross earnings	$	48,192,099	50,545,569	72,898,749
Immigrants	No.	26,326	17,850	49,149
Importations of settlers' effects	$	1,778,556	2,188,975	3,740,630
Number of letters posted in Canada	No.	97,975,000	116,028,000	191,650,000
Homestead entries of Dominion lands	"	3,523	1,857	8,167
Letters patent issued for Dominion lands	"	2,449	2,665	6,461
Lands sold by the Government and by railway and other companies having Government land grants.	Acres.	Not available for 1891.	141,390	712,566
	$		454,641	2,454,899

These figures prove beyond any question or cavil, it seems to me, that the increase in the population during the last five years must have been almost equal to the total increase that took place during the decade. There was a period of almost absolute stagnation in this country during the last five years when hon. gentlemen opposite held office. On the other hand, there has been a period of unprecedented prosperity in this country during the first five years this government has been in power. And it will not do to say that good times or better trade alone has been responsible for these increases, while the population has remained stationary. The increases are so large that the mere improvement in trade would not account for them—there must have been an increase in population as well. Now, figures are rather tiresome things so I have reduced these comparisons to percentages, and I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to listen to them :—

	Percentage of increase between 1891 and 1896.	Percentage of increase between 1896 and 1901.
	p. c.	p. c.
Aggregate Foreign trade	Increase, 9	Increase, 61
Total imports	Decrease, 2	" 60
Total exports	Increase, 23	" 62
Total exports, Canadian farm produce	" 28	" 58
Total exports, Canadian manufactures	" 49	" 71
Circulation of bank and Dominion notes	" 8	" 33
Discounts in chartered banks	" 11	" 42
Deposits in chartered and savings banks	" 27	" 59
Railways, freight carried by	Increase, 12	Increase, 52
Railway gross earnings	" 5	" 44
Immigrants	Decrease, 32	" 175
Importations of settlers' effects	Increase, 23	" 70

	Percentage of increase between 1891 and 1896.	Percentage of increase between 1896 and 1901.
	p. c.	p. c.
Number of letters posted in Canada	Increase, 18	Increase, 65
Homestead entries of Dominion lands	Decrease, 47	" 340
Letters patent issued for Dominion lands	Increase, 9	" 142

It seems to me that these figures prove conclusively my contention with respect to population and they also prove that Canada has developed at a marvellously rapid rate during the last five years. Take another illustration of our progress. During the fiscal year 1896, the daily foreign trade of Canada, Sundays excluded, amounted to $763,659; and during the last fiscal year, 1901, it was $1,236,112, an increase of nearly half a million dollars for every working day. The aggregate foreign trade of Canada on the basis of goods entered for consumption, and Canadian produce exported, for the half year ended December, 1901, was only $7,000,000 less than the trade for the whole fiscal year 1896. For the seven months ended January, 1902, it was $21,000,000 greater than for the whole year of 1896.

The aggregate foreign trade of the country during the five years 1897 to 1901 inclusive, was $1,651,726,204, as compared with $1,193,453,797 for the previous five years, being an increase under Liberal rule of $458,272,407. If further proof were needed, other figures could be given, but I do not wish to tire the House. Why have I given these figures ? Simply because they give us something by which we can judge the wisdom of the government's course in many things. Many may have been biased by statements in the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite that there has been an increase to fifty, or sixty, or as

some say even seventy millions of dollars in the expenditure. I ask fair-minded men, in judging of the increased expenditure, to take into account the difference of the circumstances of the country now and in bygone days. A business man's expenses increase with the growth of his business—so with a nation. The government had to keep pace with the advance movement. It would have been remiss in its duty if it had failed to do so. Bearing these facts in mind—the growth in the trade of the country and the evident increase that we have in the population—let us proceed to a scrutiny of the expenditure. We will take first the ordinary, the controllable expenditure. For the purposes of this comparison I take the year 1894-95 and compare it with the year just closed. I take the year 1894-95 because it is well known and will not be denied—at any rate it cannot be successfully contradicted—that the expenditure accounts for 1896 under hon. gentlemen opposite were not completed accounts. I know that in my own department amounts were left over to be paid after the year had elapsed. It was an election year and the full expenditure was not shown. Therefore, I take the year 1894-95. The ordinary controllable expenditure for 1901 was $46,866,367. In 1894-95, the ordinary expenditure was $38,132,005. These figures show an increase in 1901 over 1895 of $8,734,362.

Now on the face of it this looks large, but let us consider the details before passing judgment. I propose to go through all the departments, and thus afford an opportunity to any hon. gentleman who follows me to point out which of these particular expenditures he takes exception to. I call upon them to do that; and I mention to you, Mr. Speaker, right here, that the position of the opposition at this present moment is one that absolutely justifies every dollar of expenditure that has been made, and every dollar that has been added to the public debt. Why do I say that? Why, Sir, the Minister of Finance has made his budget speech, he has given the fact that our expenditure has been increased; he has not hidden the fact that on ordinary expenditure there has been an increase; he has not hidden the fact that on capital expenditure there has been an increase; he has not hidden the fact that there has been an addition to the public debt. These hon. gentlemen know that, and now is the time, now is the opportunity, if they dare do so, to offer an amendment and have it fairly debated. It was their duty to do it, to put a resolution before you, Mr. Speaker, declaring that the expenditure was unwise, unjustifiable, but they have not done it; and the fact that they have not done it proves conclusively to my mind that, they themselves being the judges, being conversant with the public accounts and the state of the country, are satisfied that the extra expenditure has been well and wisely made,

and that there is no fault to be found with it. Sir, they do not venture to do so. If ever there was a time to challenge that expenditure it is now. It is very easy for them to rise and make speeches and let them go broadcast throughout the country, but the way for them to show that they are in earnest is to place themselves upon record against these expenditures——

Mr. POPE. And so we will.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But you have not done it, and this is the time to do it when the financial statement is being discussed. The hon. gentleman sees the weakness of the position. Instead of introducing an amendment, an amendment so vague in itself that we cannot tell what it is, a thing that has reference to something that is not clear even in their own minds—instead of introducing that amendment, if they believe their own statements that there has been unjustifiable expenditure, why it was their bounden duty to move an amendment to that effect, and place it in your hands challenging the administration of the affairs of this country and dividing the House upon it; and, Sir, we would not have shrunk from the test and from the discussion that would have ensued. Let me go through these departments in detail, and as I do so I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that while there has been an increased expenditure, necessitated by the circumstances and conditions of the country, I think they will admit there is nothing to be alarmed about. Take the first item, the sinking fund, there is an increase in that of $478,025. Nobody is alarmed about that, it is simply a cross entry, that is all. In immigration there is an increase of $249,077, nearly a quarter of a million dollars. Now perhaps hon. members opposite join this in the general statement that there has been an unjustifiable increase in every department of the government. But what are the facts with reference to immigration? Have we had full value for the expenditure under that head?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, does some hon. gentleman say? Then we hope he will put himself on record as condemning it. But if he does he will have to face these facts when he puts his motion before you, Mr. Speaker, that according to the records of the Interior Department, in the five years from 1897 to 1901, 190,000 immigrants have been brought into the country, and what is better, they seem to be staying here. Every western man knows that immigration has been greater during the last five years than for any previous like period. The figures prove that. Homestead entries:

1891	3,523
1896	1,857
1901	8,167

Do you tell me that a quarter of a million dollars of extra money expended in the way it has been under the Minister of the Interior, bringing in that 190,000 people, settling up these homesteads, has not been a good investment for this country? Why, Sir, the added commerce of this country alone justifies that increased expenditure. You can see it from the increased number of patents of Dominion lands issued:

1891	2,449
1896	2,665
1901	6,461

And as I said before, the government and railway companies sold $454,641 worth of land in 1896, and in 1901, $2,454,899. I say, and I believe the country will say, that the increased expenditure under the head of immigration is justifiable, and has been a wise investment on the part of the minister who conducts that department. During the last fiscal year no less than 18,000 people came from the western states to settle in western Canada, many of them our own sons coming back to this land, when there is a government in power making a condition of things here which entices them to return. This spring, reports from responsible customs officers indicate that there is a great rush of incoming settlers from the States. Permit me to quote an extract from a letter of one of the sub-collectors of the Customs Department stationed at North Portal, which is at the boundary of Minnesota:

> Since the rush began we are almost swamped with work both night and day. What with settlers coming in and wheat going out the railway yards are full all the time.

That is cheering. Swamped with work, night and day, with immigrants coming in with their settler's effects. And yet the hon. gentleman opposite would propose a resolution in this House affirming that $250,000 of an increase is unjustifiable. Why, in the 'Evening Journal' of Ottawa we saw a day or two ago this item clipped from the Medicine Hat 'News':

> Pouring Into the West.
>
> The influx of settlers to the Canadian west is simply wonderful. At Medicine Hat we are in a position to size up the great incoming, especially of Americans, as we see here daily train load after train load of would-be settlers, bringing with them carloads of miscellaneous effects—horses, cattle, implements, household stuff. The exodus, this time from the states into Canada, shows that the undeveloped riches of western Canada are becoming known, and Canada is coming into her own. The rush of settlers is unprecedented, and is taxing the railways to the limit to handle the business in connection with their trade.

Now it may be said that these settlers are coming in of their own accord. The Minister of the Interior has had a few men throughout the western states for a few years past to promote immigration from that country, recognizing the fact that they are a most desirable class of settlers; and their work is bearing fruit, and no fault can be found with that comparatively small increase of expenditure which has brought about such results, especially when we remember the fact that every one of these incoming settlers who settles in that country becomes himself a most valuable immigration agent by the letters he writes to others; and great as has been this increase of immigration, we can scarcely imagine at what ratio it will continue to grow in the years that are coming, and that without a greatly added expenditure on the part of this government. This, I claim, to be wise legislation, wise administration, and in the very best interests of the country.

Now, we come to the next department, that of arts, agriculture and statistics, presided over by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher). The increase here is $480,000. It is accounted for largely this year by an expenditure of $249,907 for the census, and for cold storage $100,059, for which there was no corresponding expenditure in 1895 except a small item of $5,729 charged against the belated preparation of the census in that year. Then, in exhibitions we have had Glasgow, Buffalo and Paris, and we spent $164,823 on these exhibitions. Any one who is conversant with the success of the Canadian exhibitors at these different exhibitions, I think, will admit that it was money wisely expended. It was money expended for the benefit of all classes of the community, not any one industry alone, but for all, and the accounts of the Glasgow exhibition especially are most cheering in their nature. Canada has been advertised, trade has been increased to a wonderful extent there, and also to a more limited extent at Buffalo, but even at Buffalo the Canadian commissioner's quarters were thronged daily with people making inquiries about the North-west Territories and other portions of the Dominion. The benefits to be derived from the Paris exhibition were fully explained to us by the Minister of Agriculture last year. This accounts for an increase of $162,864. Is that expenditure to be condemned or is it to be approved? Was it not a wise expenditure, the laying out of that small sum at the present time to be returned ten-fold, though not perhaps in the manner in which you put it directly in cash into your pocket, but which will manifest itself in the increased prosperity of the people of the country? Then, in promoting the dairying interests of the country $20,000 more was spent last year. But the hon. Minister of Agriculture had no charge of $40,000 for the purchase of cheese and butter as in 1895. The maintenance of experimental farms only cost $4,700 more last year and we know the valuable work being done there, too.

I ask what expenditure there has been in connection with the Department of Agriculture that has not been wisely made or productive of good.

In legislation there is an item to which, perhaps, there might be a little exception taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. There is an increase of $231,155. This is largely accounted for by the increase in the sessional indemnity granted last session. If our hon. friends are feeling very badly about that, or, if any of us feel badly, we can reduce that increased expenditure by telling the accountant that we will be satisfied with the old sum that we received before.

Mr. BROCK. Are you prepared to make a motion to that effect ?

Mr. CLANCY. Does that include the hon. gentleman's increase of salary as well ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In civil government there is an increase of $52,000. I suppose any one will admit that you cannot, with the increasing work that is devolving upon the government, expect that there will not be some increase.

In the government of the Yukon there is an increase of $274,000 spent by the Department of the Interior on ordinary or consolidated fund account. Now, there was no corresponding expenditure in 1894-95, but everyone knows, or should know, that while $274,000 was expended there, as far as any taxation upon the people of Canada is concerned outside of the Yukon territory, it has no bearing whatever, because, if you go to the Public Accounts you will find there a statement which shows that since and inclusive of 1894-95 there has been an expenditure in the Yukon of $5,945,216, while the revenue derived from that district amounts to $6,700,193, the surplus of revenue over expenditure being $755,000. Now, though you had a swelling up of the expenditure made under the Department of the Interior by $274,000 on Yukon account, it did not cost the people of this country one cent of taxation outside of the Yukon. The Yukon paid for itself and put $755,000 into the public treasury besides.

Under the head of administration of justice there is an increase of $117,550. Of this amount $74,787 was spent in the Yukon, while $3,701 was spent for enforcing the alien labour law. There were no expenditures under these heads in the year 1895. There is an increase of $20,000 in the province of Ontario and of $16,000 in the province of Quebec for additional judges. Of course, justice must be administered, and it is necessary, with the growing condition of the country that facilities shall be given for the settlement of disputes. This is an item, however, which I think will very well bear comparison with previous years. In 1890 there was an expenditure for the administration of justice of $709,784; in 1895 it had swollen to $755,682, while in 1901, excluding the Yukon, it amounted to $798,445, so that the expenditure has not increased at as great a ratio during these years of plenty as during the previous years.

Under the head of fisheries there is an increase of $47,529. This is practically accounted for by three new necessary services : Steamer for fisheries and customs protection in British Columbia $19,973, cold storage for bait $12,674, and fish hatcheries in British Columbia and Gaspé, $19,981. These are the items of increase. Who will say that these items are not justifiable ? I believe that the credit for providing cold storage for bait is to be given to the hon. senior member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall), who pointed out that the expenditure would be of great benefit to the hardy fishermen who live down on the coast there, and listening to him with the most intense interest, as I have endeavoured to do to every hon. gentleman who has taken part in this debate, coming from whatever part of the Dominion he may, I heard him state that he thought he could see a way in which this important departure might be still further extended with advantage to the fishermen by providing something of the same kind for the deep sea fishermen. As far as I am individually concerned, he will not need, if he can perfect a scheme of that kind, to ask that the cost be taken out of the bounty that the fishermen get at the present time, thus reducing it by that amount, but I think this parliament will willingly vote him any amount that is in reason.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you reconcile that increase with the fact that the decision of the Privy Council took the fisheries away from you largely ? Notwithstanding that there is an increase in the expenditure of the government.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It did not take the ocean away from us.

Mr. SPROULE. It was decided that the fisheries belonged to the provinces, except of course the Atlantic fisheries.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In public works there has been a very great increase. There has been an increase of $1,644,316. Now, that is a large increase. I frankly admit that if the people of this country want to stop every improvement; if they want to stop all expenditure on these public works, the government can do that. But it is for us to consider whether it would be wise policy for the government to do so. In a prosperous period such as we have had, when the finances of the country warranted needful public expenditure, and when the public works in many parts of this Dominion had to be repaired or renewed to save them from utter collapse owing to the dilapidated condition into which they fell during the Conservative government, the question for us was : Is it

wise that we should preserve these public works for the benefit of the people of this country ? Of course, as I have said, we can stop this expenditure if we choose. If we want to stop all expenditure we do not by any manner of means need to raise the amount of revenue we do, and we could confine ourselves simply to carrying on the ordinary machinery of the government. But there are other duties devolving upon the government and upon parliament. We have a country to be developed and to be improved, and there are certain expenditures which while benefiting the country bring back to us valuable returns. In such cases there should be a wise expenditure of public money.

On public buildings we expended in 1901, $1,195,847 and in 1895 there was only expended on these buildings, $486,275. It will be seen that we spent a great deal more than was expended in 1895, and if we spent it properly the people of Canada have the benefit of it. If we did not spend it properly, then of course we are to blame, but our hon. friends opposite do not make that charge against us. On harbours, rivers and dredging in 1901 we expended $1,636,726, while in 1895 the expenditure was only $1,075,993. We expended over half a million more in dredging our rivers and harbours last year than we did in 1895. Is that an unwise expenditure? Who will say that it is? Remember, that expenditure was not confined to the harbours and rivers within the boundaries of the constituencies of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, but it was a general expenditure in different parts of the Dominion; deepening harbours where it was necessary it should be done; giving increased accommodation to the vast flow of trade and commerce, especially on the great lakes where we need all the harbours that can be provided in order that we may bring that vast traffic down through our own magnificent lake and river system, to the summer and winter seaports of Canada. That expenditure is made to enrich the producer in Canada who puts into his pocket in actual cash every cent that is saved in transportation, and it benefits the whole country as well for it gives employment and wages to the men who handle that grain at Canadian ports. On slides and booms, and upon roads and bridges, and so on, there has been an increased expenditure. These have been some of the expenditures for public works and I do not know that I need enlarge more fully upon that subject. The sum of $60,000 represents the expenditure on a telegraph line eastward to the Straits of Belle Isle in the interest of our shipping. We built a telegraph line to the Yukon, so that the far away city of Dawson, almost within the Arctic circle, that it used to take weeks and even months to reach, is now brought within daily communication of the Capital of the Dominion because a telegram given to the operator at Dawson reaches Ottawa on the same day. These are all expenditures that we had to make and which, if they were wisely made no one will find fault with. I do not know that even our Conservative friends opposite will find fault with these expenditures. When the estimates are under the consideration of the House I noticed that these hon. gentlemen instead of objecting to grants, rise one after the other in their places to point out where a further expenditure could be made in the public interest in their different constituencies, and it is perfectly right on their part to do so.

In the lighthouse, coast, ocean and river service there is an increase of $130,783, and $36,000 of this was spent for the construction of lighthouses in excess of what was spent before. Who will find fault with that ? On an additional steamer for this service $27,000 extra was spent and for a new lighthouse and fog alarm in Lake Erie $24,000.

The cost for mail subsidies and steamship subventions increased $115,930. Here is an item which effectually refutes the statement that it is impossible for a government to benefit the farmers of this country. What do we give these steamships subventions for ? Why does my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) expend money for cold storage ? It is because he wishes to benefit that portion of our population which belongs to the agricultural community, and seeing that he can reduce the cost of carrying their goods in prime condition to a foreign market, he expends money to provide these cold storage facilities in order that the tillers of the soil may get one cent or two cents a pound more for their produce. That is the reason why we give these increased subsidies to steamship lines, and who will deny that that is a wise expenditure ? Under the head of steamship subventions twenty-nine services were subsidized last year, as against eighteen in 1895.

The expenditure upon superannuation increased by $59,122. In reference to that let me say that so far as I am aware no additional term of years has been added to the superannuation of any employee by this government and it will not be forgotten that this government two or three years ago substituted for the Superannuation Act, another Act which is self sustaining and applies to new appointees after July, 1898.

For militia and defence there was an increase of nearly half a million dollars. I merely mention that because it is well known that that money was for the better equipment of our volunteers, and the expenditure has never to my knowledge been questioned or even criticised.

On the mounted police service there has been an increase of $266,025, but $498,824 of that was expended for the mounted police in the Yukon, and as I have pointed out the

Yukon has paid for the Yukon, and has paid for that expenditure along with the others. Therefore, if you deduct the expenditure for the Yukon police, you will find that the service generally costs us less than it did before.

In the North-west Territories government there was an increase of $200,761. For my part it seems to me—although I am not inviting people to ask for additional aid to the government—but it seems to me from the facts within the knowledge of every man, that that item ought to be increased in fairness of the settlers who went into the North-west, who are charged with the expenses of the government and of educating the youth, and whose expenditures are bound to increase commensurate with the increase of the population. No one will find fault with that expenditure.

Under the head of 'miscellaneous' there has been an increase of $118,000, and $60,000 of this represents the grant that was given to beautify the city of Ottawa, and in return for which we receive considerations from the city authorities in the line of a water supply and so on.

The interest on the public debt increased $341,660. But let us look at this for a moment. The expenditure for interest in 1890 was $9,656,841, and in 1895 it had increased to $10,466,294; an increase in these five years of $809,453. In 1901 the expenditure for interest on the public debt was $10,807,954. During the five years since 1896 it had increased by $341,660 as against $809,453 increase during the previous five years of the Conservative government. That is quite a difference. Then, I trust the hon. gentlemen opposite have not forgotten that when they went out of office they left this country in debt; that they were not paying their way. Several millions were added to the public debt, and they had not provided for the interest on that, because it had not become due until our first year, and therefore there is a debt which ought to be charged against them. In these different departments I have shown the increases to the amount of something like $5,000,000 out of the $8,000,000 increase in the ordinary expenditure.

I come now to the expenditures under the head of collection of revenue, that is, customs, excise, post office, railways, and minor revenues. Now, a good way to judge whether there has been extravagance on the part of the government or not is to compare the revenue derived from these different sources with the amount expended in collecting that revenue. If that is done, the comparison stands to the credit of the Liberal government. In 1894-5 the expenditure under this head was $9,129,416, and the revenue collected was $33,978,129, the percentage cost of collection being 27 per cent of the amount collected. In 1901 the expenditure was $12,503,249; but the revenue was $52,514,701, the percentage cost of collection being only 24 per cent, or 3 per cent less than it was in 1895. If it had cost as much per cent last year as it did in 1895, the expenditure would have been over $1,600,000 more than it actually was. That, I think, points to economy and efficient administration. That is a statement that will enable any one who has thought that the expenditure in these different departments had increased, to see that there has been nothing reckless or extravagant in the conduct of them.

Take the post office department as an illustration. Its expenditure in 1901 was $3,931,446 and its revenue was $3,441,504. In 1895 the expenditure was $3,593,647 and the revenue was only $2,792,789. The increase in the expenditure in 1901 over 1895 was $337,799, but the increase in the revenue during the same period was $648,715. This shows nearly $2 more revenue for every dollar expended; and this has been accomplished along with a reduction of 33⅓ per cent on the cost of transmitting those millions and tens of millions of letters which have circulated through this country; with a reduction in the cost of carrying a letter to the British Isles from 5 cents to 2 cents, and with all the other advantages that have come to the country, such as additional mail routes and other facilities which had never been in use before.

Then take the Intercolonial Railway, another of the departments in which there is expenditure for the collection of revenue. Last year the working expenses of the road increased by about $2,500,000; but do not forget that the revenue increased by fully $2,000,000. I may be told that there was a deficit this year in the Intercolonial Railway. But I may remind you that there was a surplus last year. On a great public work of this kind, you may have a surplus in one year and a deficit in another. The profits of a great railroad cannot be judged by the results of any single year. This year there has been an expenditure of many thousands of dollars that will result in saving expenditures for years to come. So I think there is nothing to be alarmed at, even though there happens to be a deficit this year.

I am not as fully conversant with the departments of other ministers as I am with my own, and I will just illustrate by reference to the customs department, how the increase of expenditure is not only necessary, but is perfectly justifiable and perhaps worthy of commendation instead of condemnation. In the department of customs there has been an increase of expenditure from 1895 to 1901. In 1894-5 the expenditure was $917,632; in 1901 it was $1,123,817, which was an increase of 22·46 per cent in the expenses of working the department. The revenue, however, in 1894-5 was $17,890,516, while in 1901 it was $29,106,979. The expenditure increased 22·46 per cent while the revenue increased

over 62 per cent. I may be met by hon. gentlemen opposite with the objection that your customs officers can as easily take in $10 on an entry as $1. But I would point out that the tendency in trade at the present time is for importers to repeat orders, so that the entries are really more frequent. In 1895 the number of entries inwards was 501,357 ; in 1901 there were 739,809, an increase of 47 per cent. The entries outwards increased 150 per cent. The railway reports inwards increased 51 per cent, and the railway reports outwards increased 85 per cent. There are 115 more ports at which the revenue is collected.

The percentage of the cost of collecting the revenue in 1894-5 was 5·13 per cent. It cost $5.13 on every $100 to collect the customs revenue in 1894-5. Last year it cost us $3.86 on every $100. With all the extra work I have pointed out—work that brings in no revenue at all, such as special officers that have to be engaged at Coteau, Fort William and many other places, owing to the volume of trade and commerce going through this country and demanding the attention of the Department of Customs; but from which we have no direct revenue added to the treasury—with all this extra work the cost of collecting is less than it was in 1894-5. Had it cost last year the same percentage to collect the customs revenue as it did in 1894-5, we would have expended $369,371 more than we did. We therefore saved that much in proportionate work to the government of this country, and in that increase of labour I have not asked credit for the new improvements we have made in the service—improvements which have cost this country large sums of money, but which, I believe, this country approves. Take my statistical office, there is $44,000 of expenditure there charged up, which was not incurred in 1894-5. Two years ago I asked the House to sanction this expenditure, and the House generously did so. It does not bring any revenue, but this is what it does. On April 4, there was placed on the Table, and ready to be placed in the hands of every member of this House, a complete statement in detail of the whole trade of this Dominion to the end of February, or about thirty-five days after the close of the month, you had in your possession a detailed statement of the whole trade and commerce of this country, from ocean to ocean, as complete as you could get it in the Trade and Navigation Returns, which you used to receive six months after the close of the fiscal year, and not before. That is something, I believe, the people are glad to have. That tells in what directions our trade and commerce is expanding. That gives information to hon. gentlemen of which they are glad to avail themselves. But it costs an extra expenditure and brings in no revenue, and yet is included in the expenditure I have given you. And notwithstanding that and other items I could mention of a corresponding character, it has cost us less to collect our revenue last year than it did in 1894-5. For instance there is the secret preventive services, on which we spent $5,000, and there is an expenditure of $7,000 on extra preventive service to prevent smuggling, and I venture to say that that expenditure has been repaid to the country ten times over. Unfortunately, however, for the Customs Department the benefits are not to be found in the added customs receipts, but will be found in the augmented inland revenue receipts, caused by our people buying the products of this country instead of foreign products smuggled into Canada. Then there is an additional expenditure of $18,000 for additional revenue cruisers and also $3,000 additional for customs uniforms. We thought it only right that the officers of this Dominion, who have to meet the travelling public at the border points, should have something more than a little medal to show their authority, when examining baggage. We thought that this government ought to put these officers in a decent uniform, so that our people need not be ashamed of the appearance of these men who have to meet the travelling public and examine their luggage. There are altogether some $92,000 additional expenditure by this government on new services that did not exist in 1894-5; and if I were to deduct that amount, as I should do to make a fair comparison, from my expenditure, instead of their being a proportionate saving in the cost of collecting the revenue of $369,371, there would be a saving of $461,371.

I have no doubt wearied the House with these items, but I did think it worth while, in view of the statements made by our friends opposite, that we should examine a little into detail, and I believe that the information I have given will be satisfactory to those who wish to be in a position to know just what extra expenditure was paid and the purposes to which it was put, and the government are not afraid of their verdict.

Let me now call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to this fact, which I think is most important, namely, that while there has been this increased expenditure of $8,000,000 odd, it has been defrayed out of revenue, and a surplus of over $19,000,000 left in the treasury. Whereas, during the last five years of Tory rule there was a net deficit of over $4,000,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the $19,000,000 has been left in the treasury ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I say that in the five years this government have been in power, we have paid all our ordinary expenditure and have a surplus left amounting to $19,743,527.69.

Mr. CLANCY. What has become of it ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I shall deal with that point a little later. I was

mentioning to my hon. friend that while we have paid our way, that while we have met this increased expenditure out of revenue, we have done so, and still had a surplus left at the end of those five years, which we could have applied to reduction of our public debt but did not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And for which I propose to give good reasons when I reach that part of my subject. But even if we have spent the surplus on capital account, as we did, let me ask the hon. gentleman in all fairness: Was it not better to have in those five years that surplus of $19,000,000 and spend it on capital account, which must do some good to the country, than have done as they did, during their last five years of office, namely, not meet our ordinary expenditure but absolutely run the country in debt? Which is the better? Which would my hon. friend rather have? Would he rather have us go back to the old times and have to borrow money to carry on our ordinary expenditure, or so arrange—as we have done—that under a lightened taxation we still have millions to spend on capital account besides paying all ordinary charges?

I find, on looking at my papers, that I anticipated my hon. friends opposite would want some light upon this point. For I have a note here: 'Our opponents may say you spent that surplus of $19,000,000 and more too on capital account.' And I have noted here: True, and for what have you spent it? Here I have the details of the capital and other special expenditures of the present government. We can call it all capital expenditure, for, as hon. gentlemen opposite understand very well, it all goes into capital account, although the special expenditure, such as my subsidies and the like, is kept in the books, as it has been under all administrations, under the heading of special account.

The present government has spent under this heading of capital, in the last five years, $41,622,572, as compared with $26,858,798 in the previous five years, or an increased capital expenditure of about $15,000,000. Thus, we have expended on capital account during our five years $15,000,000 more than hon. gentlemen opposite did. And, for my own part—I do not know how others may feel about it—I am not in a mood to apologize for it, but rather in a mood to approve and commend it. For what services was this money expended? These are the expenditures in round figures:

St. Lawrence river canals	$10,890,000
Trent canal	1,623,000
Welland canal	244,000
Sault Ste. Marie, canal	645,000
Lachine canal	883,000
Rideau canal	13,000
Total for canals	$14,000,000
Government railways	$8,700,000
Improvement, River St. Lawrence	1,460,000
Railway subsidies, including Crow's Nest Pass	8,270,000
Militia	1,670,000
Yukon	1,043,000
South African war	2,450,000
Dominion lands	838,657

Small services account for the balance. Now, to what do hon. gentlemen opposite take exception in these expenditures? Do they condemn the expenditure on the canals? They had entered upon it themselves, and were proceeding with it at a very leisurely pace—and borrowing money to pay for it. But, when this government came into power they recognized the fact that all parties were agreed that the St. Lawrence canals should be deepened. We had fourteen-foot navigation from the great lakes, through the Welland canal and a large part of the St. Lawrence river, but there were parts where you could not send a boat drawing more than eight or nine feet. As the strength of the weakest link determines the strength of a chain so the shallowest point of your navigation determined the size of the vessel that could be brought down from the great lakes. We believed that the country would sustain a policy that would complete this system of navigation, and that the people would like to see it done while they were alive—for men take more interest in things when they are alive than when they are dead. We engaged contractors, and their electric lights blazed on the banks of these canals, making the night as the day, while double gangs of men worked in order to complete the system of navigation. And it is completed. As a result of this expenditure, you have made Fort William and Port Arthur, Canadian ports at the head of Lake Superior, fourteen hundred miles from salt water—you have absolutely made them ocean ports. A vessel loaded at those ports may pass through that mighty waterway down to Montreal, on to Quebec, and, if need be across the broad Atlantic and land its cargo, as has been done, at Liverpool. Do hon. gentlemen opposite now say it would have been better to have sayed that $10,000,000 out of our $19,000,000 of surplus, not to have had the canal and still be $4,000,000 in debt. Is that the alternative hon. gentlemen opposite would favour? Then, take the government railways. On these you have spent $8,700,000. Have you not an asset for it? Have you not added to the length of the system? Have you not strengthened and improved the railway in all directions? This improvement was necessitated by the progress of railway business. We need to-day larger cars, heavier locomotives, and these entail heavier rails and stronger bridges. Of course, these things cost money meanwhile. But we have every reason to believe that this expenditure will result in an augmented revenue or les-

sened expenses. Who finds fault? Who says the Intercolonial Railway should not have been brought to Montreal, the great commercial emporium, instead of being left to terminate in a field, as you might say, at Lévis? It is true that a cry was raised against this in days gone by, but we do not hear it to-day. Who objects to the $1,460,000 spent in improving the River St. Lawrence? I represent an agricultural constituency, yet I approve that expenditure. Why? Is it out of love for the city of Montreal? I value Montreal and its residents very much, as I do other places in this Dominion and those who live in them; but it is not wholly for that and without thought of the interests of my constituents that I favour this expenditure. I wish to improve this waterway and the harbour of Montreal primarily because the harbour of Montreal cannot take all the shipping that seeks to come there. I want all the ships that will come to Montreal to have facilities for doing so. Why? The more ships that come there looking for trade the lower will be the freight rate; and every cent off the cost of transporting a bushel of wheat, or every dollar off the cost of transporting a steer, means a cent or a dollar in the pockets of the farmer in my constituency. This is a Dominion question and one in which the producers of this Dominion generally are interested. Then, take the railway subsidies, including the subsidy to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, the total being $8,270,000, and also the expenditure on the South African war of $2,450,000 which this parliament granted willingly. If these expenditures had not been undertaken, we should not have added a dollar to the public debt, and would have had all these other improvements besides. Do hon. gentlemen opposite object to these subsidies to the railways? Does anybody object to the subsidy to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway? We do not hear them say so. One hon. gentlemen ventured to refer to it the other night—I think it was the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). He told us a yarn to the effect that he had found something crooked about it——

Mr. TAYLOR. Did not you increase the subsidy granted by the late government?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What was crooked about it?

Mr. TAYLOR. Ask Joe Martin; he will tell you.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman tells us to ask Joe Martin. If I remember well, the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Taylor's) statement—I have not had time to look it up in 'Hansard,' but if I am wrong the hon. gentleman can correct me—was that there had been some corrupt bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway to take Joe Martin, as he calls him, and for this we were to give an increase of subsidy.

Mr. TAYLOR. And you did it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Where did the hon. gentleman get the news, and when did he get it?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) will not contradict it conscientiously.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will the hon. gentleman tell me how long he has had this information and yet kept it from the public. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) refuses to tell us where he got his information and how long he has had it. But this we do know—that hon. gentlemen opposite were loud in their denunciation of the Crow's Nest Pass subsidy when they were upon the political platform addressing the electors. The Crow's Nest deal and the Crow's Nest steal was the way they rang the changes on the words.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Some hon. gentlemen say 'Hear, hear.' That is the way in which they do it. Well, Mr. Speaker, will you listen to this argument and see whether it is correct? I voted for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway grant, and I believed that it was in the public interest, and that being the case, there may be in the minds of some people an idea that I erred in judgment, that I made a mistake. But they can forgive an error in judgment, they can forgive a mistake if they believe the man is honest in doing what he thinks is right. But if these hon. gentlemen opposite, as by their cheers they now allege, believed there was something wrong, something corrupt, and if they knew it and never voted against it, as they did not, I ask if the country can forgive them?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Your shouts of 'louder' will not drown the judgment of the people of this country. If hon. gentlemen imply there was corruption in the deal that was made in the House of Commons, and they sat there as one of the parties to it, the judgment of the country will be that, while they may forgive a man who honestly did what he thought was in the interest of the country, they cannot forgive men who sat there and knew that a corrupt bargain was being put through and never dared to record their vote against it. That is the position. Now, what about that Crow's Nest Pass Railway? Let me illustrate how I think a government can benefit a country by wise expenditure. Let me illustrate also how, under our system of raising revenue by a tariff and customs duties levied upon many articles, the operation of which may give more direct benefits to one section of the community than another—how it is possible that those other sections of the community may also benefit, perhaps not so much through the tariff, as by a wise expenditure of the money col-

iected from the tariff, to the advantage of the other classes who contribute, the artisans among them. Let me illustrate this principle by the bargain that was made with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. By that bargain you opened up your vast Kootenay mining districts, a source of wealth to the Dominion of Canada, opened up a market for the farmers of Alberta, made running arrangements with other roads upon the payment of a fair rental to use their line and got 50,000 acres of coal land that are held by this government to prevent any monopoly of that valuable mineral in that district. What more ?

Mr. SPROULE. Two mililon dollars to the 'Globe' newspaper.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Two million dollars to the 'Globe' newspaper, and the hon. gentleman knew it at that time, and yet supported the resolution ! Sir, what more, I say ? This government, careful of the conditions of all the people of this land, recognized the fact that the bargain that was originally made with the Canadian Pacific Railway by our friends opposite, imposed terms and conditions with reference to freight rates to be charged over that road that could not be altered until the company earned 10 per cent of their capital. They have not done it. The settlers in Manitoba and the North-west felt that this was a very heavy charge upon them; the government recognized the fact, and they recognized that no doubt while the Crow's Nest Pass bargain was of special benefit to the men who farm in that country, still the interests of all are so intertwined one with the other in this country, that they made a stipulation for a lowered freight rate over that road. It is not likely that, under the conditions that prevailed last year and which are likely to prevail for some time to come, with the amount of freight pressing upon them more than they could handle, the company would voluntarily have reduced the rate, and they agreed under this Crow's Nest Pass Railway bargain and subsidy, to a reduction of the rate by three cents per 100 pounds on all the wheat and flour that went out of that country. And what is the result ? It was in operation last year, and we are told that there is the equivalent of 60,000,000 bushels of grain to be moved out of that country. What does it mean ? It means over $1,000,000 of actual cash that goes into the pockets of the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west, as actually as if it was paid out as a direct bounty by this government from the Dominion treasury. Perhaps our hon. friends will say that the government should have stipulated with the railway to keep back 3 cents on every 100 weight and pay it into the Dominion treasury to help the revenue. They might say that it was not fair to ask other portions of and classes of the community who dwell in cities and work in factories to pay a portion of this subsidy when the indirect benefits were felt chiefly by the farmers in the west. But the government did not take that view. They recognized that primarily, perhaps, these men are more benefited by it, but they recognized that in their prosperity is involved the prosperity of all who dwell in this country to a greater or lesser extent, and so they secured that reduction in the public interest, and I believe that as the years go by that arrangement will be found more and more to have been made in the public interest. It may be said that the company would have voluntarily thrown it off. Well, I ask if, under the conditions that prevailed last year, and that are likely to prevail, the company would not, if they had the power, have charged the 3 cents per 100 weight more ? Why, to ask the question is to answer it, and having answered it, I leave it to the judgment of the House to say whether that $3,300,000, which is included in that $8,270,000 of subsidy, was not an investment redounding directly to the benefit of those men who farm our lands in the North-west, and incidentally to the benefit of all the people who dwell in this Dominion ?

What more ? Remember the government can advance the interest of the community not only by the way in which they impose their taxation, but also by the expenditure of the money. Things can be equalized in that way. It may be that some classes are benefited a little more through the imposition of a certain tax—though it never can be justified except it is in the public interest—while another section will not get the same benefit. But in the expenditure of this money all sections benefit, though not all directly, and consequently there is something like justice, and there is regard for all the different sections of this community. There should be no legislation passed for any particular section of the community unless it can be justified as in the interests of the whole community. But where you have diverse interests, as we have in this country, then I say the way in which the taxation of this country is raised, and the way in which the people want it to be raised, through customs and inland revenue, is fair, and in the interests of the whole people of this country. Our interests are so intertwined that all legislation which we pass should have reference to it. But, I will not spend more time with the capital expenditure. I have asked my hon. friend to what he objects. Is it to the half million dollars of railway subsidies which has gone to the Great Northern Railway ? Who will say that is not in the interests of the public ? Who will say, having witnessed the grain blockade that has occurred in the west, that this expenditure is not a wise one ? That road is being pushed through the North-west Territories, it has reached there already, and it will be turned to ac-

count this year. The same applies to all the other lines that we have opened up. Who will say that we should not have done that, that we should not have opened up mineral regions and given an advantage to the miners—the miners who cannot be benefited by tariff arrangements, but who can be benefited by the expenditure of money raised under the tariff and to which others have contributed as well as themselves? It is fair that money should be expended in this way and so we have endeavoured to hold the scales evenly and justly as between the different sections of the community, and the fact that this government and the friends who are behind them have succeeded moderately in their desire to do justice to every section of the community, is shown by the universal prosperity and contentment that I believe reigns throughout this country at the present time.

Then, my next note is that our opponents say that our resolution of 1893 expresses alarm at the large increase in the debt and that instead of using our surplus to reduce it we have increased it. Well now, that is true. Let us examine that. It is nominally true that we have increased the debt. I have a comparative statement here of the increase in the debt. When we speak of ordinary expenditure and capital expenditure, hon. gentlemen know how the books are kept, but the final record is that when the ordinary and capital expenditure meet together and are offset by the total revenue from all sources and according as the revenue is greater than ordinary and capital expenditure combined, there is a reduction of the public debt. If, on the other hand, the combination of ordinary and capital expenditure is greater than the whole revenue from all sources you have an addition to the public debt. We have an addition to the public debt. In 1897 we added to the public debt $3,041,163.69. In 1898 we added $2,417,802.45. In 1899 we added $2,317,047.69, and in 1900 we had a surplus, thereby decreasing the public debt, of $779,639.71. In 1901 we added $2,986,196. In five years, deducting the surplus of 1900 from the amounts that we increased the public debt, the total addition to the public debt was $9,982,570.92, or an average increase per annum during the five years of $1,996,514.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the $6,000,000 of temporary loans you have from the banks?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) got mixed up when he was speaking the other night. In 1892 there was a deficit on the part of our hon. friends opposite and I will not weary the House by referring to it. But, they added to the debt every year of their last five years and the increase for their last five years of the public debt was $20,688,402.26 as against $9,982,570.92 of an increase under us, or the average increase per annum under hon. gentlemen opposite was $4,137,680 while the annual increase per annum under us was $1,996,514. I have taken their last five years in office. If hon. gentlemen will take the public accounts and go through them they will find that during the whole 18 years that they were in power they added over $6,000,000 to the public debt every year. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) when he made his speech the other evening asked us to drop out the years 1882, 1883 and 1884, when they added $60,000,000 to the public debt, and he said that we would find that if we did that they had not added as much as they were charged with adding, a proposition in which I agree with the hon. gentleman. Still, it is true all the same that we have to pay interest on the debt. But, my hon. friend will see that I have left out these years and that I have just taken the last five years for the purpose of this comparison. I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, what the resolution of the Liberal convention did, for I have it before me here, express alarm at the increase of the debt. Plank No. 4 was as follows:

> We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

That was the resolution passed by the convention in 1893, passed under the circumstance that your ordinary expenditure was $38,000,000, and that with your ordinary expenditure at $38,000,000 your government could not pay it out of your revenue but were running in debt, borrowing money, and adding to the public debt, to say nothing of the expenditure on capital account. It was a period in which the prosperity of the country seemed to have shrunk away. It was a proper resolution to pass then. When the country was running in debt to pay its ordinary running expenses, it was time to express alarm. But, the conditions are entirely changed as compared with that time, because now we have paid everything out of the lowered taxation imposed upon the people and have had $19,000,000 in five years to the good in the way of surpluses. In reference to the public debt we have added a little to it. We would not have added anything to it if we had not to meet these expenditures on capital account, and I think the additions we have made to it are justified. There are two ways of reducing the public debt. The only method of properly measuring the public debt is to ascertain the debt per head of the population. It is self-evident to any man that if we could suddenly increase the population of the Dominion of

Canada to 10,000,000 of people and keep our debt where we have it now, we would cut it in two. We could reduce the expenditure in that way. What are the facts ? In 1891 the public debt amounted to $237,809,-030. Based upon a population of 4,833,239, according to the census of 1891, the debt was at the rate of $49.20 per head. In 1896, which was the last year of the Conservative administration, the debt of the country was $258,497,432. Now, assuming, which I do not grant, that the increase in population between 1891 and 1896 was in as great a ratio as during the last five years under the Liberal government, the per capita debt in 1896 was $50.66, or an increase in the debt of $1.46 per head over 1901. If you were to admit for the purpose of argument that hon. gentlemen opposite added one half of the population that was added during the decade you will find that while they were running behind in their ordinary accounts they were increasing the debt to such an extent that in five years it was $1.46 per head more. Now the public debt in 1901 amounted to $268,480,003. Calculating from the population as shown by the recent census, the debt amounts to $49.99 per head, or a reduction of 67 cents per head as compared with 1896. Not only were they running behind and not meeting their ordinary expenditure but in their last five years they increased the public debt $1.46 per head, while in our five years we have decreased it 67 cents per head ; and as the population increases, as it is increasing, and as the expenditure will be kept in reasonable bounds as it will be, considering the demands of our great public works, you will find that the debt per head—if the Liberal government are permitted to remain in power—will go on decreasing as it has been decreasing during the five years we have been in office. It will therefore be seen that during the last five years of the Conservative regime the debt was increased per head $1.46, while during the five years the Liberals have been in power it has decreased 67 cents per head. The comparison is made all the stronger in favour of the Liberal administration when it is explained that during the five years of Liberal rule from 1897 and 1901 inclusive, the large sum of $41,622,572 was expended on capital account in connection with the development of great public works within the Dominion and other special services ; whereas during the five preceding years of Conservative rule the capital expenditure was $26,858,798. The addition to the debt during the last five years of Conservative rule amounted to $20,688,402, being as I said an average increase per annum of $4,137,680, while during the five years of Liberal rule the debt was increased by only $9,982,570 or an average per annum of $1,996,514.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In brief —and I ask the attention of the House to this summary—in brief, the Liberals during the last five years spent $15,000,000 more than the Conservatives did for the previous five years on capital account ; added less than half the Conservatives did to the public debt, and still decreased the per capita rate of the public debt 67 cents per head, as against an increase of $1.47 per head during the last five years of the Conservative rule.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I ask the attention of the House to the resolution I read when we expressed alarm, and with reference to which our Conservative friends attempt to say : That we have violated the instructions of that convention by our increased expenditure and by making an increase to the public debt. I ask the House again to bear in mind the wording of this resolution. It did not say what the expenditure was to be, but it expressed alarm at the expenditure of that time and at the increase that was being made to the public debt under the conditions which I pointed out ; and added this : That what did alarm them was the consequent undue taxation of the people of that account. Now then, what about the taxation. We have spent this money, but it may be said perhaps by our hon. friends opposite : You may spend money very freely if you go into the pockets of the people and take from them the money that should be left to them.

But what has been our record with reference to this question of taxation and of taking revenue from the people. Briefly it is this. In 1896 the average rate of duty levied upon all goods dutiable and free coming into the Dominion was 18·28 per cent. That was under the rule of our Conservative friends. On every hundred dollars worth of goods that came into this country there was levied upon an average a duty of $18.28 by the Conservatives. Under the Liberal administration of last year—as you will if you take the trouble to figure it—we only taxed the people $16.06 for every $100 worth of goods that came into the country.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman exclude the Indian corn that is being exported, when he makes that calculation.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not and for this reason : That the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will find, that if for these years he excludes the corn and the coin and bullion, instead of there being a difference of $2.22 on every $100 in favour of the Liberal administration, it would be $2.29 ; so I am taking the figures that tell least in our favour.

And about this $2.22 reduction, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) al-

luded to it and he said that there had been a 'paltry' reduction of $2.22 per cent in the taxation. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) pointed out to him that $2.22 of a reduction on $18.28 was something more than 2·22 per cent reduction, as I think any gentleman will see at a glance. A reduction of $2.22 on $18.28 means that the tariff was reduced 12 per cent by the Liberal government. That is what it means. It means 12 per cent of reduced taxation by this government, notwithstanding all our expenditure. A 'paltry' reduction, says my hon. friend from West Toronto. Well, I can tell him that another reduction in the tariff even less than that, would bring the rate of taxation that has been levied by this government below the rate of taxation that was levied by the Mackenzie government under which we did not raise revenue enough to carry on the affairs of the country. I want to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Osler), who called this a 'paltry' reduction, that if, when he goes to the accountant at the close of the session the accountant hands him a cheque for $1,320, and he says: What is the matter here; the indemnity is $1,500 now. Suppose the accountant says: Oh, yes, I know, but I have just taken off $180, and it is a paltry reduction of 12 per cent. I wonder if the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) would consider that very paltry. Suppose a farmer in the North-west takes his load of wheat to Brandon or to Winnipeg and sells it for 60 cents a bushel, but next day he is told that he will get only 53 cents, and he inquires what is the matter; is the market down, that you should take off the 7 cents; and the answer is given him; it is only a paltry reduction of 12 per cent—I wonder what that farmer would say. I wonder would he consider it very paltry? Suppose a man working for $12 a week in a factory gets $10.60 handed to him at the end of the week and he says: What is this for, I lost no time; but the cashier answers: why it is only a paltry reduction of 12 per cent—I wonder would that wage earner consider it paltry.

Sir, that is the reduction made in the rate of taxation by this government. Paltry or not paltry it is the reduction we have made. I call the attention of our friends to it, and I call it a material reduction; a very material reduction indeed. I could give you the items here in the general tariff; many of them to show that reduction. The great general outstanding feature of our tariff policy was of course the preferential tariff given in favour of the motherland, which reduced the general rate of taxation, and brought us great benefits otherwise. But, I have heard my hon. friends opposite say: Oh, but what is the use of talking of not taxing the people more; the accounts show that you have taken between $11,000,000 and $12,000,000 more money into the treasury than we did in 1894-5.

When did the Liberal party ever pledge themselves to have less revenue? You will not find any resolution of that kind passed anywhere. We expected to have more revenue when we came into power, and we got it. Governments do not make the prices of goods in foreign countries; the law of supply and demand regulates that. A government cannot compel any man or woman to go into a store and buy a dollar's worth of imported goods on which duties are levied. Every man and woman do just as they please in that respect. There is one thing a government can do, and only one. What is that? It stands between the man who buys the goods and the price he will have to pay for them, and says by its law that before the merchant can take those goods out of the custom-house to place them on the shelf for sale, he must pay so many cents on the dollar to go into the Dominion treasury. That is the rate of taxation; that the government can control; it was that rate of taxation which we were pledged to lower, and which we have lowered 12 per cent; and the extra millions that have gone into the public treasury have gone in under that lowered rate, because the people are better off, and because there are more people in the country who voluntarily buy goods on which duties have been paid.

Having shown that under a reduced rate of taxation we have obtained a greatly increased revenue, the next question is whether that increased revenue has been expended wisely. The Liberal party in their convention declared that there should be economy in public affairs, and I maintain that there has been economy. True, economy does not mean parsimony; it means the wise expenditure of public money. I have challenged our opponents to formulate a motion condemning the financial administration of this government; but they have not done so. Why, Sir, when we think of all the advantages that have accrued to the country under the administration of this government, ably supported by the gentlemen who have given it their confidence; when we think of the expenditure on canals, on the Intercolonial Railway, on subsidies to railways in order to open up and develop the country; when we consider the expenditures made to deepen the harbours and waterways of the country; when we consider all these, then we are able to judge whether we did wisely or unwisely in not only spending our surplus, but in adding slightly to the public debt, nominally, while virtually, if you measure it, as it should be measured, per capita, there has been an actual decrease. No wonder the opposition have failed to move in regard to the financial administration of this government.

Now, I did not intend to do more than speak on the financial side of the question, which had not been discussed, I thought, perhaps as fully as it might be, and a dis-

cussion of which might be of profit, though no doubt it has been wearying too. This amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition does not touch upon that subject at all. If hon. gentlemen opposite view that subject with the alarm which some of them have professed in their speeches, I think it should have been voiced in their resolution; but instead of that they move :

> That all the words after 'that' in the proposed motion be left out and the following substituted therefor :
>
> This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries, as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians. And, while thus firmly maintaining the necessity of such protection to Canadian interests, this House affirms its belief in a policy of reciprocal trade preferences within the empire.

This House is here asked to affirm that we regard the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory. When the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) rose to speak upon that resolution, he made a remark to the effect that when he heard it read, he fancied that if he were to shut his eyes and listen, he might almost believe he was hearing something that had been read in the House some twenty or more years ago—at which our opposition friends cheered. They thought he had made a mistake.

Mr. HUGHES. Oh, no; they knew he had stuck his foot in it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Then they mean that that resolution is intended to signify that they prefer their old national policy to the present tariff. If that was the meaning of their cheers on that occasion, they have challenged a comparison of the two policies, and it is well we are able to make it. It is a very great advantage that we are in a position to see the results of the operation of both tariffs. Let us look at what these hon. gentlemen consider to be unsatisfactory. Let us take the trade of the country—the tariff has something to do with that—and let us see how it stands. Let us compare the trade of the country during the last five years under their policy with what it has been in the last five years under this policy, which they regard as unsatisfactory; and if you are persuaded by the result of that comparison that their tariff worked much more satisfactorily than this one, then we can let them come in and put their tariff back. The aggregate foreign trade of Canada in the two periods under comparison was as follows :

From 1897 to 1901..	$1,651,726,204
From 1892 to 1896..	1,193,453,797
Increase.....	$ 458,272,407

Perhaps this increase in the five years of Liberal rule is unsatisfactory to the hon. gentlemen; perhaps they do not want this extra trade—a very strange state of mind to get into. I do not view trade as a bad thing; I consider it a good thing. I think we are all looking for more trade. What is good for an individual, I take it, is good for a nation; and we have had 458 millions more trade in the last five years than we had in the previous five years. I do not see how that can be unsatisfactory, or a reason why we should want to go back to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, unless we want to crawl backwards. Our imports for consumption have increased 190 millions. Our exports the produce of Canada have increased 233 millions; our exports to the United States have increased 72 millions; our exports to Great Britain have increased 142 millions. So with our exports of fisheries, of the mine, of the forest, of animals and their products and of agricultural products. So with Canadian manufactures, the exports of which have increased under our policy to $62,143,532, while under their policy they were only $39,561,961, an increase of $22,581,571. And then they ask us to go back to the old policy under which this restricted trade was done, and to declare that the expanded trade, which is taking place under our policy, has not been satisfactory. Why, take the whole eighteen years under the national policy and compare it with the period under the present tariff, in that whole eighteen years the aggregate increase in the foreign trade of the country was only $66,000,000, while in the five years of our Liberal policy that trade had increased to $147,000,000. I need not go through the whole list to show the wonderful increase in trade.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition said that if we deduct the gold bullion and concentrates the exports of Canada in the last fiscal year decreased as compared with the previous one. No doubt, Sir, there always will be variation in the exports of particular items, comparing one year with another. One year there will be a larger wheat crop or a larger mineral output or a larger fishery export. But to reassure my hon. friend, let me show him that our export trade has recovered itself in the other lines. He will be glad to know in the eight months of the present year, ending February, 1902, our exports increased by $9,000,000 over the same period last year, and while they increased to this extent, there was a decrease in the products of the mines to which the hon. gentleman made particular effort. The increases are in these lines :

The fisheries....	$3,000,000
Products of the forests....	1,000,000
Animals and their products and agricultural products....	7,000,000
Manufactures....	1,000,000

The foreign trade of Canada, Sir, is something of which we may be proud. Compare it with that of older and stronger nations,

and we have reason to congratulate ourselves. The per capita export trade of Denmark is $27.67 ; of the German empire, $17.88 ; of France, $19.53 ; of Austria-Hungary, $8.44 ; of the United States, $18.27 ; Great Britain, $34.67 ; Canada, $32.51. Canada, therefore, stands next to Great Britain, within two dollars per head, and its export trade exceeds that of the United States by nearly two dollars to one.

Mr. ROSAMOND. And it does not grow half as fast.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I expect that it will grow faster in proportion.

Mr. ROSAMOND. You are a long time expecting it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. As a business man, my hon. friend will agree with me that the more people we can bring into this country as settlers in the west, for instance, the better it will be for our manufacturing industries in the east. No doubt one of the great secrets of the success and prosperity of the American manufacturers was the great immigration that came to their shores in years gone by, when they might be said, to use a figure of speech, almost to have annexed the foreign market to their own by bringing the people there. That is a state of things which, we believe, is about to take place in Canada, and which will immensely benefit our manufacturing industries by furnishing them with a vastly increased market in our western territory.

But the great feature of our policy, compared with that of hon. gentlemen opposite, is the preferential tariff. We take credit to ourselves for that tariff, and I note that while our friends opposite may attack it in an underhand way, they have not ventured to ask by resolution for its repeal. True that is embodied in the spirit of their amendment, but is not openly stated. The hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Kendrey) came out last night plainly on the subject. He said that he was opposed to this preference. Some other gentlemen opposite have also expressed their disapproval of it, but they have not moved to abolish it except in a very covert way in the resolution before the House. What has been the effect of that preference ? In the first place, it has been one of the great causes of reducing the taxation on the people. I am not going into details, but to give you a test which any man can apply for himself. Take the Trade and Navigation returns for 1896 and 1901, divide the amount of duties by the value of the articles imported, and what will you find ? I am not taking individual items but general lines of goods, of which we import tens of millions of dollars. Take, for instance, iron and steel manufactures, under the tariff of 1896, they paid $25.65 per $100. Under the preferential tariff that has been reduced to $11.56. Take woollen goods, in the tariff of 1896, they paid $31.71 per $100 and that has been reduced to $23.

Mr. CLANCY. How much of the iron goods came in under the preferential tariff?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am dealing in great general lines. I have the figures showing the special reductions made on a long list of implements used by the farmer, but these have been given to the House before, and I do not want to repeat them. I am simply dealing with great lines of goods and taking the aggregate duties paid. Take the item of woollens, you know the millions of dollars worth that we import of this line of goods, the duty has been reduced from $31.71 per $100 to $23. Then take cottons, they paid $28.53 under the Conservative tariff of 1895, but under our preferential tariff they come in at the rate of $20.43 per $100. Earthenware and chinaware paid $30.20 per $100 in 1896 and now they only pay $20.02. On manufactures of flax, hemp and jute the duty has been reduced by the preferential tariff from $22.25 in 1896 down to $18. But let me give the items tabulated :

Articles.	Average rate of duty under Conservative Tariff on importations of 1896.	Average rate of duty on importations under Preferential Tariff, 1901.
Iron or steel manufactures....	25·65	11·56
Woollen goods.....	31·71	23·
Cottons	28·53	20·43
Earthenware and chinaware...	30·20	20·02
Manufactures of flax, hemp and jute	22·25	18·
Glass and manufactures of....	25·60	17·11
Hats, caps and bonnets.....	30·00	20·00
Gloves and mitts	35·00	23·33
Leather and manufactures of..	20·11	10·70

I call your attention further to this fact that, in all these lines that I have mentioned, Great Britain is an active competitor with the United States and with other countries. And any business man knows that if there are large importations of these same articles from the United States under a tariff of 30 or 35 per cent and also large importations under the preference from Great Britain, the Canadian consumer gets his goods from the American producer at the same price as the English goods, and that the public treasury receives hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars in duties besides.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) tell the House how much reduction has been made on the iron goods coming from the United States because of the preference given to imports from Great Britain at the same time ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. As a business man—or one who was a business man—I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr.

Clancy) this, that if a gentleman representing an English house offered me an article in which I was dealing, quoting a certain figure, and an American commercial traveller also offered me a precisely similar line of goods—of course, supposing that the circumstances were equal, that is for instance, that I was not in a hurry, and therefore was not compelled to get the goods from the United States, the transport being quicker—I would add to the price quoted the preferential duty and the freight from England, and also the general duty and the freight from the United States, and, if the price quoted by the Englishman plus freight and duty, came to less than the price offered by the American, plus freight and duty, I would tell the drummer from the American house: I can get these goods cheaper from England, though you offer the same price at your factory as they do; and, if the American did not lower his price, I would buy the goods from England. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) shakes his head. He would buy the Yankee's goods and pay more for them. Hon. gentlemen opposite say this tariff has done no good to England. But their speeches contradict one another. They say the imports from Great Britain are damaging some of the industries of this country.

Mr. BROCK. Does the hon. gentleman deny it?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I believe that in one line, which has been mentioned by hon. gentlemen opposite, the manufacturers are hampered. And they have my sympathy. They may say that sympathy does not do them much good. But the fact must not be forgotten—hon. gentlemen opposite had to recognize it when they were in office—that there are a great many interests concerned, and it is not such an easy matter to have a tariff every detail of which will be advantageous to everybody. We are told that there are differing views expressed on this side. Wherever you have your revenues raised by a customs tariff, you must have diverse interests and so cannot expect all to think alike.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? In the matter of woollen goods, if you imposed a higher duty, would you not also assist the farmer?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know. But I do trust that this government, in all its legislation, will not lose sight of the interests of the farmer, and I feel sure that they will not. Of course, there are differing views expressed on this side. You cannot get in the Liberal party—I doubt if you could get in the Conservative party—all men to think alike on these questions. I can understand a man being a Liberal and believing that the best way to raise the revenues of this country would be to follow as closely as we might the British method of taxation, yet being frank enough to admit that the conditions of the country are not such as to make that the most advantageous system for the present time for us; and, for the present he may move with the party that most nearly agrees with the views he holds. I can understand a man holding Liberal views, a man who thinks for himself, and favouring the policy that was stated the other night by the hon. senior member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall). That hon. gentleman said that it would be better to have absolute free trade, to wipe out the customs and excise, and raise all the revenue by what is called the single tax, the tax on land values, the tax that would take for public purposes what is called the unearned increment or community value of the land—the value added to farms in the Northwest by incoming settlers and by extending the railways, and so with other lands. But that hon. gentleman himself admits that he is not prepared to advocate that as a means of raising the tariff at the present time, and says that he is content with a tariff framed on the lines of the present tariff and with the care that has been shown in arranging it. I can understand men taking such position as I have suggested, but some of the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite I do not understand. I cannot understand hon. gentlemen arguing that a preferential arrangement with Great Britain has done no good to Great Britain, and that, at the same time the vast imports from that country are ruining the interests of Canada. These are absolutely contradictory positions and cannot be reconciled.

Mr. TAYLOR. The goods are made in Germany.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is a statement that has been reiterated in this House. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Kendrey) urged this very strongly upon us last night. If there are goods made in Germany coming in under the British preference, they are coming in contrary to the desire and intention of this government. And I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that the Prime Minister has asked me to go——

Mr. BROCK. Has not the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson), in his tariff directly made provision for that, by providing that goods made in Germany or elsewhere may come in under the preference, if 25 per cent of the labour employed in producing them was English labour? Does not this give a preference on 75 per cent to Germany?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was about to say that I trust that any representations made to this government are received with all the consideration they deserve. I take it that the Finance Minister

and myself, owing to the departments over which we preside, are brought in contact with the business interests of this country—not with the manufacturers alone—more than are other members of the administration. I think hon. gentlemen will give my colleague and myself credit for having endeavoured to give the utmost attention to all representations that have been made to us. I certainly do not believe that any man can sit quietly back in his chair and, out of his own inner consciousness, verify all the complex conditions of business in this age. Therefore I am delighted to avail myself of all the information I can get from deputations, come with regard to what subject they may. It may be said that the manufacturers come to us oftener than others do. But I can assure our agricultural friends that they have good representatives in this House. I have listened to those representatives with the utmost attention, as they have pointed out difficulties that seemed to them to exist, and how they could be best removed. Wherever I have been able to get any information from a member from British Columbia or any other province as to how the prosperity of this country could be enhanced consistently with the general interests, I have been delighted to avail myself of that information. And, because there has been no action of the government in the direction that, perhaps, some gentlemen could have desired, that does not prove that attention has not been given to representations made. It must be remembered that, as has been pointed out by a previous speaker, when we have the actual results of the census showing the production of the various industries of this country, we shall be in a position to determine much more accurately what increases and decreases have taken place in production. When hon. gentlemen have made representations to me about goods coming in from Germany, I have tried to find out the actual facts. So far, I have not found that these statements have been verified. But, as I have said, the first minister has asked me if I would go to England this summer with one or two of my colleagues to take part in the trade conference. If I should go, one of the reasons that would tempt me—for I have no love of the ocean—will be the hope that I shall be able to learn for myself the facts with regard to this matter which has been pressed upon my attention—of foreign made goods coming in under the English preference. All I can say is that if I should find that is the case, I will lay the matter before my colleagues; and I can tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that if if it should be found to be the case, it is possible for the government to act in that matter without the intervention of parliament, as parliament has sufficient confidence in the government to entrust them with determining what proportion of English labour should be put upon the goods to enable them to enter under that tariff. I was remarking that hon. gentlemen opposite have objected that it was a fraud upon England. Now, is it not a waste of time in this House for any gentleman to take that line of argument? If the English people are pleased with it, why do hon. gentlemen opposite worry over it? Can they produce any testimony from any English source that the English people regard this tariff as a fraud upon them? I defy them to do it. If, on the other hand, they were to challenge me to produce evidence from public print and from personal testimony as to the value placed upon it in England, it would not trouble me to give article upon article and testimony upon testimony. Therefore, I do not see why our hon. friends opposite should trouble themselves on that ground.

I desire to refer to one remark that was made by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I think, it was, in regard to an industry which he specified, and I think his remark has been quoted by some of his friends opposite. He said that capital was being withheld from investment in this country for want of a declared policy of adequate protection. Now, I would ask where is there any evidence to prove that? The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) who addressed the House last night, asked the same question. I remember, however, that the hon. member for East Grey said that capital was being withheld in the matter of the erection of sugar factories, because we would not give a bounty upon sugar. I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) will bear testimony that one or two factories are going up in his own riding. Out in Alberta and the Northwest Territories, there has been a contract entered into by Mr. Jesse Knight, a wealthy man from Salt Lake City, with the Northwest Irrigation Company, in which he bound himself under a deposit of $50,000 which he has placed in the hands of that company, to be forfeited if he does not finish the construction of a beet root factory costing not less than $300,000. That is an answer to the hon. gentlemen who attempt to bring up specific instances of capital being withheld from this country.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman permit me? Did not the sugar interest make application to the hon. gentleman for assistance?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, I have no doubt they did. Yes, they did, but nevertheless they are going on with the erection of the factory. And I would remark to my hon. friend that if the factory is started, as it is about to be started, without that extra assistance, it stands on a stronger foundation when it does not depend upon tariff props than if it did, because public sentiment may change in reference to the tariff, and anything that is built upon the tariff alone is not as stable

as if it stood upon its own merits. So I say that, compelled as we are to raise a revenue by a tariff, and a tariff that I believe is right, a revenue not only to carry on the ordinary machinery of the government but one that will give us millions of dollars that we can expend on public works to the benefit of all portions of the community, I say a tariff such as that must impose a large percentage of taxation on certain lines of goods, and there is no doubt it will be an advantage to those who are engaged in the manufacture and production of those goods. That has been the case under the operation of the present tariff which these hon. gentlemen say is their old national policy, so much protection do they find, or seek to find, in the tariff we have at the present time. Sir, there will be a special advantage to some persons where you levy duties, there can be no doubt of that; but when we were told to reduce the taxation and to reform the tariff, we were instructed to do so without working any injustice to any class of the community. And, Sir, I can appeal to this country, I can appeal to the prosperity of all sections of it, if in the tariff in its present shape, though I do not claim it is perfect by any means, we have not succeeded in framing a scale of duties that are on the whole satisfactory to the people of this country. I am quite sensible to the fact that changes take place in the trade conditions of a country, I am sensible to the fact that changes take place in other countries. New devices, combinations may I term them, may spring up, and policies may have to be altered. In that case changes may have to be made in the light of what has transpired. We have a notable instance of that in England at the present time. England for years, from Gladstone's time away down, refused to move when the Germans, French and Belgians were making a slaughter market of England for their sugar. English public men held that if foreigners would tax themselves to give the British people cheap sugar, the British people would accept it. And so it went on until the government, seeing that one of their possessions in the West Indies was suffering under this unfair competition, has taken the step of using their influence, of making almost a threat, to compel these people to withdraw their system of slaughtering sugar, even though it means an increased expense to the users of sugar in the British Empire. I recognize these facts. I recognize that there are immense trusts and combinations formed upon the other side of the line, and it has been reported to me that the design and avowed object of some of these immense corporations is to crush out any industry in this country producing goods like their own, and after they have succeeded in crushing out such industry, then they will raise their prices and make the people pay. These things demand consideration, inquiry, that we may arrive at a knowledge of the facts. I am not insensible that changes take place in trade and commerce, nor do I believe that my colleagues or our friends on this side of the House, are insensible to changing conditions. I believe the hon. members on this side of the House, having had confidence in us in the past, will continue their confidence until, by our declared policy—which must be a declared policy, if any changes are made and laid on the Table—they will then judge us, and I think they will continue to give us their confidence unless they feel that we have proved ourselves untrustworthy.

Sir, I wish only to add in conclusion, that I recognize the value of every man to this country. It is no part of the government's duty to legislate in favour of one man as against another. I recognize that different pursuits are followed by different sections of the community; I recognize the value of our manufacturing institutions. I do not lay the stress that some do upon the importance of the comparatively few individuals who own the capital by which these institutions are run; I lay much more stress upon the hundreds, and thousands, and tens of thousands of artisans that work in these factories; and I recognize the fact that every man who labours in this country is producing wealth, and his labour is a source of wealth to others as well as himself.

I say then that he is a valuable member of this community. I recognize that the farmer, the miner, the fisherman and the lumberman are all producers of wealth, and that, under the tariff there are advantages given that cannot perhaps particularly benefit these classes, but when expenditures to which the whole people contribute are made for cheapening the cost of transportation, when we pay out money to enable the miner, the farmer, the fisherman, or the lumberman to reach his markets and to produce more cheaply, then, I say, he is benefited. Under the tariff the class least benefited is the class of hardy fishermen whose case I have alluded to. In their case I should say that in the expenditure of public money, if there can be means found by which these men can have advantages greater than they enjoy at the present time, it would be only justice in their case that that expenditure should be made, as I believe it is in the case of every section and in the interest of the whole country, because our interests are so intertwined one with another, that care being exercised and fairness being given effect to, you cannot benefit one portion of the community without you benefit every other individual member of that community in a greater or less extent.

I see that the hon. leader of the opposition is in his place and I would like to say a word in regard to the resolution that he asks this House to adopt. I would ask him if, when the right hon. Prime Minister of this country, goes over to engage with the repre-

sentatives from different parts of the empire and from other colonies in the trade congress, which is to be held in London, this resolution embodies the instructions of the opposition to the Prime Minister as to the course he is to take at that conference. As I understand the resolution by the 'adequate protection' which hon. gentlemen call for, they have gone beyond their national policy. Some goods did come in under that policy, but we have had interpreted by their speeches, that by this 'adequate protection' they want us to declare that it will never be adequate until it absolutely prohibits any goods coming into Canada from any other country. The issue is clear between the parties. They believe in absolutely prohibiting all goods coming in and therefore prohibiting all the revenue from that source. We stand for a revenue tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The laughter of hon. gentlemen—I was going to say, but it would be unkind—is like the crackling of thorns. I will not make the comparison for the hon. gentleman knows what Solomon says, but to laugh at our tariff being a revenue tariff that produces $30,000,000 as against $17,000,000 as in times past is really something to be wondered at. While there may be some amendments, and amendments must take place in a tariff, though there has been stability in this and stability is a great thing in the tariff, while, as I have said, there may be some change the change will not be the introduction of a tariff that absolutely prohibits all goods that we can produce in Canada coming into Canada from any other country. There is no other meaning to be taken from the resolution of the hon. gentleman. The speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite have enlarged upon it. The hon. leader of the opposition himself said that the tariff should be put at least as high as the tariff of the United States is against us, but the amendment goes even further than that. This adequate protection will only be adequate when it keeps out all goods that we can produce in Canada, and I suppose they will put it up notch by notch, keeping a continual state of uncertainty in the country until they get it up to the point at which they have killed any advantage that may be derived from it. What does the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) say :—

> I hold that the tariff should be so arranged that every institution in this country which is manufacturing goods to be consumed by the Canadian people should have sufficient protection to keep out the same class of goods made in any foreign country ; and I have no hesitation in saying that if that country should be England, the policy of Canada should be framed in the interest of the Canadian taxpayer as against people who are producing the same class of goods even in the old country under the same flag.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Hon. gentlemen say hear, hear. Our policy would be to make everything we can in this country except such things as we do not produce, and allow no foreign goods to come in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What I have to ask the hon. gentleman is this : Your tariff is prohibitory. By the resolution it is prohibitory. There is no doubt about it, and while you declare for preferential trade you declare for it on such terms that as far as Canada is concerned the Prime Minister of this country will be placed in this position. We will suppose that negotiations are opened with the object of seeing what arrangement can be made. The Prime Minister, we will suppose, will say : We want your products and we want to sell you our products, such as agricultural products, so that our farmers can get a preference. Very well. What do you propose to give us in return ? We are now making a bargain. The Prime Minister will say : My instructions from the opposition are that we are going to give you a reduced rate on anything that you produce which we do not. Then the Englishman will probably, and he will inevitably ask : What do we produce in this country that you do not produce over your way ? I would like the hon. leader of the opposition to write out a list of those products for the guidance of the Prime Minister. I know of nothing that is produced in England that is not or cannot be produced in this country under adequate protection. Sir, the amendment of the Opposition in respect to preferential trade is very similar to the position said to have been taken by parties in the United States. They professed to be ready for reciprocity, and if the report be true, their idea was to get an open market for their products in foreign countries, in return for which they offered to lower their customs duties on only such articles as would not interfere in the slightest degree with their own industries. Considering the fact that the United States manufactures almost everything required for consumption, it seems to me that an offer like that was an insulting offer. It looks to me that men who could really propose that virtually say to all other nations of the world that they must be foolish. What will England think of Canada if we go over there, make an offer for preferential trade on the lines laid down in the hon. gentleman's resolution, ask her to give a preference to our products in her market and announce at the same time that we will maintain a tariff here that will absolutely prohibit the introduction of a dollar's worth of goods ? That is the effect of their amendment, that is what they propose and to that amendment I believe hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will not give their adhesion. I fain would hope

for their own sakes, that gentlemen on the other side of the House will recognize the position in which they have placed themselves, and withdraw that resolution, and not insist on a vote being taken.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I would indeed be deceiving myself were I to think for a moment that I could add anything new to what has already been so ably said on this question by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I must even ask the indulgence of the House for directing the attention of hon. gentlemen at any length however brief to the question before us at this late state of the debate. I was much struck with the opening remarks of the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson). He commenced by saying that for a debate to be valuable and to be worthy of proper consideration, the facts presented in the discussion should be presented with exactness. To that we can all subscribe. I had hoped that I might be able to congratulate the Minister of Customs on having at least fairly adhered to that principle, but I am afraid that I cannot extend my congratulations to him in that regard. He gave us a very lengthy disquisition upon a great many subjects, but the House must conclude that they were largely composed of apologies, rather than directed to a vigorous defence of the government. From the commencement to the end, his speech was an apology for the conduct of the government of the day. The first task he set himself to was to try to prove that the population of Canada had vastly increased since the advent of the Liberal party to power. He told us that he would not attempt any discussion as to whether the census had been stuffed in 1891, or whether it had been underestimated in 1901, and the hon. gentleman has saved his reputation to some extent in avoiding that unpleasant discussion, and leaving that unsavoury task to others of his friends. As an evidence of the increase of our population he told us that there has been an increase in trade, an increase in exports, an increase in the deposits in the banks, an increase in the discounts, an increase in the amount of freight carried, an increase in the earnings of the railways, an increase in the immigration, an increase of settlers effects brought in, an increase in the number of letters passing through the mail, an increase in the sales of land in Manitoba and the North-west. Let us test that. Let us see about the increase of immigration and the sales of lands in the North-west. I have here the evidence given under oath by Mr. Pedley, superintendent of immigration, and he says :

The land sales that took place during the last fifty years in Manitoba and the North-west were as follows : The Hudson Bay Co., sold 82,398 acres ; the railway companies sold 538,719 acres; the half-breed scrip or land sold under the authority of it, 231,076 acres ; lands sold by the department, 91,539 acres or in all 943,076 acres of land sold under these circumstances stated.

In connection with the sum of $400,000 spent on immigration, Mr. Pedley was asked if he could identify a single person who was brought in by the Immigration Department and who was connected in the remotest sense with an acre of that land, and Mr. Pedley answered, no. I now ask the Minister of Customs if he will look into the evidence given by Mr. Pedley, and if he does he will see that his whole defence of the immigration expenditure by the government was refuted long before he spoke this afternoon.

But I want to point to another thing. The hon. gentleman, in trying to show the economy and thriftiness of this government, claimed that although they were collecting a large sum of money from the people, yet after all the people did not pay it. That is rather a new doctrine—that money can be taken out of the pockets of the people, and yet they do not pay it. He gave us some instances of the economy of the government in connection with the different services, particularly in the cost of collecting the revenues of his own department. He told us that in 1894 it had cost this country 5·13 per cent to collect the customs revenue, which is quite correct. Then he said that for the year 1901 it had only cost 3·86 per cent. That is quite true too. But the hon. gentleman held that the cost had been lowered to that extent by reason of the economy and efficiency of the government. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman if that is a fair conclusion. I ask him if it is not the case in his own business, as in every other, where in these days of keen competition every penny must be turned to the best account, that a large establishment can be carried on more cheaply than one conducted on a smaller scale ? And is there any rule that obtains with regard to the collecting of customs revenue that does not obtain in regard to every large and small business in this country ? The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that there was no necessity of increasing the officers in many cases when the revenue doubled. The hon. gentleman knows that customs collectors are not a class of men who are overworked. He knew very well that the comparison he made was not a fair comparison. But the hon. gentleman went further than that. He selected the year 1894. Why did he select that year? The hon. gentleman told us at the outset that we ought to be fair, and I am sure he thinks he is fair. He selected the year 1894 because it was the most unfavourable year he could find in the 18 years of Conservative rule. If the hon. gentleman looks in his own report, he will find that in the last year the Mackenzie government was in power, the expenditure was $5.56 for every $100 of

revenue collected. The hon. gentleman may search in vain during the 18 years of Conservative rule until he comes to the year 1894 to find as large an expenditure compared with the revenue. That is a sample of the hon. gentleman's fairness. Has the hon. gentleman told the whole truth to the country? Has he done himself justice in taking a position of that kind? I do not think he has. The hon. gentleman thought we ought to be very candid and very decided about criticising generally the expenditure of the government of the day. He told us our duty was to point out the items to which we objected. If we were opposed to any items, we ought to move against them, and if we failed to do that, we were not doing our duty—in other words, we were quite insincere. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman if he wishes to lay down one rule of conduct for the opposition and another for the government with regard to criticising expenditures, and taking action, by vote or voice, against any that are objected to. I do not think the hon. gentleman will do so. I wish to point out that the hon. gentleman sat for 18 years in this House without moving a single resolution to reduce a single item of expenditure under the Conservative government. Was he sincere in his criticism of its items? Was he doing his duty during that period? Was he open to censure, as he would give it to be understood we are open to censure, for not having moved against the items he objected to? If the charge is good against us in this case, it is more than good against him for his own conduct during those 18 years. But somebody may say, although the hon. gentleman himself did not move against what they call extravagant expenditures it was done by his friends. I suppose that would be the hon. gentleman's answer. Now, I happen to have under my hand a list of the items of expenditure which the Liberal opposition moved against during the whole period of 18 years during which the Conservative party were in office, and we will see what they were. In 1879 the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) proposed to make a reduction of $70,000 in the expenditure for civil government. In 1880 no objection was taken. In 1881 they were silent; they did not move any resolution. In 1882 Mr. Mills proposed a reduction of $8,000 being payment for damages to a steamer known as the U. C. Upper. In 1883 no resolution was moved against the expenditure; in 1884 no resolution; in 1885 no resolution; in 1886 no resolution; in 1887 no resolution; in 1888 no resolution. In 1889 the present Minister of Trade and Commerce moved that the vote for Manitoba penitentiaries be reduced by $10,526. In the same year Mr. McMullen moved that the vote for East Pictou river improvement be reduced by $500. In the same year, Sir Louis Davies, a late member of this government, moved that the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway be reduced by $200,000. Mark the reasons given for the reduction: because the railway carried coal from Spring Hill mine at less than cost and created a deficit of $368,000. In the same year the present Minister of Trade and Commerce moved that a vote for the Department of the Interior be reduced by $95,748. Mr. Sommerville, in the same year, moved that a vote of $195,135 be reduced by $50,000 because Mr. Henry Smith, who was formerly a member of the House, and Mr. W. A. Webster, who was immigration agent, had not furnished correct dates for their services. In the same year, Mr. McMullen moved that the salary of C. C. Chapman be reduced by $2,300 or left out.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who was that Mr. McMullen.

Mr. CLANCY. A gentleman recently appointed to the Senate of Canada. In the year 1890 no resolution was moved by hon. gentlemen opposite. Nor was any moved in 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896. Therefore, this hon. gentleman who took the opposition to task this afternoon for not having moved any resolution, has in the same breath condemned himself and his colleagues in the past. Why, Mr. Speaker, during the whole period of eighteen years, in which there was an expenditure to the extent of $603,000,000 in round numbers, these gentlemen only objected in the irregular way I have mentioned, to $447,000 of it, I would ask the hon. gentleman to say now whether in view of the opinion he has given to this House, that he and his friends properly discharged their duties in the past. The duty of the opposition, sir, in this House and out of it, is not what the hon. gentleman gave us this afternoon to understand it was. That is an old trick resorted to in the back country school houses, but he knows perfectly well that the opposition put themselves sufficiently on record when they rise and criticise the various expenditures as they are submitted to the House. Would he not be quite ready himself to take advantage of any speech made in this House on any item of expenditure? Would he not name the member who made that speech and call him to answer for his conduct, if the item was not one which should be criticised? It would be for the opposition an impossible task to call for a division on every item of expenditure to which they object. If such a practice were resorted to, it would take up our whole time, and we would not be able to do anything else. If that were the only means the opposition of the day had of putting on record their objections to any item of expenditure which they considered wrong, why, the whole session would be taken up in division.

The hon. gentleman has given, as an evidence of the increase in population, the increase in trade, the increase in exports and bank deposits and discounts and railway freights and railway earnings and settlers' effects, and letters and lands and so on. Let me say that there can be no room for discussion of the fact that we are enjoying a period of expansion. The opposition of to-day have no desire to imitate the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in this side. We do not care to decry Canada as these hon. gentlemen were wont to do even in periods of great expansion. I challenge any one of them to show any instance in which they put themselves on record, even in periods of great prosperity, by a single sentence giving credit to Canada for being prosperous and progressive, Neither the hon. gentleman nor any of his colleagues can be accused of having given utterance to a single sentence on behalf of their country. Their cry was always to the opposite effect. Well, we do not propose to imitate a policy of that kind. We frankly admit that Canada is making great progress. But we say that in that respect Canada cannot be singled out from any other civilized country. It is an undeniable fact that the whole world is passing through a period of great expansion and prosperity. But we deny that Canada is enjoying the prosperity which she should under the circumstances. I deny that Canada is as well off as she might be if her affairs were properly conducted. Hon. gentlemen opposite take great credit to themselves for our prosperity, but everybody knows that in 1896, before they came into office, a change began to make itself felt. They knew perfectly well that the betterment began in 1896, not only in Canada, but throughout the civilized world. Our customers began to buy from us, prices advanced, we have had good crops, and indeed have enjoyed everything that can contribute to the advancement of our country. And in that respect we are not alone, but the whole world in general has shared a corresponding advance in prosperity. These hon. gentlemen came into power when the whole commercial world started to move, and they went with it. They got on the merry-go-round and have been riding on it ever since, and seem to labour under the delusion that they were running the whole world. They appear to believe that they have made Canada. But let me tell them that it would have been impossible for them even with all their efforts—and they did their best—to stem the tide of prosperity that has come upon Canada and the world in general. I do not propose to dwell therefore on a subject that is not open to discussion, namely, whether we are enjoying a period of great prosperity or not. On that question both sides are agreed. But the question now fairly open for discussion is whether these hon. gentlemen have made proper use of their opportunities, whether they are conducting the affairs of Canada as they should be administered, taking into consideration the great advantages we are enjoying.

The hon. Minister of Finance gave us, at the outset, his forecast for the coming yeaf, just as last year he gave us a similar forecast. Let me call his attention to this fact, that in not one instance last year were his previsions correct. Take, for instance, the first item. He estimated our revenue at $52,750,000 and it turned out to be but $52,574,000 or $235,299 short of his prediction. The expenditure on consolidated revenue he estimated at $46,400,000, but the actual expenditure was $46,866,000 or nearly half a million dollars in excess. Then take his estimate of expenditure on capital account, he put that at $10,700,000, whereas the actual expenditure was $11,116,000, or an excess over his estimate of $416,499. I now come to the estimated surplus, in which he disappointed the people although he has taxed them highly. That is not nearly what he said it would be. He estimated that at $6,330,000, but it actually was only $5,648,000 or $701,667 less than his estimate. Then he predicted what the increase of the public debt would amount to.

And he said that would be $1,800,000. And how much did he state the increase to have been? Not $1,800,000 as he stated it would be, but $2,986,000, or $1,186,000 more than he had estimated. If his figuring is not more correct than that of last year, the House and the country need repose but little confidence in his predictions. He said that in the coming year we shall have a revenue of $58,500,000. And he estimates an expenditure on consolidated revenue account of $51,000,000 and, on capital account of $14,250,000. He estimates a surplus on consolidated revenue fund of $5,800,000, and an increase—and this is where the charm of the surplus is felt by the people—an increase in the public debt of $6,000,000. I propose to deal with that branch of the subject somewhat later on. In the meantime I wish to say a word about the tariff. The hon. Minister of Customs took a good deal of pains to show the House that the people were paying less taxes now than in 1896. I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, and, if I am not correct I would like him to give his dissent now. I understood him to say that the people are now paying less in taxes than in 1896.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. At a less rate.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, my hon. friend qualifies it by making it a matter of rate.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not modifying it, but telling the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) what I said.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman makes a distinction between taking millions out of

the pockets of the people and the rate of assessment upon which his taxes are levied. I am glad to understand the distinction he makes, because it is important. Now, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition they were in favour of what they called a revenue tariff. The Minister of Customs read this afternoon a resolution adopted by the Liberal party in 1893—or rather he read a portion of it. But here is the concluding part of that resolution, which will live as long as the Liberal party lives and tariffs are to be dealt with in Canada :

> We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.
>
> This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

Does the hon. gentleman stand by that now? They will not stand by it, for they have been alarmed by the public sentiment of this country. They know that they must give the people a measure of protection, and that they must give a better measure of protection than would be given as an incident of a revenue tariff. But a revenue tariff and the protection incidental to it were what they declared for in unmistakable terms. Let me see what the Prime Minister said on this very subject. Speaking at Elmira, on the 24th of October, 1895, according to the 'Globe' the right hon. gentleman said :

> This is the platform on which we stand. We want the revenue to be raised by customs, but we do not want to have a revenue to be raised to have extravagant expenditure such as we have, but simply to take from the pockets of the people only what is necessary to have economical, honest and efficient government.

When the right hon. gentleman made that speech, the amount being taken from the people was $42,000,000. He called public attention to this, and deplored it as a great burden of taxation. But to-day he is taking $57,000,000 out of the pockets of the people. Is it a revenue tariff which takes $57,000,000 instead of $42,000,000 out of the pockets of the people ? It is not a revenue tariff; it is a taxation tariff. The Prime Minister went further on that occasion :

> This we denounce as an invasion of the rights of the people. I take this issue with the Conservative party. They believe in taxation to build up the country——

That is very true. We do believe in so levying the taxes as to build up the country.

> —we hold that taxation is an evil——

Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to hold taxation to be an evil now. They all revel in it, as the Minister of Customs did this afternoon, when he told us that he had no apologies to make for it, but approved it.

> —a very necessary evil if you will, but an evil that nothing will justify except the necessity of raising the revenues of the country and nothing else. We of the Liberal party lay down the principles that taxation is taking away from a man a portion of his earnings, and we say that every man has a right and an absolute right to his own earnings and to dispose of it as he thinks fit.

Are they carrying this out ? The Prime Minister went on :

> We stand here against protection, in favour of a customs tariff based on the principle of revenue and nothing else.

Then we have the familiar speeches of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), but I will not trouble the House with them, they have already been embalmed in 'Hansard.' All will remember that that hon. gentleman denounced protection as a fraud and a robbery. Then we have the hon. Minister of Customs who made a speech at Harristown, which I find reported in the 'Globe' of 14th of November, 1895. In that speech, the hon. gentleman said :

> There has been an indirect taxation that has been paid that does not go into the treasury at all but has gone to the support and maintenance of the industries of the country. I do not say and I do not claim that in all cases the amount of the duties is added to the article by the manufacturer who manufactured that article in the country, but it would be more than folly for any man to say that under a protection system the man who purchases home-made goods does not pay more than he would have to pay if there was free competition. What is protection put on for? It seems to me that it is a waste of time to talk about it in any other respect than that.

The hon. gentleman made a speech in London a few days before this, in which he made a reference to himself. I know the hon. minister's delicacy, and I realize how embarrassing it must have been to him on that occasion to make any reference to himself, and it is with equal delicacy that I refer to anything having relation to the hon. gentleman's own personal business. He was speaking to a large and intelligent audience. He said :

> What I want you to consider when you go home——

He was speaking to all classes of consumers, he was speaking to the taxpayers of the country, whom he had been teaching that the system of protection was a wrong one and ought to be changed, he was pointing out its evils, and he gave an example. What was that example :

> What I want you to consider when you go home is whether a law passed by the Tory government and placed on the statute-book, that made Paterson rich, has made you not rich, or some of you even poorer than you were before. Whether that is a just law or not and one that should be continued ?

Would you not expect, Mr. Speaker, that the

first thing that gentleman would do on coming into power would be to remove that stigma from himself ? Would you not expect that the hon. gentleman would take the first opportunity to wipe out a statute which gave the business in which he was concerned a large measure of protection ? Your surprise will be, Sir, that the hon. gentleman did nothing of the kind. That hon. gentleman does not want any protection, and yet—I do not say this in any offensive sense to the hon. gentleman—the hon. gentleman made use of that language to point out to the people that there ought to be a reduction in taxation, that the manufacturers had a large share of protection to which the hon. gentleman declared they were not entitled. He selected his own case, and he declared this was an unjust law and ought to be removed from the statute-book. I ask him when he is going to remove that law from the statute-book ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did the hon. gentleman say that I said it had made me rich ?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman gave the inference to the public that he was rich.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, no, tell the truth.

Mr. CLANCY. Very well, I will take the hon. gentleman on his own interpretation of his language. The hon. gentleman meant that it did not make him rich. If it did not make him rich, it did not make other manufacturers rich. The hon. gentleman has absolutely no means of escape.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon gentleman said I stated that it made me rich. I ask him if I said that ?

Mr. CLANCY. I will read it again.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his garbled extracts.

Mr. CLANCY. As I have already said, I am quoting from the 'Globe' newspaper, I have given him the date, so I take it for granted the extract is an accurate report. This is what the hon. gentleman had to say :

What I want you to consider when you go home——

Mark the words.

——is whether a law passed by the Tory government——

Mark those words.

——and placed on the statute-book, that made Paterson rich——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What preceded that, please ?

Mr. CLANCY. I will tell the hon. gentleman what succeeded it if he will wait a moment. What was the next sentence of the hon. gentleman ? It was an interrogation to the persons who were listening to him. What does he say ?

——has made you not rich or some of you even poorer than you were before. Whether that is a just law or not, and one that should be continued.

Is there any escape from the hon. gentleman's meaning on that occasion ? If the hon. gentleman wishes to revise it, I am quite willing.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What is the date ?

Mr. CLANCY. The 'Globe' of the 5th of February, 1895.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will look up the date, but I fancy the hon. gentleman will find that I was dealing with a statement made by a late colleague of his, Dr. Montague, that the national policy had made me rich, and on that I based the argument that if it had made me rich it should make them rich too. I did not say it made me rich.

Mr. CLANCY. Very well, I will take the hon. gentleman's own version of it. I will conclude that the hon. gentleman was not made rich, I will conclude that the hon. gentleman meant that Dr. Montague was wrong when he declared it had made him rich, I will conclude that when Dr. Montague included him with the other manufacturers as having benefited by the national policy, that he was wrong, and that he did not benefit by the national policy, and therefore the national policy was not taking money out of the pockets of the people. What was the hon. gentleman's contention on that very occasion ? It was that a large sum of money was being taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers of Canada, and that a great proportion of it never went into the public treasury, and therefore it was unjust taxation. Why was it unjust ? Because it made the people poorer by reason of the taxation, and for other reasons. I ask the hon. gentleman which of those two positions he desires to choose; that he was telling the people things that were not true, or that I have been misrepresenting him. There is no escape from one of these two positions.

Then, we have the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). This hon. gentleman seemed to sing the same song during that period. It is very funny, Mr. Speaker, that during certain periods hon. gentlemen took a certain course and were generally pretty well agreed upon that course; but as soon as a turn of affairs came and it suited them to take another course, they did so. The hon. member for North Norfolk, speaking in the same campaign, said :

The farmer might rely upon this statement as being infallibly true, that no protective duty upon any product of which he raised a surplus

for export could increase the price to the producer in Canada.

The hon. gentleman gave his views on that point. But he went further. He would level down everything, he was supporting the contention of the Minister of Customs and of the government of the day. I will quote what he said, and ask you to put it alongside the speech that he made here a few evenings ago :

> Much has been said and still was said about making a slaughter market for cheap goods. In the interests of the consumer he was unable to see what evil consequences would result from buying articles we needed away below their value. He would advise every man to buy a dollar's worth of what he wanted for fifty cents if possible, and he had no hesitation in assuring him that the only party that wanted him to pay full prices would object to his having a chance to pick up bargains. Even if the importer of slaughtered invoices wanted to force goods upon him as a gift he could stand it. So far as the consumer is concerned, the cheaper he could buy goods the better, and the prejudice that was excited against permitting buyers to pick up bargains because some were living in the country, wanted to force sale at a ruinous sacrifice, was not a well founded one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had that hon. gentleman telling us a few days ago that we ought to have a defensive tariff. He told us that we could produce nearly all the goods that were brought in from abroad, and he gave the government a friendly warning of what he expected them to do in the future. That is the position of the hon. gentleman on the tariff. We know now about the difficulty of framing a tariff policy for the country. With the settled opinions as enunciated by the Liberal party in the past with regard to what their attitude is on the trade question, the government is placed in a difficult position; because the Minister of Customs does not dissent from the statement I made a moment ago that a revenue tariff and a revenue tariff alone, is suited for the interests of Canada, and that under what he calls a revenue tariff Canada has made great progress.

The Liberal party are pinned down to this position that their policy is a revenue tariff, and if there is any departure from that it is an evil. It is an evil to the extent which the hon. gentleman himself has said more than once in this House. The difference between the policies of the two parties, as stated by the hon. gentleman on more than one occasion, is this : The policy of the Conservative party, as he states it, calls for a tariff that is protective. If any revenue comes from that tariff as an incident it must come as an incident because the principle is protective. The opposite to that is the position of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, namely, that their tariff is a revenue tariff and if any measure of protection arises from that revenue tariff as an incident the manufacturers and people of this country will have that protection to the extent of the incident and no more. I think I have correctly stated the positions of the two parties as understood by the hon. gentleman himself. They hold that every particle of protection that arises out of a revenue tariff as an incident is an evil. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he takes that position ? The hon. gentleman is opposed to every form of protection. It is well for us to understand the position of the two parties upon this great question. I ask the hon. gentleman, as he has set his face against protection in every form, if any protection arises from a revenue tariff as an incident, is it an evil ? Will the hon. gentleman answer ? I will sit down and ask the hon. gentleman to give an answer to the question because it is an important question.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We do not generally argue questions across the floor of the House. We make speeches. The hon. gentleman is not my catechist. Go on with your speech.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) tells me to go on with my speech. The hon. gentleman finds himself in difficulties. I tell the hon. gentleman that he and his party and his government, like every individual and everything that is started wrong, feels that he must play false to the end of the game The hon. gentleman is in a false position and he knows it perfectly well, namely, that when he enunciates the differences between the two parties he declares that the policy of the Liberal party is opposed to protection, and he tells the people that he grudgingly gives that protection which arises out of a revenue tariff as an incident ; yet, the hon. gentleman has not the courage to get up and deny the statement here this evening, that if any protection arises as an incident out of the revenue tariff it is not an evil to this country. I tell the hon. gentleman that he is a protectionist and that he dare not own it. The government of the day are doing things every day in regard to the tariff and other matters that they dare not own because they have been preaching other doctrines for many years. What is the difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff ? We frankly own that the object of the Conservative party in framing the protective tariff was to help the interests of Canada. We framed that tariff for the purpose of advancing the interests of this country. What is the difference between a protective and a revenue tariff ? One is a tax gathering tariff as the hon. gentleman admits it must be, and the other is a protective tariff. A protective tariff is the very opposite of a revenue tariff. What is the position of Canada to-day ? What is the position of every civilized country to-day ? We have a commercial war continually in progress between the civilized countries of the world. What are the weapons of defence that are used in the United

States, and what are the weapons of defence that should be used in Canada ? Are they not the tariff ? Does the hon. gentleman not throw them away when he refuses to use them and proposes to impose a dead weight upon Canada by means of a revenue tariff as he calls it ? Does he propose to throw away every weapon of defence we have against the United States? What does a protective tariff in Canada mean, and how is it viewed by the United States and by other countries ? Are not our tariff changes, as they affect the United States, a subject of great alarm ? They are, and properly so, because they affect the trade of that country and affect the rights of the people of that country to come in and take what belongs to the people of Canada. This is the only weapon that the people of any civilized country can use and it is the only weapon of defence that we have with which to protect the interests of the people of Canada. Yet, the hon. gentleman says we will give you just what protection you have as an incident. In every way he says protection is false and an evil, view it from whatever standpoint you may, and he will give you no protection. But the hon. gentleman is giving a large measure of protection, or rather, the hon. gentleman and his friends failed to take away, I am glad to say, the large measure of protection that was already given. In the whole revision of what the hon. gentleman calls the protectionist tariff, and which I admit was a protectionist tariff, less than 30 per cent of all the items were dealt with. Two-thirds of the items, I am glad to say, in the interest of the country, were not dealt with, but I regret to say that those that were changed were changed to the injury of Canada as a whole, as I shall be able to show later on. Now, one of the positions taken by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1897 was this : The first thing the hon. gentlemen did was what we might have expected from a set of very intelligent gentlemen who either never understood the trade of Canada or who put themselves in the position that they were not able to deal with it. In other words, the hon. gentlemen were shrinking from the consequence of their own conduct and teachings. The first thing that hon. gentlemen did was to introduce what they called a general tariff and a reciprocal tariff and they gave reciprocal advantages to every country in the world that was willing to take advantage of them. One year passed over and hon. gentlemen repented and repented with very great cost to Canada. Hon. gentlemen found themselves in a false position, namely, that they had undertaken a task that they could not perform, and when my hon. friend smiled when I said that the government of the day had either not studied the trade question of Canada, or that they had placed themselves in a false position to escape the difficulties of their past record, I will say to him that this statement is perfectly true. After undertaking to have the Belgian and German treaties renounced they were obliged to forego the reciprocal advantages that they professed to give to the world at the outset. There are two conclusions to be drawn from this—either hon. gentlemen did not know what they were doing in 1897, or they were not honest in what they did in 1898. I will leave it to hon. gentlemen to take their choice if there is any choice in the matter.

What followed ? Why, Sir, the preference was given to Great Britain alone, and the outcome is that there is not one redeeming feature in the preferential tariff in so far as any benefit to the people of Canada is concerned. That is a very broad statement but it is as true as it is broad. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) attempted to show that some benefits did flow from the preferential tariff, but I tell him that a preference under any condition, even it were a reciprocal preference with Great Britain or with any other country, is a difficult thing to work out. I do not say that it is impossible to work it out ; I believe it is possible that it might be adjusted, but I say that the adjustment would be difficult. We cannot give England or any other country a preference without having to make two kinds of sacrifices. One is : That we must to some extent interfere with the industrial interests of Canada, and the other is : That we must relieve foreign importers from the duty which they would otherwise pay, and then the deficit has to be made up by taxation on the people of our own country. That would be the result even in the case of a mutual preference. But the government has made these sacrifices without obtaining a single iota of compensation in return for the people of Canada. In round numbers, customs duties have been removed to the extent of $2,000,000 last year by reason of the preferential tariff. I assert that the people of Canada have not benefited as a whole to the extent of a single dollar by that reduction. I am prepared to admit that some few persons in Canada may have been benefited, but the hon. Minister of Customs will not contend that we should have a tariff in Canada which benefits only a few, and in the benefits of which the people in general do not participate. Any system of taxation is unjust under which the burdens are not fairly divided. Does the hon. gentleman say that the consumer in Canada pays one farthing less for his goods than he did before the preferential tariff was inaugurated ? Not at all. Every dollar saved in that way goes either to the wholesale man in England or to the wholesale man in Canada, and the consumer does not get a dollar out of it. We have lessened our revenue to that extent, and in one way or another the people of Canada will have to contribute the $2,000,000 which we have sacrificed, without receiving any compensa-

tion whatever. To that extent the preferential tariff is absolutely an injury to Canada. Let me point out that last year farm implements were imported to the extent of nearly $2,000,000 on which was collected a duty of $388,000, and how much do you suppose the farmers of Canada—who in numbers represent one-half of the taxpayers—how much do you suppose they were relieved on that importation of $2,000,000. Well, they saved by the preference tariff the very magnificent sum of $2,493. That is the extent to which the preference helped our farmers.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) spoke about giving encouragement to the industries of Canada, and he said that with the exception of one, namely the woollen industry—with which he expressed his sympathy but which he made no effort to relieve—he knew of no other industry in Canada that was injuriously affected. But the hon. gentleman knows that his attention has been called to numbers of industries that are injuriously affected ; some by reason of the preferential tariff and some by reason of the unwise changes which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues made in the tariff in 1897. Look at the refusal of this government to give any assistance to the beet sugar industry. The hon. gentleman told the House that two factories were being built in my constituency, that another was being built in the North-west, and that because these gentlemen had invested their money there was no reason to suppose that they needed assistance, and so the government refused them assistance. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) that the fact that about $1,500,000 has been invested in the beet sugar industry in my constituency is no reason in the world why this industry should not be assisted by the government. He knows perfectly well that to a large extent the beet sugar business in Canada is an experiment. He knows it will be some time before that industry can be firmly established, and he ought know that during the period of its growth it should have encouragement from the government. The people from several districts came here and asked the government, either to increase the import duties on foreign sugar or to give assistance by way of bounty, but the government refused to give assistance in either way. The Minister of Customs invited the deputation to dinner and he gave them a stone to eat, and they have gone back home to live on that and to work out the difficult problem of carrying on their industry. It is quite true that two beet sugar factories are being built in my constituency, but I can tell the Minister of Customs that the people of that constituency have burdened themselves by giving immense municipal bonuses to encourage that industry. They have relieved these factories from taxation for many years, and although already overburdened by taxation they assumed these responsibilities, hoping and believing that their efforts would be seconded by the government. In this they have been disappointed. That is the true position of the beet sugar industry in my county. Why was not the beet sugar industry given assistance as any other industry in the country ? I would like the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to tell me, what is the difference between the sugar industry and the iron industry in Canada. Will any one tell me that there is a reason why there should be encouragement given in one instance and not in the other. For my part, I am utterly unable to see why both industries should not be treated in the same way.

It is another evidence of the false step hon. gentleman took in the past ; and what was it ? Why, Sir, with regard to the iron duties, they had been crying out from one end of Canada to the other for years that all the duties on iron ought to be taken off. That was the position of the Minister of Finance; it was the position of the Minister of Customs. It was the trend of the speeches of every member of the government and of every Liberal in public life at that time, that the duties ought to be taken off both coal and iron. When they came into office they found themselves bound to do what they believed was wrong. What did they do ? The first thing they did was to slash off the duties from iron goods coming from the United States, giving the United States manufacturers an advantage to that extent in the markets of Canada. Then they had to do something to offset that, and we have the words of the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance to the effect that having taken the duties off iron, they had to put their hands in the pockets of the people to grant bounties to the iron industry to make up for it. That is a case of burning the candle at both ends. In the first place, we have taken off a large amount of duties that would have been paid by the manufacturers of the United States in order to come into the Canadian market ; and, to make up for that, we are taking three quarters of a million dollars from the pockets of the people to pay bounties on iron made in Canada. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if that is a consistent position, or one that inures to the benefit of Canada. On the contrary, it is one of the most stupendous blunders a government ever made. I am not opposed to a fair measure of bounties on iron, if the government took care, when they gave the bounties, that Canadians would have the field to themselves in which to sell their goods, instead of throwing down the bars and opening the gates, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) put it, and allowing foreign producers of iron to come in. I say there never was a greater mistake made in a revision of the

tariff than that was; but in that, as in everything else they have done, the government had to act falsely. They took the duties off iron, to what purpose? Let the hon. gentleman go to the farmers and every other class of consumer, and ask them if there is one article of iron manufacture which they can purchase more cheaply now than they could in 1896. Nor has the reduction of the duty gone to any great extent into the pockets of the manufacturers in Canada who were making farm implements. It has gone to the benefit of the iron producers of the United States to the detriment of Canada. If, on account of that blunder—and I say it was a great blunder—we can take from the pockets of the people of Canada, by way of bounties to the iron industry of Canada, I ask the hon. gentleman on what ground can he or his colleagues refuse to give similar encouragement to a great industry which will benefit the farmers of this country? True, the farmers cannot come to this House and present their case. They have not the same organization; they cannot make themselves heard; they cannot come here at short notice and thunder at the doors of parliament for their rights. But the hon. gentleman is doing a manifest injustice to them. What was the remedy the Minister of Trade and Commerce offered them the other evening? That hon. gentleman is usually on all occasions a master of jibes and jeers, and he could not allow the farmers to escape. On that occasion he said: You cannot protect the farmers; there is no use in trying to do that. All you can do is to give them bounties. We will give them bounties on their cows, their pigs, their grain; it will only cost the country forty or fifty million dollars, but what is that so long as you are protecting the farmers? I tell the hon. gentleman that the farmers are not going to take any such slurs; because they know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was insincere when he made that statement, in order to ridicule the idea of giving aid to the greatest of all industries. The hon. gentleman is doing the farmers a manifest injustice by not granting them some assistance by way of bounty. I am not prepared to say that the government would be called upon to raise the import duties on sugar to a large extent. They have done that already to some extent in their revision of the tariff in 1897; but there is no reason that one can imagine why they are not bound to assist the sugar industry by way of bounties as they have done the iron industry as a result of their mistaken course in taking the duties off iron.

Now, the hon. Minister of Customs has drawn a parallel between taxing the people and imposing a rate of taxation upon the people. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that a rate on the dollar means no more than a rate of taxation in a municipality, irrespective of the assessment. There is no means by which the people may draw a more absurdly false conclusion than to say that the rate is the measure of taxation. The Minister of Finance knows that it is perfectly idle to take a rate of taxation independent of the sum taken out of the pockets of the people. Take the hon. gentleman's own municipality. I will suppose that the assessment in that municipality is $100,000, and that the rate of taxation is one cent on the dollar. I will suppose that that assessment is raised to $500,000, and that the rate of taxation is reduced to 99-100ths of a cent on the dollar. The Minister of Customs would have us suppose that in such a case the taxation had been reduced instead of being as a matter of fact trebled. Let me give you an evidence of the way in which the hon. gentleman has lowered the taxation to the people of this country. The rate of taxation for customs and excise in 1896 was $5.42 a head, and in 1901 it was $7.31 a head; or, taking a family of five, which is the average number throughout Canada, the extra sum paid in the latter period is $8.95 per family. The total revenue taken out of the pockets of the people in 1896 was $7.14 a head; in 1901 it was $9.78, or an increase for each person in Canada of $2.64, or, for each family of five, an increase of $13.20. In other words the tax per family, in 1896 was $35.70 and in 1901 $48.90, or just $13.20 per family more than in 1896. Does the hon. gentleman call that lowering the taxation? Will he go to the people and convince them that he is imposing less taxes and lower rates when he is taking out of the pockets of the people now $13.20 per family more to run the affairs of Canada than was taken by the late government in 1896. I think he will find great difficulty in convincing the people that he has done so.

Let me now take the rates of taxation which, the hon. gentleman says, he has lowered to the extent of 3·02. In 1896 the rate was 18·28, and the hon. gentleman was not fair when he said that it had been reduced to such an extent that there was a difference between the average taxation of 1896 and that of 1901 of 2·02 in favour of the latter. What are really the facts? The whole importations into Canada of goods dutiable and free in 1901 amounted to $181,237,988. Of that amount there was Indian corn which passed through in transit, which was exported from Canada and not entered in the sense of being for consumption at all, which formed no part of the consumption of goods in this country, although so entered, under the new regulations of the hon. gentleman—of that sum, the Indian corn thus entered amounted to $5,506,542, thus reducing the amount of goods entered for consumption to $175,731,000 in round numbers, or giving an average rate of 16·56, being 1·72 less than when hon. gentlemen took office. That includes, as the hon. gentleman knows well, the operation of the preferential tariff

which, as I have pointed out, was absolutely of no use to us. What then is the effect of that ? The effect is this, that while the hon. gentleman has given a reduced rate, as he says, of something like 2 per cent on the present tariff, he has not given any relief to the people, for he knows that that could not be anything but a mere fraction, even if the preferential tariff operated to the benefit of the people.

But let us take the iron duties. The hon. gentleman took off in duties from grains to the extent of $182,000 in round numbers, and the reduction on iron duties amounted to $971,000, making a total of $1,251,000 from which the people have not derived a particle of benefit. He knows that under the preferential rate, the iron goods which came in from England were only 15 per cent of our total importations, and that we got from the United States 85 per cent, so that the people of Canada in no sense received any benefit.

Then take the industry with which the hon. gentleman has so much sympathy. He asked the leader of the opposition for some advice to the Prime Minister with regard to the tariff of Canada and those questions in general which interest the colonies and Great Britain and which will come up for discussion in the London conference. He wanted some explicit declaration with regard to what the resolution of the opposition meant when it declared the present tariff unsatisfactory. He seemed not to be able to understand just what that meant, and wanted some light, not only to guide himself, but to guide the Prime Minister when in England. Well, I suppose, in view of the right hon. gentleman's refusal to consider the question of Imperial defence, it would be very difficult for the leader of the opposition to give him any advice which would cover that question, and therefore I think he would be quite absolved from doing so. But I want to point out where the tariff is unsatisfactory. Take the woollen trade of Canada, which we know is in a very unsatisfactory condition, owing entirely to the blunders of the government. They were wrong in the position they took before 1896 and have been wrong ever since. They made war upon specific duties in every case, as unduly taking money out of the pockets of the people and as being an unfair discrimination against the poor in favour of the rich. Let us see what was the effect of the specific duties on this industry. The rate that would have been paid upon the goods imported in 1901, under the tariff of 1896, would have been 31·82. That was reduced by the preference to 25·71, but the rate on goods that did not come in under the preference was 33·44. The people were thus taxed on these latter goods the difference between 33·44 and 31·52. Their burdens were increased to that extent, and still the protection taken away from the manufacturers. These hon. gentlemen took away the combined duties of 25 per cent and 5 cents a pound, which were charged on woollen goods under the tariff of 1896, and replaced them by the tariff of 35 per cent. If that had not been modified by the preferential rate to the extent of the importations from England, the Minister of Customs must be aware that he would have been taxing the people more than they were taxed in 1896 and at the same time have taken away the protection from our manufacturers. There is an instance in which taxation has been increased and the protection taken away from our own manufacturers on the goods imported under the general tariff, on which the tax is 33·44 as against 31·82 on those imported under the preferential rate. The taxes have been increased and yet the Canadian industries have been ruined. If these hon. gentlemen would restore the weight duty of 5 cents a pound, which existed under the Conservative tariff of 1896, our manufacturers would at least have their present condition considerably relieved and have a fair measure of protection. I am giving this as an instance, of which there are many others, to show how the present tariff is unsatisfactory, and how an increased protection may not mean increased taxation on the people.

There is just one more matter to which I wish to refer and that is the position of the Liberal party and that of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman is not able to be in the House. Hon. gentlemen will remember that he wrote a letter to the newspapers on the 25th of October, 1894, in which he had this to say :—

> What are the other planks of the Patron platform affecting Dominion politics ? They are these. First, economy in administration : second, purity and independence of Parliament ; third, tariff for revenue only ; fourth, reciprocal trade ; fifth, protection of labour from monopoly ; sixth, no railway bonuses ; seventh, voters' lists made by local officials ; eighth, no gerrymandering——

We shall see what is to come—

> ——ninth, lands for the settlers. Now, there is simply no single one of all these objects which the Liberal party have not been fighting for, moving resolutions for and doing their very best to obtain any time during the last 25 years.

As to economy, how do hon. gentlemen opposite fulfil that ? The expenditure in 1896 was about $44,000,000, and in 1901 it has risen to $57,000,000. As to purity of elections and independence of parliament, their fulfilment of that is well illustrated by West Huron, Brockville, West Elgin, the St. James division of Montreal, and even the municipal elections in London. Tariff for revenue only has been fulfilled after the fashion of hon. gentlemen opposite by taking $52,000,000 out of the pockets of the people last year as against $36,000,000 taken out of the pockets of the people in 1896—an increase of about 50 per cent. Reciprocal trade—their promise with regard to this has been fulfilled by the first minister declaring

that Canada no longer needs it. As to granting no more railway subsidies, which they were supposed to have been fighting for twenty-five years, that has been fulfilled by the hon. gentlemen opposite granting since 1897, no less than $21,736,000.

Now, I wish to say just a word with regard to the charges that have been brought in this House about the taking of the census of 1891. I am sure it must be a matter of sincere regret that hon. gentlemen opposite have taken the position with regard to this matter that they have taken in this House. I am sure the Minister of Trade and Commerce must have surprised the House and the country by the shocking declaration he made that the census enumerators of Canada had fraudulently lent themselves to the assistance of the leader of the government of that day, Sir John Macdonald, and that some 4,000 of these persons had deliberately banded themselves together and committed fraud, and, in doing so had violated their own oaths of office and so had committed perjury as well. This is a sad commentary upon the influence of the churches in Canada. It is a charge so shocking that the government cannot disregard it but must see the duty that is imposed upon it of making a full investigation. What are we to think of the morality of the people of the great province of Ontario, when we find such charges made against a large number of men of whom probably 85 per cent belong to one or other of the great brancnes of the Protestant church ? The Minister of Trade and Commerce took care to say that this is a matter that should not be spoken of or treated lightly. I know well what I have to say ; I understand the gravity of the situation ; but I shall give chapter and verse for everything I have to say. I defy any man in this House or out of it to find any word in the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that can be tortured into the form of a single reason in support of the charges he made. What were those charges ? One was that Sir John Macdonald was in a bad plight ; the elections of 1891 had given him but a small majority, and he was likely to be compelled to face a new election ; therefore every census enumerator had come to the assistance of Sir John and had falsified the lists in order to give a false impression to the country. Is there a man in this House who believes that that charge has any foundation ? The Minister of Trade and Commerce did not even make an attempt to do more than make the bald assertion that the enumerators had falsified the census. The government of the day must take notice of that charge and investigate the facts, or they will stand convicted before the people of having, under the shelter of the privileges of this House, made charges which they would not dare to make outside. I am not going to deal with the case of the province of Ontario just now, but with the province of Quebec. I do not see the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) in his place. I do not see the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in his place. I do not see many of those who pride themselves, and justly pride themselves, upon being French Canadians. But I call upon these gentlemen to pay close attention to the charge made against that province. The last man you would think to make a charge against these people is the Minister of Agriculture. He says :—

> Now, Sir, what have we found ? We have found, by a careful investigation, in so far as it has gone—and it has gone very far indeed in the province of Quebec, and a reasonable distance in the province of Ontario—that if that instruction was given, it was disregarded to such an extent that we must conclude that it was wilfully disregarded.

In other words that they had deliberately perjured themselves. Let us see the charge the Minister of Trade and Commerce made against the province of Quebec.

> It is utterly impossible to compute the total extent of the frauds that were committed in Quebec ; but I do not think anybody will say that I am exaggerating when, after examining the evidence I have laid on the Table, I say there is every reasonable ground for believing that at least 50,000 or 60,000 souls were improperly counted in Quebec in the census of 1891.

Could a man make a more grave charge than that ? But that is not all. The Minister of Agriculture has taken special pains to single out the province of Quebec, to cast a stigma on the people of Quebec, although Ontario has been besmirched and the hon. gentlemen have done everything they could to take away the good character of the people of that province. What does the Minister of Agriculture add to the charges and insults that have been already mentioned ?

> Now we did not wish to confine the investigation by any means to the province of Quebec. Although the difficulties were much greater in the province of Ontario, still a slight investigation was made to find out whether anything like the same conditions obtained. I may say at once that we did not find anything like as much of this sort of thing in the province of Ontario as we did in the province of Quebec.

In other words, as depraved as the people of Ontario are, willing as they were to commit perjury, still they must take second place to the people of the province of Quebec.

Mr. MONET. So far as the Tories of the province of Quebec are concerned, because these people are Conservative employees.

Mr. CLANCY. Quite so, Mr. Speaker, we have the version of the hon. gentleman. Is the hon. gentleman sincere ? Is he prepared to take the responsibility of saying inside or outside of this House, would any

gentleman on either side of the House so far forget himself as to say that because a man was a Conservative he was likely to be a perjurer? Yet there is where the hon. gentleman draws the line of distinction. We have this state of thing trumped up, we have the hon. gentleman pursuing that course, and that he should back up the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Agriculture is not at all surprising. But let us see the evidence upon which they proceeded in the province of Quebec. What have they done? Why, Sir, they started out in the first place upon a fishing expedition. Mr. Thomas Cote was employed as an assistant commissioner, and I challenge the government to say that Mr. Thomas Cote, from the hour he was appointed, and during all the time that he has been drawing the public funds of Canada, ever lifted one finger towards preparing a single figure or a single portion of the census of 1901. I challenge the government to say that he did one act in that census. But what did he do? Why, he started out on a fishing expedition. His business was to justify the false position, the slanderous position, which the government had taken. They were bound to have blood, whether innocent or guilty blood. Mr. Thomas Cote went out, and what did he do? Why, I charge him before the people of Canada and before this House with having violated a sacred oath, and I charge the Minister of Agriculture with having violated his position as a minister, and he should no longer sit there in a parliament or in a ministry of Canada. Let me give you the proof. I will quote now, Mr. Speaker, from the regulations and instructions that were given to the census commissioner, the census enumerators and all the officers in the Census Department, on entering upon the work of taking the census of 1901. This is what I find on page 8:

> Every commissioner, enumerator or other person employed in the execution of the Census Act must take and subscribe an oath binding him to faithful and exact discharge of his duties under the provisions of the Act, and in all respects as required by the forms and instructions issued by the Minister of Agriculture; and every such person who makes wilful default in any matter required of him by the Act or the instructions, or who wilfully makes a false declaration touching any such matter, is guilty of a misdemeanour.

It goes on further to say:

> Every officer or other person employed in any capacity on census work is required to keep inviolate the secrecy of the information gathered by the enumerators and entered in the schedules or forms. An enumerator is not permitted to show his schedules to any other person nor to make or keep a copy of them, nor to answer any question respecting their contents directly or indirectly. And the same obligation of secrecy is imposed upon commissioners and other officers or employes of the outside service as well as upon every officer, clerk or other employee of the census office at Ottawa. The facts and statistics of the census may not be used except for statistical compilations, and positive assurance should be given on this point if a fear is entertained by any person that they may be used for taxation or any other object.

Now I come to the latter part of the instructions:

> No result of the enumeration may be given to the public in advance of the printed bulletins or reports, except by the head officer of the census acting under the authority and direction of the Minister of Agriculture.

What has been done? Why, Sir, information that has not yet been given to this House, for which no bulletins have been issued, has been peddled out and given indiscriminately by Mr. Thomas Cote in the province of Quebec. What is the conclusion? The conclusion is that the Minister of Agriculture lent himself to the scheme, and gave authority to use this information in procuring which Mr. Thomas Cote stands charged with having violated a solemn oath. Now the government of the day can take their choice of the two positions. The Minister of Agriculture may deny that he gave such information, but if he only gave authority to use it he is still guilty of an act that is disgraceful. If he takes the responsibility of saying so, we are quite willing that the country should judge what kind of a minister is at the head of that department. I say to the members of the government that are here to-day, that they should demand that man's resignation, he should not remain a member of a responsible government for a single hour if he takes a position of that kind.

Let me see what kind of evidence we have of the efforts that have been made for the purpose of fastening a charge of perjury on the people of the province of Quebec. Now we have a letter written by a gentleman who signs himself the Rev. J. B. Morin. I am told that the Rev. J. B. Morin is at present the parish priest at a place called St. Jean de Matha. He has been there for something like a year. I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether the evidence was taken under oath on so serious a charge against the people, and I was told that it was not taken under oath. I asked the question because, if two hundred, or three hundred are selected, or, two thousand, or three thousand, it is a fair indication of the character of the people throughout the whole province. I asked the question because I think that when the pastors of the people in the province of Quebec had conducted so serious an investigation upon so serious a charge they ought to have conducted it under oath. I was told that it was not conducted under oath but that the information was given and that the investigation had taken place under the parish priests. I tell the hon. Minister of Agriculture now that this is a base slan-

der upon the parish priests of the province of Quebec, that the parish priests took no part in it. The parish priests did what they were expected to do, I suppose. They gave in that courteous and prudent manner in which they usually act such parochial census as they had in their hands and at their disposal. Beyond that they had no part in this unsavoury job. It is a sad thing that hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House, of the same religion and nationality, living and growing up under the same teachings, will not rise and say one word in defence of these gentlemen, and I am sorry to say that it falls to my lot to say that the clergy of the province of Quebec took no part in this affair with the exception of one and I regret to see how disinterested that gentleman was and how anxious he was to convict the Tories of perjury. He wrote as follows :

In answer to your circular letter dated Oct. 21 last, I have the honour to inform you that the movement of population in this parish of St Jean de Matha, county of Joliette, has been during the last ten years practically stagnant. The population must be about the same as in 1891, and we do not understand here the discrepancy of 717 between the census of 1891 and the census of 1901.

How does he get the information that there was a discrepancy of 717 unless Thomas Cote had violated his obligation and given that information to him ? He had no means of knowing unless Mr. Cote gave him that information through the connivance and through the assistance of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. He goes on to prove that and gives evidence of it. He says :

The census that I do take every year since I am in this parish agree with the figures of your enumerator. I have already sent you these figures, and you must have remarked their identity.

How did they come to agree ? Because the figures had been sent down there illegally, improperly and contrary to the regulations by the minister or his census officer, and gives evidence of it. He says :

The census I take every year——

What does this gentleman know about the people of the parish of St. Jean de Matha ? The man never was in that parish, so far as I can tell. He had not been parish priest for fifteen years until 1900 or 1901. That was the first time that he had anything to do with the parish so far as there is any record. I will not say what his zeal was.

We are all of the opinion that the census of 1891 was over-valued by at least that difference of 717 which is seen between the last census and the census of 1891. It would be very easy to discover the fictitious figures and I will do the work if you will send me copies of the figures of 1891.

They had no business to do that. Then he goes on :

It would be extremely easy to check the lists and I will show you the names to be struck off. We will willingly do that work to help you, to give you satisfaction and to show you that the enumerators of the last census have faithfully and conscientiously done their work.

In other words, that the Liberals were not perjurers and that the Conservatives were perjurers. Then, there is another letter from this gentleman dated 5th December :

Dear Mr. Cote,—I have received your letter and copy of the census tables used in 1891. I am conscientiously at work.

Mark this. Mark the tone of this disinterested gentleman employed to investigate a serious charge :

I am conscientiously at work. I have asked the help of two good citizens. You may expect results which will surprise you. For instance, a man aged 48 years and his wife aged 35 are put down as having eighteen children and the eldest is 24 years old or just eleven years less than his mother. In a few days I will send you my report which will be very carefully prepared with references to the schedules. This is rather a long work.

I venture to say you will see a pay list at the end of it.

But we desire to be absolutely sure of our facts and data, so as to enable you to use the same in due time. We find repetitions in the book also names of people who have left the parish in 1882 or of people absolutely unknown in this locality. Families of two or three children are gratified——

I do not know what this means.

—with a dozen of them. You must expect nothing but real astonishment.

When the hon. Minister of Agriculture dealt with this question he told us that this fortunate man who had eighteen children was Paul Guilbault, that his wife was 35 years of age, that he was somewhat older and that there was just eleven years difference between the eldest son and his mother. I am surprised that a man should pen this statement, and that the hon. minister should be silly enough, and I do not make any apology for using the word, to make such a statement in the effort to make out a case of perjury without investigation. It is quite possible, indeed it is probable, that that particular man not only had eighteen children, but that the son, as it is stated, was only eleven years younger than the reputed mother. Every hon. gentleman knows that there is no provision by which to enumerate whether the wife is the mother of the children shown in a particular family or not. Let us take the ages of the children as they were given by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The oldest is put down as 24, the next 23, and the next 22, the next 20, the next 19, the next 18, the next 17, the next 16, the next 15, the next 14, the next 13, the next 12, the next 11, the next 10, the next 9. There are two eight years of age and the last is put down as

being three months old. What conclusion do you come to from that ? I am told that in some cases there are very large families in the province of Quebec, reaching as large as eighteen in number. They may be exceptional cases, but I am told that such cases do exist in Quebec. What are the facts as to the charge on the face of it ? That this was this man's second wife. What does it prove ? The space between the seventeenth child and the eighteenth child is considerable, as one is put down as eight years of age and the other as three months. Does not anybody know that that may be the case, that it is perfectly true, and that there is no falsehood in the statement which is cited in order to make out a case of perjury against the Conservative enumerators. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe just such a case did occur in the province of Quebec. What did the Minister of Agriculture say as a climax, and he was cheered by his friends. He said :

> This is another specimen of the way the census was stuffed in the province of Quebec in 1891.

That is his final conclusion. Now, the Rev. J. B. Morin sends another letter with the result of his investigation, and you can understand what the report will be when I have shown the zeal of this gentleman. He says :—

> You will receive by the same mail a report of the census of 1891. You will notice by the reference which I have made to the census that the returns of ten years ago were frightfully exaggerated. The report which I am sending you has been prepared carefully and conscientiously. It is accurate. You may use it at your discretion. Dr. Turgeon, the notary and Mr. Dugas, both responsible citizens residing in the parish for the past fifteen or sixteen years are absolutely qualified to certify to the accuracy of the information I am mailing you. We are still at your disposal and if you ask for more details we will gladly furnish you with the same.

My hon. friend beside me asks me who Mr. Dugas is. If he asked me who Mr. Turgeon is and who Mr. Marcil is I could say without fear of contradiction and without making inquiry, that both Mr. Dugas and Mr. Turgeon are active Liberal politicians who are endeavouring to bolster up a bad case for the government. Now, let me point out that this gentleman and his two responsible citizens had from the 5th of December to the 16th of December, or nine working days, to do the work they undertook. Let us see what they did in that time. They were able to locate 380 heads of families ; they were able to locate 556 children of all ages ; they were able to hunt up their location ten years ago, and they were able to tell who were in the parish then and who were not in the parish then. In nine days, they were able to do that and more. They were able to tell that a great many of them were in the constituency but absent during the census year of 1901 ; they did all that in nine working days, and sent their report to this government. Well, Sir, I know of nothing more disgraceful to Canada, than what that piece of business discloses. I turn to the opposite side of the House because there should be men there who would rise up in defence of the enumerators of the province of Quebec, whose characters have been assailed in this way. I ask the member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) if he thinks this charge of perjury is a fair one to make against the enumerators of the province of Quebec. I ask him if he thinks his people have had fair play. I ask him if it is not the saddest thing that Canada ever contemplated, that the clergy made up of more than ninety per cent of one religious persuasion, and nearly all of one nationality in that province, have been so remiss in their work of centuries as to turn out such a body of perjurers as these enumerators are alleged to have been. I tell him and I tell his compatriots from the province of Quebec, that as a matter of fair play to their own nationality they should demand a most rigid investigation into the serious charges of perjury, and if they fail to do their duty in that respect they are no longer worthy of the confidence of the people. I repeat that it is the saddest commentary upon the religious teachings of the ministers, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, that Canada has ever had to contemplate in its whole history.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I am in favour of the resolution of the hon. leader of the opposition which declares in the most emphatic terms that the present tariff is not a satisfactory tariff. I shall vote for that resolution as a protest against the policy of this composite government made up of men of all kinds of theories with regard to our fiscal policy. We have the Minister of Finance telling us that he does not propose to make any tariff changes this year, because it is not a good thing to have constant tariff changes. In that we may agree with him. He tells us that conditions may arise with regard to our home trade and our foreign trade which it will be necessary to take notice of. His tariff is unsatisfactory because he does not take notice of these conditions. We have the Minister of Agriculture still trimming. He says that the tariff is satisfactory, but that conditions may arise when the interests of the country will demand a change. How can he better the country by a revenue tariff ? That is a dead weight tax collecting tariff, but a protective tariff protects the interests of the people of Canada and it is the only weapon we can use against foreign countries who make commercial warfare on us. I will vote for the amendment of the leader of the opposition because it announces a policy that will give every Canadian in Canada the first chance, that will give every Canadian workman the first chance for

a day's work; that will give capitalists security for their investment, and that will give to the producers of this country the first right to the markets of Canada; a policy that will in brief, benefit Canadians first and before all others.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, it appears to be my misfortune to come in near the close of this debate now extending over three weeks. From the very able manner in which this subject has been discussed by hon. gentlemen, I fear that little is left for me, but I trust to be able to pick up here and there some crumbs that may have dropped during the debate, on which I may be able to found an argument that has not yet been touched upon in support of the resolution of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. I am sure we have listened with pain, I think with extreme pain, to the statement which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has been compelled to make in reference to the charges made against our French fellow citizens in the province of Quebec. I confess, Sir, that I have not lost my respect for them. I cannot understand why the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and still more I cannot understand why the Minister of Agriculture who has been for many years a citizen of the province of Quebec, should take so much trouble to decry and besmirch the reputation of honourable citizens of that province. I have no doubt the day will come when the French of the province of Quebec will reckon with the Minister of Agriculture for the stand he has taken in this House, where they have no opportunity of defending their reputation. I regret that the Minister of Customs has found it necessary to leave the Chamber. He opened up this afternoon a fresh discussion on the question of the tariff, and I do think it is his duty to be here when a question of that important character is under discussion. Notwithstanding his absence, a good many of my remarks will have to be addressed to him, because I intend to give some attention to the question he has raised. He began by intimating that he as well as his colleagues in the ministry had been unfaithful to the promises they had made to the people. He did not attempt to deny that they had been unfaithful; but possibly he thought the better way to get out of the difficulty was to make the confession, and appeal for mercy to his supporters around him. He took another plan, however. After having acknowledged the unfaithfulness of himself and his colleagues with respect to the expenditure, having increased it far beyond the amount which they assured the people would be proper, he commenced to throw dust in the eyes of his supporters as if to blind them to the fact of such unfaithfulness. He brings out a perfect mass of figures, which I will undertake to say he had the clerks in his department engaged in preparing for the past three months. Every one of these figures was prepared at the expense of the people of Canada. I have no doubt that collection of figures cost the people of this country thousands of dollars, simply and solely for the purpose of enabling the Minister of Customs to make a defence in this House. Then he called upon the opposition to answer this terrible array of figures. Just imagine the Minister of Customs, with a staff of eight or ten clerks in his department, spending three months preparing figures to make an attack on the opposition in this House, and, then, at the close of the debate—because he refused to be heard until the last afternoon, when there was no opportunity of looking up these figures—he boldly calls upon us to answer them.

An hon. MEMBER. And then runs away.

Mr. HENDERSON. And then runs away, as an hon. gentleman says. Surely he is a brave man. I have no doubt the Boers in South Africa would like to meet such men; I do not think they would have much difficulty in establishing their position. Then he tells us that we do not dare to formulate a resolution and submit it to this House condemning the expenditure of which we complain. The hon. gentleman who has preceded me (Mr. Clancy) has dealt very fully with that question. He has shown us that the hon. gentleman himself, during a long period of eighteen years, never dared to open his mouth when in opposition, in condemnation of what he called the extravagance of the Conservative government. But the hon. gentleman is all wrong when he says that we dare not formulate a resolution. Has he forgotten that within twelve months a resolution exactly of the character to which he refers was moved in this House and voted upon? And now, to refresh the hon. gentleman's memory, I will read that resolution, which was moved on the 22nd of May, 1901:

> That this House desires to place on record its opinion that the expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1901, and the proposed expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1902, are excessive and extravagant, and it regrets that the government, with an exceptionally large revenue at its command, has not only failed to reduce but has largely increased the public debt, and has not shown proper appreciation of the extreme difficulty if not impossibility of reducing in future years the very high standard of expenditure which is being fixed during a period of great prosperity.

What stronger resolution than that, I ask, would the hon. gentleman expect us to move? And to a man we voted for that resolution. But where was the Minister of Customs? If he thought, as he intimated at the outset of his speech, that the expenditure had been excessive, why did he not join us? I look in the division list, and I

find that all the thanks we got for introducing that resolution was that the hon. Minister of Customs assisted in voting it down.

The hon. gentleman referred to the question of superannuation, and I was very much surprised at a statement he made. I will not suppose that it was based on information which he himself obtained from the Blue-books. I am sure that was the work of one of the clerks in his department, because I am sure he would not have made the statement had he examined the record himself. He said that the superannuation was self-sustaining.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The Minister of Customs certainly did not say that. He said there had been a change made in the system, and that under the new system it would be self-sustaining.

Mr. HENDERSON. I certainly caught his words, that it was self-sustaining. Now, in 1901 the collections on account of superannuation were $10,916 less than they were in 1896, whereas the payments were $13,276 more, so that, as I understood the hon. gentleman, he was wrong by exactly $24,192.

Then he took up the question of the reduction of postage. Now, I desire to say at the outset that I have no wish whatever to take away from the Postmaster General one iota of the credit that is due to him for anything he has done in connection with the administration of that department; but I want to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that before the present government came into power there have been Postmaster Generals who have to my mind done as great things for the country as the present Postmaster General. In 1868, the government of that day reduced the postage on domestic letters from 5 cents to 3 cents. The present Postmaster General reduced the letter postage 1 cent, and it was blazed all over the country as a wonderful thing, although it was only half of what was done in 1868. In 1871 another reform was introduced by the Conservative government of that day in the matter of post cards, which gave the people a cheaper system of communicating with each other. I consider that this was a very great reduction indeed, in the postage paid by the people generally, but that was not the only reduction. In 1889 the postage rate was practically cut in two in a great many instances. On a letter weighing two ounces the postage previous to 1889 was 12 cents, or three cents per half ounce, but after that year a letter weighing two ounces passed through the mails for six cents. In many cases the postage was actually split in two by the reduction of the charge from three cents per half ounce to three cents per whole ounce. This no doubt affected the revenue very materially, and was a great step towards cheaper postage, so that we find that previous to the advent of the present government our Postmaster Generals had done very great service to the country in that respect. We are told frequently by hon. gentlemen opposite that the postage rate has been reduced one-third. But they forget that a very large amount of postal revenue is derived from drop letters, which pay only one cent. These letters paid one cent before and are paying one cent still, and they furnish a very considerable amount of revenue. Then we have the letters in cities where there is a postal delivery. The old rate on these of two cents has not been changed, so that there has been no reduction whatever in the postal rates in the cities where there is a postal delivery. He charges also the same rate for registering a letter, namely, five cents, as before. Considering therefore the whole matter, the reduction in revenue by the change from three cents to two cents on ordinary domestic letters, does not amount to what the government claim credit for. I want to draw attention to another feature in this connection. It has been claimed, and claimed by no one more strongly than the First Minister, notably in his speech at the city of Toronto, that the government have wiped out the deficit or the difference between revenue and expenditure in the Post Office Department. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who do not ask the Postmaster General to make the revenue and expenditure meet. I do not think it fair to do so. Why should we take a department, such as the postal department, which comes the nearest to every man, woman and child in the country, in which every man, woman and child is more interested, I believe, than in any other department of the government, because that is the one which furnishes them with the means of communicating with each other—why should that department be starved simply to enable the government to declare that it is self-sustaining? The other departments are not self-sustaining. The Department of Public Works does not meet expenses, nor does the Department of Railways and Canals. What other expending department of the government is self-sustaining? And why should the postal system in which the people are more interested than in any other department of the government, be made self-sustaining at the expense of the service. I say that the government will act wisely if they will give us a better service, even if it should cost us more than the revenue it brings in. The government claim credit for having reduced the deficit. Last year that deficit stood at $512,023 and the previous year it was $553,241. Of course I include in this both the revenue and expenditure in the Yukon district. I find, on referring back to 1891, that there were 8,061 post offices then in Canada. In 1896 there were 9,103,

or an increase in the five years of 1,042, making an average increase of 208 new post offices every year during the last five years of Conservative regime. Let us see how far this Liberal government have supplied the people with postal accommodation. We hear a great deal about the development in New Ontario and the immense areas of land that have been settled in the Northwest and the new territory that is being taken up. If all that be true, surely there ought to have been a greater demand for new post offices in the last five years than during the previous five years. But what do we find ? We find that in 1896 the number of post offices was 9,102, and in 1901 it had increased to 9,824, or an increase of only 731 in those five years, against an increase of 1,042 in the previous five years. In other words, while the increase in the last five years of Conservative rule was 208 on an average per year, the average yearly increase in the last five years of Liberal regime was only 146. These hon. gentlemen may have reduced the deficit, but if so they have done it by refusing to open new post offices where required in this new country, by applying the sweating system to the mail carriers throughout the country, by refusing to pay the mail carriers in the cities their honest due, and by starving the service in every way possible. The United States has never attempted to cover its postal expenditure by its revenue. In 1901 the post office expenditure of the United States was $115,554,920, and the revenue only $111,631,193, making a deficit of close on to $4,000,000. This, of course, is provided for out of the revenues of the country, and I have no doubt the people of the United States are provided with the very best postal service, much better than in this country, because there the government have introduced the rural delivery system—a system which will not be introduced in Canada for many years, if hon. gentlemen opposite are going to insist on their policy of wiping out the deficit before furnishing better accommodation.

The next point that came up in the hon. gentleman's speech was that of reduced taxation, on which he dwelt more perhaps than on any other question. He insisted that they had reduced the taxation, and of course claimed credit for it. I do not propose to enter into a lengthy argument, but let me say that I take very strong exception to that statement, and I have no hesitation, standing here in the presence of hon. gentlemen on this side and in the presence of a very small number of hon. gentlemen opposite, in declaring that the hon. gentleman has not reduced the rate of taxation. That statement, I believe, I can substantiate before I sit down. Notwithstanding the figures he has quoted, I claim that he has not reduced the average rate of taxation. What I maintain is that the average rate in the last five years of Conservative rule was lower than that during the five years of Liberal rule. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to fail altogether to make any distinction between taxation and protection. They seem to treat these as precisely similar terms, but to my mind they are entirely distinct. We may have very high taxation and very low protection, and the trouble at present is that we have too much taxation and too little protection. What we require is just the reverse. We require to reduce the taxation and increase the protection, and when we get a policy of that kind we will get a policy that will develop this country.

We are told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the figures we find in the public documents of this country are not to be relied upon. Consequently we must go to other sources for information. The Minister of Finance last year informed us also that the figures prepared by the Minister of Customs were not correct. I have the speech in my desk, and read it over a day or two ago to refresh my memory, and I find that he said the deductions put in the Blue-books from year to year were not, strictly speaking, fair or correct. I do not intend to be guided by those incorrect figures. I will not take exception to the trade returns as we get them in the Trade and Navigation statistics. I am compelled to admit that they are all right. But, when I come to deal with the summaries or deductions that the hon. gentleman makes in these figures, I must refuse to accept his calculations. I do not know whether they are made by himself or by the officers of his department. But, in any case, I assume that they are made under his direction, and, where they are in error, I hold the hon. minister responsible for those errors and not those who are employed under him. I need not dwell upon the export of corn from this country, for that was referred to this afternoon. We are familiar with the fact, that, under the old regime, when corn crossed through the country, entering at one side only to be sent out at the other, it was counted neither in the imports nor in the exports, but was merely treated as being in transit. To make a fair comparison with the years before the change in tariff, we must get down to the same basis. Therefore, I propose to deduct from the total imports for home consumption for the last five years the amount of foreign corn exported from this country, corn not the produce of this country and I am sure I shall be borne out by the Minister of Finance, who drew attention to the fact last year that this ought to be done : In 1897, the present government imposed a very large additional tax on tobacco, averaging upwards of $1,000,000 a year. That duty was imposed not as a customs duty, but as an excise duty. But, no matter whether excise or customs, it is taxation, and when we are dealing with the taxation of the country we must include that increased item.

So, each year as I read my statement I will include the increased duty paid on tobacco and cigars for that year.

I take first the year 1898—

Imports for home consumption	$130,698,006
Less corn exported	5,165,955
Net imports for home consumption	$125,532,051

During that year, the customs duties paid on goods dutiable coming into the country were $22,157,188; increased duty on tobacco and cigars, $971,558; total $23,128,746. This made an average duty on goods, dutiable and free for 1898 of 18·34 per cent, and not 16·95 per cent as given in the return of the Minister of Customs. I regret that I am obliged to read all these figures, but I desire to have them in 'Hansard' that they may be carefully examined. Now, take the year 1899 —

Imports for home consumption	$154,021,593
Less corn exported	6,332,682
Net imports for home consumption	$147,688,911
Customs duty paid	$25,734,728
Increased duty on tobacco	1,067,156
Total taxation	$26,801,884

This makes an average duty on goods dutiable and free for 1899 of 18·4 per cent instead of 16·7 per cent as given by the Minister of Customs. Now, here are the figures for 1900 —

Imports for home consumption	$180,834,016
Less corn exported	4,757,595
Net imports for home consumption	$176,076,421
Customs duty paid	$28,889,110
Increased duty on tobacco	971,977
Total taxation for the year	$29,861,087

This makes the average duty on goods dutiable and free 16·96 per cent, instead of 15·98 per cent, the figures given in the Trade and Navigation Returns. Now, we come to 1901, the last year for which we have the figures :

Imports for home consumption	$181,237,988
Less corn not the produce of Canada	5,506,542
Total net imports for consumption	$175,731,446
Customs duty paid	$29,106,779
Increased duty on tobacco and cigars.	1,206,817
Total	$30,313,796

Or an average duty on goods dutiable and free of 17·25 per cent, instead of 16·6 per cent, the figures given in the Trade and Navigation Returns. Now, I summarize these. **I take the years 1892 to 1896 inclusive.** These I take as they are given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, because by taking off the corn in transit and adding the increased duty on tobacco, I have brought the calculation to the same basis as in these years, and we are now in a position to make a fair comparison, which we could not do under the system adopted by the Minister of Customs. The following are the average rates of duty for the years 1892 to 1896 inclusive —

Average duty.	Per cent.
1892	17·56
1893	17·38
1894	17·13
1895	16·99
1896	18·28
A total for the years given of	87·34
Divided by 5 years gives an average of	17·46

This is the average for the five years under the Conservative regime on goods dutiable and free. Now, take the five years commencing with 1897, the first year of Liberal rule. I find that, according to the Trade and Navigation returns the average was 17·87 per cent. Only for a very small portion of this year was the corn free, and for only a small portion of it was the new tobacco duty in force, and so trifling was it that I did not take it into consideration. In 1897 the average rate of duty was 17·87. In 1898 the average rate of duty was 18·34 ; in 1899, 18·14 ; in 1900, 16·96 ; in 1901, 17·25, or a total for the five years of 18·56, divided by 5, gives an average of 17·71. The average rate of duty paid on goods coming into this country, dutiable and free, during the past five years, was 17·71 ; and for the last five years of Conservative rule it was 17·46. I challenge the government by any conceivable plan to controvert this statement of the average rate of taxation ; and I trust when the hon. gentleman rises to speak in this House again he will not compare dissimiliar things in order to make a good showing for himself, but that he will be fair enough to give us the facts and make a comparison which is fair to all parties. If he does so I am sure he will admit that his rate of taxation is higher than was the rate under the Conservative government for the periods named.

We have been told and I think the Minister of Finance reminded us in his budget speech, that had the same rate of taxation been applied to the imports of this country in 1901 as was applied in 1896 we would have paid $4,000,000 more duty than we actually did in 1901. Now, I consider that that was a very unfair statement, because, strictly speaking, it was not absolutely correct. Of course the hon. gentleman was mislead by taking the figures of his colleague. However, he admitted that these figures were not correct, and he should have been more guarded before he made the statement. Now, what are the facts ? In 1898 we actually paid $1,104,572 more duties than we would have paid under the average rate of duty from 1892 to 1896 ; and in 1899 we paid $853,607 more duties than we would have paid under the average

rate of the last five years of Conservative regime. In each year from 1897 to 1901 we paid an average of $390,866 more than we would have paid under the average of the last five years of Conservative rule.

Now, with reference to the additional $4,000,000 which the Minister of Finance tells us we would have paid had the Conservatives been in power, I want to draw his attention to this fact, that free sugar was the Conservative policy. In 1891 the Conservative party placed raw sugar on the free list and gave the people of this country a free breakfast table. Sir Leonard Tilley, nearly ten years before, had placed tea and coffee upon the free list. Then Mr. Foster, in 1891, put raw sugar on the free list, and gave back to the people of this country what he might have collected between 1891 and 1895, a sum equal to $20,000,000. Mr. Foster was aware of the fact that a wave, not of prosperity, but of adversity was passing over the country, and he did what a good statesman should do, he took off the burden of taxation, struck off $20,000,000, to enable us to tide over the difficulties of those days. Had he retained that $20,000,000 of taxation he would not have had the deficit that the hon. gentleman talked so much about this afternoon. In fact, had Mr. Foster not removed that, the hon. gentleman would have scarcely had a text from which to preach to-day. But Mr. Foster did it in the interest of the people of this country; and although in 1895 he was compelled, owing to the fact that he was unable to make the revenue and expenditure meet, to put back half a cent a pound on raw sugar, that was no evidence that Mr. Foster nor any other Conservative Minister of Finance intended that it should continue and with the return of better times and the improvement of business, there is no doubt in the world that in one or two years that half a cent would again have been removed, and that to-day we would be enjoying free raw sugar in this country instead of an increase of from 50 to 67 cents per 100 pounds. So that practically there would not have been a dollar of that $4,000,000, because with the duty taken off raw sugar amounting to $1,105,855, which was the tax in 1896, the average rate of taxation that year would not have been 18·28 but would simply have been 17·28, practically the same as we had during the past year of 17·25. Thus I say the whole burden of the song of the hon. gentleman about the favourable comparison between his own tariff and that of the Conservative party, when investigated, really amounts to little, and his argument fails altogether to support his contention.

Now, a very strange statement was made by the hon. gentleman to which I will refer just now. He stated that the public debt of this country had decreased during the five years of Liberal rule by 67 cents per head of the population. Well, I thought that was an astounding statement. It staggered me, I could not understand it. An increase in the public debt of $16,000,000, and an actual decrease per head of the population—it was inexplicable. Well, I made a little investigation during the recess between 6 and 8 o'clock, and to my surprise, after allowing the most liberal increase for population, since our last decennial census was taken, allowing 100,000 to be added to the population from 1901—and that would be at the rate of 1,000,000 during a decade, I think I was liberal enough in my allowance—even after making such an allowance I find there was no decrease whatever, for five years to 1902 that there was actually an increase. The hon. gentleman told us also that in 1896 the average rate of taxation was 18·28 for 1901, he quoted his erroneous figures of 16·06, making a difference of 2·22. This is a point which I wish to draw attention to. Why, he said, that was not simply a decrease of 2·22, it was a decrease of 12 per cent—a most astonishing statement for the hon. gentleman to make. Now, if he would simply decrease it about a third more than he has done, about ·71, he would bring the total decrease up to about 16 or 17 per cent, and we would have no taxation at all. That just shows how utterly absurd the hon. gentleman's statement is. Of course he means 12 per cent of the rate of duty, but he intends that statement to go to the country as a reduction of 12 per cent in the duty. That was his intention. He intended that statement to be read by the farmers of the country who, through his speech will be told that the duty is 12 per cent on an average lower than it was. I cannot say that he is honest. I do not like to use harsh terms, but that statement has been made by other hon. gentlemen in this House and it is a statement that should not have been made.

Then the hon. gentleman spoke very boldly about the preferential tariff and asked: Why do you not move to repeal it? If we had fifty of a majority on this side of the House, we would very soon repeal it. I would have no hesitation any day recording my vote in this House to wipe out the present preferential tariff. I never favoured it. I do not expect to live long enough to be able to favour a one-sided preference such as we have now. I am a Canadian, Canada first is my motto, and if there are preferences to be given I am going to give them to Canada. I do not intend now to discuss the effect of the preferential tariff. If I had anything to say now I would limit the importation of goods coming into this country under the preferential tariff to goods wholly made in Great Britain. And I would do more than that; I would limit the imports under the preferential duty to goods imported through a Canadian seaport. If we did that I believe we would maim and wound and hamper this preferential tariff so

that it would not be so much of an injury after all, but, if we cannot get rid of it in that way, let the government bring down a resolution to remove that preferential tariff, and on that question I will assure them that they will have my hearty support.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) had better do it instead.

Mr. HENDERSON. We practically are doing it now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, you are not.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) told us so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well do it.

Mr. HENDERSON. He said that our resolution in favour of adequate protection and then a reciprocal trade preference within the Empire, but adequate protection first means practically the repeal of the one sided preferential tariff, and it is embodied in that. The hon. gentleman may not see it, but the day is coming when he will see it. I trust that the day will not be very far distant. I am prepared to vote for a bald motion to repeal it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Move the motion.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not speak for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, but I presume there is very little difference of opinion on the subject.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Make a motion.

Mr. HENDERSON. And in the country there is very little difference of opinion on that question. It is not a policy that has met with the approval of this country. Of course, the sentiment is very nice. It is a nice thing to do something for the mother country, but as we have heard an hon. gentleman say, a 12½ per cent preference would have accomplished all the sentiment that a 33⅓ preference would accomplish. I do not think that the people of Great Britain fully appreciate Canada's preference, and they did not appreciate us one whit more when we lowered the rates of duty. How many people in Great Britain know that there is a preferential tariff? Very few of them take more of our products because of that tariff. I will venture to say that out of the forty millions of people in Great Britain, not twenty millions know that there is a preferential tariff. I will undertake to say that there are millions of people in Great Britain who do not know but that Canada is part of the United States. It is absurd to say that they are buying our products because we give them a preference. What does the workingman's wife, when she goes to the butcher shop in the morning to buy her bacon, her hams, or her eggs know about the preferential tariff? She does not buy Canadian products at all. The products of Canada are not consumed by the working classes of England. Our hams, our bacon, our butter and our cheese are bought up at the highest prices by the wealthier classes in Great Britain. The working classes consume the products of the American farms, and the curse of the preferential tariff is that instead of providing a market for Canadian goods in this country, or in the old country, we are doing all we can to provide a market for the products of the American farmers, our competitors.

Just a few words as I pass along in reference to some remarks made by some hon. gentleman. I find that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes), the other night made a very nice speech, and I must compliment him on it. It was the most erratic speech I have heard for some time. He said the national policy was rejected by the people in 1896 and again in 1900. We know perfectly well that the national policy did not decide the elections of 1896. I need not elaborate that for a moment. There is not a man in this House who will contend that the trade question of this country decided the fate of the government at that time, or in 1900 again as he contended. In the province of Quebec I think that the popular cry was 'Laurier,' 'Laurier,' where they did not stop to inquire what kind of a policy he favoured. It reminds me of a little story that I heard the other day. the right hon. leader of the House ran in the constituency of Richmond and Wolfe. It was just after he became a member of the administration of Alexander Mackenzie, away back in 1877 or 1878. It was reported through the constituency that he was a minister. The people voted against him. They did not believe in having a minister in parliament, and therefore they would vote against him. It is very peculiar sometimes what questions turn an election. In the province of Ontario I will undertake to say that the government did not gain anything from what they call their revenue tariff. Let me look around. I see the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Clare). Did you ever hear of a protectionist being elected for South Waterloo before? No, but the people of that intelligent riding rejected the Liberal candidate who supported this revenue tariff. I look around and I see the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Tolton). Just fancy the redoubtable James McMullen having been laid aside after his advocacy of free trade principles for 18 long years and being succeeded by my hon. friend. Is there any evidence in that that the national policy was rejected by the people of Ontario? Then, I see the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. McGowan) leaving behind our old and esteemed

friend Mr. Semple, an ardent supporter of anything in the nature of free trade or a revenue tariff. Then I notice my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) who defeated a man who had some four or five hundred of a majority, and came out with a very respectable majority, condemning the policy of the government in that respect. The election of my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Richardson), who is unfortunately absent to-night on account of sickness in his family, is another instance in which the policy of the government was condemned. Look at my hon. friend here from North Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Lavell), and look at my hon. friend sitting next to him from Cardwell (Mr. Johnston). They are all over. The woods are full of them, and when the government again comes to appeal to the province of Ontario let me tell them that a revenue tariff is not a policy on which they will appeal if they are going to succeed in the country. How is it that there are a hundred members on that side of the House who dare not rise and support the government, who are compelled to sit mum and not say a word on behalf of the government that they are going to vote for. How is that ? I will undertake to say that there are hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who dare not go into their ridings and tell the people that the government are justified in putting cream separators on the free list ; and yet these hon. gentlemen are going to vote against the resolution of the hon. leader of the opposition, and they are going to go home and justify their vote by saying that it was a motion of want of confidence, while at the same time they are voting against their own conscience.

Here is a peculiar thing that I am going to read. Within the next two months the hon. G. W. Ross is going to appeal to the electors of Ontario. He is an astute politician, and he knows the sentiment of the people of his province perhaps as well as any member in this House. In the budget debate in the Ontario legislature on the 22nd January last, the hon. G. W. Ross uttered the words which I will read. He knew he was going before the electorate and he knew he had to be in sympathy with the electorate, or otherwise he would not secure their support, and he delivered his speech which was intended to secure the votes of the people of Ontario, and it was a speech in direct opposition to the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentlemen who support the government in this House. Mr. Ross opens out thus :

> It has been, within the last half century at all events, the policy of the governments of all countries to aid in the development of the natural resources of the countries which they respectively represent, to foster the industries which occupy the attention of their citizens, and generally to promote trade and commerce, and by that means add to the wealth and power of the nation.

How different Mr. Ross is from the hon. gentlemen opposite, who tell us we cannot protect the farmers of this country, and that the manufacturers of Canada have no right to government consideration. Mr. Ross knows the sentiment of the people ; he is looking for their votes, and he knows which side his bread is buttered on. He says further :

> The American government, sixty or seventy years ago entered upon a policy of fostering its industries by protection. Germany, France Italy, Russia and latterly the Australian Commonwealth, has followed in the foot-steps of the United States.

Again he says :

> Railways have been built by subvention in land and money, for the development of the latent resources of the country. The states of the Union, including the federal government, have given nearly one million acres of land for that purpose, as well as large cash subsidies. The Dominion government did so for the C.P.R., and no doubt that road would never have been built unless so aided. . . . . The object of my argument is to show that it seems to be admitted all around that a government in modern times has something more to do than merely discharge administrative functions. It has to be the pioneer, if possible, at all events the foster parent, of manufactures and commerce.

How well Mr. Ross can gauge the sentiment of the people of Ontario. He further said :

> It would be an easy thing for a government to say: 'Give us so much money and we will administer the affairs of the country, see that officers are appointed for the various duties, see that checks are issued for salaries'—that would be an easy duty. It is another matter for a government to assume the responsibility of leading the nation, or leading and educating the people to apply their minds to the development of industry, and to the fostering of manufactures or to the development of latent resources, or to any other purpose which may be of more immediate advantage to one or more sections of the country than to the whole country.

Again Mr. Ross says :

> I am proud to be able to say that in the province of Ontario, as well as at Ottawa—we have addressed ourselves to the solution, or rather to the discharge, of that duty. In fact, I do not know but the Dominion government, the Conservative government at Ottawa years ago, realized more quickly than perhaps some of us did—(Opposition members—Hear, hear)—what seemed to be the direction—of universal opinion, I was going to say—or rather the direction of all civilized governments at that time, and, realizing that view, they struck out a course which in many respects has been followed since, and has been accepted by some other countries since that time.

I turn to another page and I will read a few words more.

Mr. POPE. Go on ; it is good.

Mr. HENDERSON. And I suppose the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) will be supporting Mr. Ross very shortly.

Mr. EDWARDS. What about the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson). Is he going to support Mr. Ross ?

Mr. HENDERSON. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Ross is a dead horse.

Mr. HENDERSON. We have a better policy than even Mr. Ross has. What Mr. Ross says further is very delightful reading, and I am sure that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) will endorse it. This is what he says :

No nation that does not aim in certain matters as being self sustaining can be great. No man that does not endeavour to feel that spirit of self-reliance which will enable him to go out and compete with his fellows will ever attain to anything. The Americans have become strong largely by that dominant strain which has permeated American legislation and commerce for the last thirty years, and they have become self-sustaining to a great extent; and the British navy has been dominated by the idea since Nelson's time that the British navy is invincible.

I ask the attention of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) and the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) and a number of these hon. gentlemen opposite who are going to vote against our resolution, I ask their attention to this language which was used by the hon. G. W. Ross :

And so will we Canadians, by being inbued with the same spirit of manufacturing our own goods as far as we can, developing our own resources where we have the means, so will we become self-sustaining, applying ourselves with energy and tact to whatever comes to hand.

Well, Sir, if the Conservative party comes into power I would not at all object to giving the hon. G. W. Ross a seat amongst us in this House if he still retains sentiments of that kind, as I have no doubt he will. These are the sentiments of the Prime Minister of Ontario, and he is now wooing the electors, and he believes in making a people self reliant by aiding them and fostering the industries of the country. He speaks in that way because he is speaking the sentiments of the people of Ontario.

Now, Sir, I come to deal with the amendment offered by the hon. leader of the opposition—this doubtful resolution as gentlemen opposite say. I come to deal with this resolution which we are told no member on that side of the House can understand. I am surprised at that. To my mind it is a piece of very plain Queen's English, and I do not understand why it is so unintelligible to them. I wonder if they understand what a revenue tariff means ? I know that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Holmes) was perfectly at a loss the other night to understand the difference between a revenue tariff and a protectionist tariff. He thought it was somewhere between 25 and 30 per cent. I may be very ignorant of things of that sort, but I thought a revenue tariff was one imposed on articles which we do not produce in the country. If you put a tax on tea or coffee, that is a tariff for revenue only, because we do not produce tea or coffee in this country. If you put a tax on raw sugar, that is a tariff for revenue only, because we do not produce raw sugar in this country. If you put a tax on apricots, prunes, and other dried fruits which we get from California—and I think every dollar of duty should be taken off these things—that would be a tariff for revenue, because it does not interfere with any industry in this country. Take the duty off tea, or coffee, or sugar, and you will not hurt the woollen industry of this country or any other industry. On the contrary, you will help it, because you will enable the workingman to get his tea and coffee and sugar cheaper. The fact is these hon. gentlemen have not got a revenue tariff at all, although they call it by that name. Whether it is adequate or not they do not know, because they do not seem to know the meaning of adequate. The Minister of Finance finds that it is not adequate, because he has to add six millions more to the debt of the country. I do not suppose it is my duty to schoolmaster hon. gentlemen as to the meaning of the word adequate. If it were, I would tell them it is exactly the opposite of inadequate. We know when an industry is not adequately protected. I think I have something here which will give an idea of what adequate protection is. The Canadian Textile Directory states that in 1885 there were 107,879 spindles running in the woollen industry of this country; that is, the industry that is making cloth; I have no reference to looms or cards. Under the benign influence of adequate protection, the number of spindles had increased in 1899 to 194,086, nearly double. Now I think hon. gentlemen will see what adequate protection means. It means that there are more goods made in the country, more work for the workingmen, a better market for beef, mutton, cheese, butter, eggs and all other products, which are consumed in the country. Now go back two years and a half to the time the preferential tariff took effect on the woollen industry, because it was only then that serious injury began to be felt. Since that time we find that there were new mills or additions to old ones to the extent of 3,960 spindles, but during that same time there were closed out 10,705 spindles, a total loss of 6,745 spindles. Here is an evidence of what inadequate protection produces. I will trouble the House to read an extract from this very valuable journal. After quoting the figures which I have given, it says this :

While in previous periods there has been an increase in the manufacturing capacity of Canadian mills, there has been a new loss since June, 1899 (when the preferential tariff had got into full swing), 6,745 spindles. These figures do not include the mills which are at present idle, but is simply a record of mills that are out of business entirely, either by insolvency,

abandonment by the proprietors, or destruction by fire. It is worthy of passing note that of the half dozen or more mills that have been burned down in the past year or so, not one has been rebuilt. Moreover, the insurance companies have in a number of cases cancelled their policies on woollen mills, and it is difficult to effect new insurance on any terms on small mills. These facts of themselves should be sufficient to convince the government that they have brought disaster on an industry that was once one of the most substantial and prosperous in the country, and which, notwithstanding the periods of depression, showed a steady growth up to the date of the preferential tariff.

And yet we find a minister of the Crown in a western part of this Dominion telling the people of the country—and we find it reiterated in this House, I believe in one instance by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes), that if the woollen industry cannot exist on 23 per cent, it should go under. That is the manner in which they treat men who invested their capital in good faith under a policy which gave assurance that the principle of protection to the industries of this country would be continued. In a banquet speech delivered in Montreal last autumn, the Minister of Finance gave the strongest reason I have ever read why the woollen industry cannot be successfully carried on in this country. He struck the key-note, although I am sorry he is legislating contrary to his convictions to-day. At the banquet in Montreal he said that he deplored the lack of Canadian sentiment. The people of this country, he said, would go a thousand miles to buy goods instead of buying them at home, and it was that lack of Canadian sentiment that prevented people carrying on business in this country. Why, what is the hon. gentleman doing himself? He is actually putting on the statute-books in this country an Act of parliament to legislate away and destroy Canadian sentiment—an Act telling the people of this country that if they buy their goods in Germany, in England, in France, in Austria, he will give them a reduction of 33⅓ per cent off the duty. He is legislating to destroy, instead of encouraging the sentiment which he so much deplored the absence of when talking to the manufacturers in Montreal. Business men all over the country know that the Minister of Finance was correct in that statement. I will undertake to say that fifty Canadian ladies out of every hundred will prefer to buy American-made gloves to Canadian gloves just because they are American, though they may not be so good an article. The same thing applies to shoes. Our people do lack Canadian sentiment, and it is the duty of the government to encourage Canadian sentiment. When the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, now the Prince and Princess of Wales visited this country, you know how thousands and tens of thousands of young voices cheered them and showed an exuberance of loyalty. We were glad to see that display of loyalty, because on that sentiment depends the lives and liberties of the people of this country. We believe that the Duke and Duchess will some day be our King and Queen, and we rejoice that that sentiment is so strong, but what we want is a commercial sentiment in keeping with the loyal sentiment—not a sentiment that will educate our people to go to the old country for our goods. It is quite sufficient for us that we should take our King and Queen and our Governor General from the old country, but we do not want to purchase there everything we require. What we should cultivate in Canada is a commercial sentiment, and I hope that the time is not far distant when the legislation of this country will shape in that direction, and when the Minister of Finance will correct the very thing which he deplored when speaking to the manufacturers at the banquet in Montreal.

I think I have explained pretty fully the meaning of adequate protection. I think that hon. gentlemen opposite understand it. Speaking of taxation, I find that in 1901 we collected in customs duties $28,425,284, and in excise $10,318,266, or a total of $38,743,550. In 1896, on the other hand, we collected a total taxation of $27,759,285, or the taxation in 1901 was increased by $10,984,265. But hon. gentlemen opposite may say that that is increased protection. I say it is nothing of the kind. High taxation does not mean high protection. The fact is that we have too much taxation and too little protection, and that requires to be remedied. We want more protection and less taxation. We do not want to bleed the people white by taxation, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce used to say in days gone by, but there is no danger in doing that if taxation be put on for the purposes of protection. And I reiterate again that the mistake of our tariff is that it has too much taxation and too little protection.

It was said, in the early days of the present tariff, that the Liberals had stolen our clothes. I never said so, but of course when the preferential duty was only 12½ par cent and when on coloured cotton goods and many other goods the duties were practically the same as under the Conservative regime, there was some reason for perhaps coming to the conclusion, without due consideration, that the Liberals had stolen our clothes. But I do not consider that they have done anything of the kind. I am only sorry that they did not, for it would have been better for the country if they had. Their tariff is instead just the antipodes of ours. Ours gave protection with as little taxation as possible, and theirs takes more taxation from the people and gives as little protection as possible. The government could remove raw sugar to the free list and thus reduce taxation by $2,000,000, nearly as much as the reduction by the preferential tariff on goods from Great Britain, which

only amounts to about two millions and a half, and as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has well said, the money does not go into the pockets of the consumers. I question if one dollar of it finds its way into his pocket. I believe it all goes into the pockets of the manufacturers of the old country and the importers in this country. When you get it down to the consumer, it is so infinitesimally small that you cannot divide it. What would signify the reduction on a yard of cotton, retailing at five cents, even though there was one-eighth of a cent taken off the duty. The dealer gets it every time. An hon. gentleman opposite—I think the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) was boasting about the great reduction on locks from the duty on which two and a half per cent was taken. Well, that article costs about six to ten cents, and I wonder whether he or his customer gets the benefit of the reduction. I am one of those who believe that adequate protection does not increase the prices of goods. We never had cheaper cotton goods or woollen goods in this country than when the national policy was in full swing, and I am prepared to return to that policy in its entirety. I am satisfied that under it people would get a better and cheaper class of goods than they do to-day. We may possibly be getting a class of woollen goods at lower prices, but they are not the quality that we got years ago, and for quality and price combined they are not at all equal to what we got under the Conservative regime. If we only could buy our goods in the United States free of duty, these hon. gentlemen say, how much cheaper would we get them. They want to buy agricultural implements in the United States, which is one of the highest protected countries in the world. But why not protect our own country and then get cheaper goods here ? Why do we go to the United States to buy $62,000,000 of dutiable goods ? Evidently because we get them cheaper. But why not imitate their policy, and by protecting our own manufactures be in a position to get the goods cheaper at home and not have any freight to pay, and besides furnish a home market for the products of the farm. Every farmer would be delighted to have the better market which would be furnished him at home if these $62,000,000 worth of goods were manufactured in this country. The hon. Minister of Customs tried to persuade us this afternoon that the Americans, who sold goods in Canada, simply sold them at so much less because of the preferential tariff. If the hon. gentleman will take the matter into his consideration, I think he will find the reverse to be the case. Take an article, which we may buy indifferently in the United States or Great Britain or France or Germany or Belgium. Last year I illustrated my argument by a spool of thread to show how much the people were robbed by this preferential tariff. I showed how they had to pay $1,000,000 more for spool thread in consequence of this preference. I may take that simple article because small things often serve better the purposes of illustration than large ones. A spool of thread of 200 yards, six cord, is identically the same whether made in the United States, Great Britain, France or Belgium. If I can buy that article in the United States and lay it down in Canada after paying 25 per cent duty, just as cheaply as I can by purchasing it in Great Britain and paying 17 per cent duty and freight, of what advantage is the preferential tariff to me ? If I cannot do better in Great Britain, of what advantage is this preference ? As a matter of fact, I cannot. We buy just as cheaply in countries which pay a duty of 25 per cent as in Great Britain which pays only 17 per cent, and that fact is evidence to me that Great Britain does not sell that class of goods any cheaper than the United States. The fact is the British manufacturer will not sell the thread cheaper. Of course, it costs about 8 per cent more to get it into Canada from the United States than from Great Britain. The British manufacturer knows that, so he simply adds 8 per cent to his price and makes us pay 8 per cent more than we would pay in the United States. The statement is as absolutely correct as that of the Minister of Customs. In England there is a combine that keeps up the price of that article so that you cannot get it at its actual value. This proves the case conclusively that you can buy the article cheaper in a country where there is not a preferential tariff, in the big protection countries such as the United States, France and Germany. We buy $112,000 worth of thread from the United States and pay 25 per cent duty, and we buy $131,000 worth from Great Britain and get it in under a 17 per cent duty. This is conclusive proof that the British manufacturer adds the 8 per cent to the price of his goods and makes that much more money out of the Canadians.

I have already referred to the question of the woollen goods, I stand by what I said. My experience is that these goods were cheaper under the national policy and better also than they are at the present time. Now, we have been told over and over again that the agriculture interests of this country cannot be protected. I am one of those who believe that the agriculture interest is well protected. Do we not spend hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly in the experimental farms for the benefit of agriculture ? And the provincial government is doing the same thing. All over the country we have these experimental farms. Then, look at what we are spending for cold storage. Cold storage is not necessary for the shipment of manufactured goods but for the benefit of the farmer. We are

practically giving a bonus to the farmers in that class of expenditure. And by protecting other industries, I say, we are protecting agriculturists. Take the woollen industry. What is the woollen industry but a by-product of agriculture? And it is out of the by-products that the money is made very often. For instance, everything from axle grease to chewing gum is made out of petroleum. The profit is not made so much out of the coal oil as it is out of the by-products. Unless you can gather up and dispose of the by-products your main article of the manufacture may result in a loss. We have been told that the woollen industry should go down if it cannot live under a duty of 23 per cent. When the hon. minister says that I wonder if he thinks that the Intercolonial Railway which in the last five years has cost us $13,000,000 more than we have received from it, should be closed up. I wonder if the hon. gentleman does not consider that the government of this country should resign because they cannot run the country without a loss of $6,000,000. The woollen industry buys the wool from agriculturists and this class are benefited to the extent that it makes a market for their wool. We know it to be a fact that, since the time the preferential tariff came into full effect, the price of wool in this country has gone down. The farmer does not realize the profit that he did formerly, and there is no hope that under this government the industry is to be put on a sound footing. I regret to see, I think it was in an evening paper, an item which would indicate that the cotton industry cannot be successfully carried on in Canada against the competition that is brought to bear upon it, as was so fully explained a short time ago by my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). I notice that at the annual meeting of the Dominion Cotton Mills Company, only yesterday, it was announced that no less than $312,000 was their loss on last year's business. How long is the Dominion Cotton Company going to stand that? But all the sympathy they get from hon. gentlemen opposite is: If you cannot work under the present tariff, you may go under. These hon. gentlemen kill the industry by slow degrees. Now, not only does the woollen industry buy the wool from the farmers, but the people engaged in that industry afford a market for perishable products of the farm, products that cannot be sent abroad to a market. So these industries, like the woollen, cotton and other industries are the by-products of the agriculture industry. And just as these by-products thrive so will thrive the great industry of agriculture. Until these various industries are in a healthy and prosperous state, the agriculturists need never expect to acquire great wealth. I read in a newspaper a few days ago, apropos of this point, that a gentleman in Toronto, a dealer in hogs—and that is a very important industry in this country—was asked how it was that hogs were higher in Buffalo than in Toronto. The answer to that was very simple; it was that, in the United States, they consumed 80 per cent of their hog products and exported 20 per cent, but we in Canada consume 20 per cent and export 80 per cent. This shows the importance of having such industries as the woollen industry and the cotton industry to give employment to working people and to create a market in this country for as much of the products of our farms as possible. It is estimated—and I presume it is a fair estimate—that the entire products of the farmers of this country in one year would be worth about $400,000,000. We export about $80,000,000 of that, or about 20 per cent, and we consume about 80 per cent. What a grand thing it would be for this country if we could find a home market for a much larger percentage. We should not then be troubled so much about the transportation problem, the providing of facilities for taking goods out of the country. What we want is to get people into the country and to get live industries here, as was suggested by the Hon. G. W. Ross, who says that this is necessary in order to make Canada self-reliant. When we can do that, then the value of what is consumed at home will be increased and the country will be benefited. They tell us that under protection there are combines. But combines exist in Great Britain under free trade. So much has been said on the subject of coal oil that I almost fear to touch it. But one thing I do know is that, under the tariff in force prior to 1897, we had cheaper coal oil than we have had since, and cheaper, I believe, than we shall have until the policy of the government is changed. I do not believe that, under our style of government, variable and very liable to be turned out at any time, you can get men in Canada who will invest their money in enterprises to bring about the same competition that we had before and keep the prices down. Coal oil is now at a wholesale price, at any rate in all points of western Ontario, 3 cents a gallon higher than it was five years ago; and as I said before, I do not believe that we will ever get back to the old price. So much for this tariff of high taxation and low protection.

Now, I referred a short time ago to what the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) said about the national policy being rejected. He gave two or three instances, and I want to refer to them before I go any further. He not only said that the national policy had been rejected in 1896, but that it had been condemned recently in several instances, and one instance he referred to was Beauharnois. I thought that he had a great deal to be proud of when the majority was reduced by one-half in a by election. I thought that was a condemnation of the government policy and an

approval of adequate protection. Then he referred to some other cases. He did not refer to Laval, represented by my hon. friend here (Mr. Leonard). He did not say a word about that county, where a majority in favour of the government of between 300 and 400 was converted into a minority. He never mentioned St. James division, Montreal, where a majority of 1,600 odd was reduced by 1,000 ; and if there had not more ballots come out of the box than went in, it might have been wiped out altogether. He did not say a word about Lisgar, yes the riding of Lisgar, where the Minister of the Interior fought until he almost bled, and had to go to a watering place to resuscitate his shattered nerves after the shock he received up there, after suffering a defeat of 400—because the government candidate polled 400 less votes than were polled against him, an utter condemnation, even in free trade Manitoba, of this principle of inadequate protection.

Mr. McCREARY. What about the Conservative candidate in that county ?

Mr. HENDERSON. There were two sets of candidates, one was for the government and the other was against it, and the gentleman who was running in the interest of the government polled fewer votes than the other two who opposed the Government. Therefore, the government were defeated, and the Minister of the Interior got ill from it, and had to go down to the southern states in order to recuperate.

An hon. MEMBER. What about West York ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Why, the government candidate became a protectionist, and he cannot open his mouth in this House to-day.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. gentleman has misrepresented the case in Lisgar. The Conservative candidate, the only one of the three who advocated a raise in the tariff, lost his deposit.

Mr. HENDERSON. All right. But the facts are plain that there was a government candidate there supported by the Minister of the Interior with all the machine force, no doubt, which he could bring into play. I am not finding any fault with him, he wanted to support his government. There were two other men running, they were both opposed to the government and the two polled more votes than the government candidate polled, a clear condemnation of the government from a free trade constituency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize, perhaps, that I am unfair to the House in continuing my remarks at this late hour, but I am waiting for the Minister of Customs to return, and if he stays out until three o'clock I am not sure but I will talk him into the House. I sat here, Mr. Speaker, and listened to the Minister of Customs and heard every word he had to say, and I think it is only fair that he should give us five minutes, at any rate, of his very kind attention.

Now a word about the Minister of Finance and his budget speech. We must refer a little to that, it would not be courteous if we closed this debate without complimenting the hon. gentleman on his very excellent speech. Of course, just as we expected, the old story of Canada's prosperity formed the first chapter ; and in the next budget speech I hope the same old story will be repeated when the hon. gentleman rises to address the House. Every one of us on this side of the House re-echo our great pleasure at the fact that there is a very considerable degree of prosperity in this country. I think the minister perhaps was a little more modest this year in claiming that he was responsible for that prosperity. I think he allowed Providence a little higher percentage this year than he formerly allowed. Last year the hon. gentleman seemed to be getting somewhat pessimistic. Two years ago he warned us that the pendulum that swings one way to-day is going to swing another way to-morrow, and he had some vision of a near future when the pendulum was going to swing back. I am glad that it has not swung back yet, I am glad he is not as good a prophet as we took him to be. But last year he had another vision. He thought we were on the crest of the wave, and he seemed to think we had gone just as far as we could go for two or three years, and he said in all probability Canada will take a rest. He did not think she would slip back, but he thought there would be a rest. Now, I can quite understand why the hon. gentleman was so nervous about Canada's position ; I can quite understand why he thought we were arriving at a period of rest when there would be no further improvement. The hon. gentleman was aware of the fact that new life and energy had been infused into this new Dominion of ours by reason of the national policy, and that under a system of higher taxation with less protection that energy was becoming exhausted. Realizing that fact, the hon. gentleman began to think that possibly there would be a reverse. Of course I give the hon. gentleman credit for having something to do with the prosperity of this country. I believe he has had something to do with it, at any rate the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has, perhaps even more than the Minister of Finance. We know that you cannot expend $20,000,000 of money in the Dominion of Canada on public works, even if many of them are useless, without benefiting the people among whom it is expended. If you throw that money broadcast throughout the country it is going to help trade, there is no question about it. So to that extent I believe the hon. gentleman did help to bring about prosperity in this country. I remember well the time the Grand Trunk Railway was built,

about the year 1856, through the county that I live in. Large sums of money were expended, and though there was a cry of hard times, the people in that riding were enabled to tide over those hard times. Tens of millions of pounds sterling were spent in Canada, and it was the salvation of the country at that time. But what I complain of is this; Although admitting that the expenditure of large sums of money will benefit us, the present is the wrong time to spend it. The time for a large expenditure, in my opinion, is not in years of prosperity, but in years of adversity. Now is the time that we should be reducing our public debt. Instead of adding $6,000,000 of money to the debt, we should be taking off $5,000,000 or $6,000,000. If we have a surplus we ought to apply that to a reduction of the national debt and preserve our great resources, our great wealth, our borrowing powers for the time when the lean years come, when the pendulum swings back and when we need help to tide over these years. Then Canada would never need to take a rest but would go on and on for ever.

Since the advent to power of hon. gentlemen opposite we have disbursed $250,550,000, an enormous amount of money to expend even in this big country. We have only collected $228,677,000 so that we have actually disbursed $21,873,000 more in five years than all our revenues amounted to. Of course, I desire to be fair to the hon. Minister of Finance. A portion of that is applied to the reduction of our debt by means of what is called the sinking fund. Here, I am going to take issue with the hon. Minister of Finance. I do not think that the sinking fund is treated in a fair way. Each and every year the sinking fund is charged to the consolidated fund account and then immediately on the other side it is deducted from the account and applied in reduction of the present year's indebtedness. What is the meaning of a sinking fund? Every hon. member has been connected with municipal institutions. You borrow money for a period of twenty, thirty, or forty years and you issue bonds or debentures. You lay past a certain sum of money each year to meet this indebtedness as it falls due. What would you think of a municipal officer, who, instead of saving the sinking fund to meet these debentures twenty years hence, simply applied it to the present year's purposes. If he did so in the province of Ontario he would be put in jail because there is a penalty provided for that sort of thing. He is compelled to invest it for the purpose for which it is designed. But here you do it in another way with the result that the country does not realize the actual fact that our deficit each year is much larger than it really appears. Next year it appears only as six millions, $6,000,000, but if you take into account the sinking fund it will actually be about $8,500,000. The hon. Minister of Finance brings it down to $6,000,000 by deducting the present year what should be deducted in years to come. The United States have adopted the principle I suggest. Of course, during the first three of the last five years they had a great war on hand and they were compelled to use all their revenues for the purpose of paying their war expenses, but during these few years, these years of prosperity they have been putting past money to pay off the national debt. They have set aside in two years $157,000,000. They have not spent all their revenues. They are making provisions for days of adversity in times of prosperity. They are preparing for adversity and when the pendulum swings back they will be able to utilize this $157,000,000 for general purposes to help the country, to reduce taxation and in some other ways to assist the people to tide over their difficulties and thus we will expect that in the United States, with such foresight, good times will continue while we in this country must suffer for our improvidence in making no provision in the fat years for the lean years that are sure to follow.

I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to the manner in which the Public Accounts of the Dominion are kept. I believe the time has come and I know it is the feeling in the country that the people ought to know where we stand in regard to finances. As a matter of fact the people do not know. Last year fifty or seventy-five per cent of the people were under the impression that we had a surplus of $5,648,333. That is what goes forth to the country and our local newspapers will publish the statement that the surplus is so much. They forget to tell the people in many instances, or to make it plain, that this is simply the difference between the two sides of the consolidated account, whereas there is a large sum charged to capital account. Last year the total disbursements were $57,982,866, and our total receipts $52,514,701, showing a deficit of $5,466,533. Now, that is a statement that ought to go to the people and if the hon. gentleman persists in keeping books by double entry I say that he ought in fairness to the people, in large type, over and above the whole thing, print one statement that will show them exactly how the finances stand. At the expiration of the present year, ending June, 1902, we are told that the revenue will be $56,800,000 and that the expenditure on consolidated fund account will be $51,000,000, leaving a surplus of $5,800,000. To the ordinary reader that is very satisfactory. It looks nice. But, we have a capital expenditure of $14,250,000 which, added to $51,000,000 of expenditure on consolidated fund account makes a total expenditure of $65,250,000. As the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) says it is the vastest expenditure that has been. Then

the hon. Minister of Finance tells us that this government has increased the national debt simply by $6,000,000 instead of $8,450,000 which is actually the case as his result of manipulating—I do not use the word in any offensive sense—the sinking fund of this country. Now, just one word in answer to the statements made by a great many hon. gentlemen who claim credit for the government of this country for having done a great deal to bring about the present era of prosperity. No hon. gentleman seemed to argue that the imports of the country have very much to do with the prosperity, but they talked largely about the exports and to my mind the exports are a very good test of the country's prosperity—that is what we export out of the country and realize money for. But all exports are not evidence that the country is becoming wealthier. We can extract gold from the mine or coal from the mine, which is so much national capital taken out. I do not know that the government have in any way helped to increase that export. The total exports of Canada for last year were $196,487,632, of which there were foreign products and coin and bullion to the amount of $19,056,246, leaving the net exports of home products for 1901 at $177,431,386. In 1897, the first year in which the Liberals were really in power, the first year when they controlled the affairs of this country, the net exports of the country were $123,632,540, showing that there was an increase in the preferential tariff period of exports of $53,798,846, a very creditable increase.

But how much of that was the government responsible for? How much did they influence? The increase of the products of the mines from 1897 to 1901 was $29,068,763. I don't think the government caused one dollar's worth more to be dug out of the ground than would have been if the Conservative party were in power. The increase of agricultural products from 1897 to 1901 was $6,798,846. I am not aware that the government claim any credit for the increase. They had a crop of 60,000,000 bushels of wheat in the North-west this year, against possibly 30,000,000 last year. Surely the government would not claim credit for the difference. They have no right to claim any credit for any increase in the export of purely agricultural products. It is a fact that in 1898 we shipped 10,000,000 bushels of wheat to the old country more than we did in 1901. The government did not control that. In 1897 we exported 1,000,000 barrels of apples more than we did in 1901, simply because we had 1,000,000 barrels of apples more to export. As far back as 1893, even before the cold storage system of the Minister of Agriculture, we shipped out of this country $1,000,000 worth more of all kinds of fruit than we did last year. Nobody holds the government responsible for that. I say that the government has no right to claim any credit for these increased exports. We find that when we deduct minerals and agricultural products which together gave an increase of $35,867,614, the balance of the increase is $17,821,232. What is that amount made up of? It is made up of the increase of the products of the fisheries, of the forests, of animals and their products and of manufactures. I go back to 1893 and 1897; I take the previous four years to see how it compares. You will be surprised to find that in the last four years of the old regime the increase in exports in articles that the government might control was actually about as large as the increase during the past four years, the difference being only $2,014,232. Of that $2,000,000 of increase during the last four years, I wonder how much the government was responsible for? What have they done to increase these exports? One very large item of that increase is $1,742,946 for agricultural implements exported last year. They tell us: See what we have done for agricultural implements; why, we have reduced the duty on iron and we have reduced the duty on steel and we are helping the manufacturers so that they can make implements to send to foreign countries. Well, the old government gave as large protection as the present government to the manufacturers of agricultural implements. Under the old government the rule existed with regard to rebates on exported articles, so that the present government has done nothing more to encourage the export of agricultural implements, or carriages or hardware or machinery of any kind, than the old government did. The whole thing is worked on the same principle as formerly, and therefore this government is not entitled to any credit for that.

I desire to close my remarks, Sir, by drawing attention to one other matter, and I am sorry the Minister of Customs has not put in an appearance, because the condition of affairs I desire to draw attention to is one of the most deplorable that exists in the country. I say that the farmers of this country; the great producing classes of this country are unfairly treated in this preferential tariff. We on this side say that it is an unsatisfactory tariff and our resolution is put in that way. It is unsatisfactory because it imposes too much taxation and gives too little protection. It is unsatisfactory because it gives us no new markets and has closed up the second best market that this country had for the products of Canada. We are voting conscientiously when we say that that Liberal government tariff is an unsatisfactory tariff, and I cannot for the life of me see how the Minister of Public Works is going to come here tonight to vote against that resolution after the declaration which he made in Montreal when he said he was born a protectionist and had no reason to change his faith, and

that he could not for the life of him see why we could not be protected in this country just as well as the people of the United States. But what I desire to refer to more particularly is the preferential tariff as it has affected our market in Germany. I am not going to discuss the question as to whether German discrimination against Canada has been brought about by reason of this preferential tariff or not. I think that is admitted on all hands. If there had been no denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties there would be no discrimination against Canada by Germany. That is admitted and I leave it at that. What is the position we now find ourselves in. Against Canada in Germany they put up 43 cents per hundred pounds of a discriminating duty against our butter. That is a considerable discrimination against us. On beans they have a discrimination of 3¼ cents; on oats a discrimination of 4⅓ cents; on peas a discrimination of 3¼ cents. That is the difference between the conventional tariff and the general tariff. Of course we have been giving offence to Germany by the denunciation of the German treaty and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, when in Toronto a year or so ago, was very careful to tell the people there that he was instrumental in having the treaties denounced. Therefore the government must take the full responsibility for this discrimination against Canada. On rye, there is discrimination of 9 1-12 cents against Canada, and on wheat a discrimination of 9½ cents against Canada. I read an extract from a Berlin paper on March the 19th, the very day after the budget speech of the Finance Minister the 'Berliner' declared :

> Canada is, economically speaking, a completely autonomous state and therefore she cannot establish differential duties in favour of England without exposing herself to retaliatory measures.

That is what a leading Berlin paper wrote the day after the budget speech was delivered in Canada. They say that Canada being responsible for her own tariff, she must take the consequences if she persists in doing what she has done.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) to condemn the denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I condemn it if it is for the purpose of securing a one-sided preferential tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is aware that both political parties for years desired the abrogation of these treaties?

Mr. HENDERSON. Not for the purpose of obtaining a one-sided preference.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No matter what the purpose is.

Mr. HENDERSON. The purpose is everything. That was only one part of the policy of the Conservative party, but no such wild policy would have ever been adopted by the Conservative party as a policy calculated to destroy Canadian industries and Canadian agriculture.

Now, I want to show how we are handicapped in that country by this policy. I picked up the 'Globe' newspaper of the 14th of March, containing the market reports of the 13th of March ; and I find that on that day red wheat No. 2 was selling at Buffalo at 88 cents, whereas at Toronto the highest price quoted for it was 78 cents, or just 10 cents less than the price at Buffalo. The Buffalo man could send his wheat to Germany and realize on it 10 cents a bushel more than the Toronto man. Consequently the farmer who drove his wheat to the Buffalo market got 10 cents a bushel more for it than the farmer who took his wheat to the Toronto market. At Liverpool on the same day red wheat sold at 87⅜ cents. It used to be said that Liverpool ruled the market, but under the preferential tariff Buffalo fixes the price of wheat. Germany last year took from the United States more wheat than the entire export from the Dominion of Canada to Great Britain, and this is the market that is closed against us, while German goods are allowed to come into Canada under the preference at a reduction of 33⅓ per cent. The same thing could be said about rye. On the 13th of March rye sold at Buffalo at 65½ cents and at Toronto at 58 cents. In 1901 Canada exported to Britain 9,739,759 bushels of wheat, to Germany we sent only 28,369 bushels. This may have been inferior wheat. We know that we have damaged grain, we can find a market for it in Germany when the millers in England and Scotland will not buy it ; but even for damaged grain we are practically excluded from that market. In the same year the United States sent to Germany 10,267,622 bushels of wheat, or more than all the wheat we exported from the Dominion of Canada. I listened to hon. members from Manitoba and the North-west talking about their need of transportation facilities, and telling us of the millions of bushels of wheat that were lying about the country in bags exposed to atmospheric influences and liable to be destroyed for the lack of the means of transportation ; and yet these hon. gentlemen are ready to vote for a policy which prevents this wheat being sent to Germany through the United States. Any port in a storm would be my policy, and if we could not get transportation for our products through the Dominion of Canada I would send them through the United States and out by New York. But even if we did so, we could not take advantage of the German market, because when an attempt was made a short time ago to export from Manitoba through New York, mixing it with Ameri-

can wheat, the fact was discovered by the German consul, and it was stopped. We were not permitted even to smuggle our wheat to the German market through New York. Germany is determined not to trade with a people who refuse to trade on equal terms with it. I wonder at these hon. gentlemen from the North-west talking about that loss, while they are ready to vote for a preferential tariff which shuts them out of a market where they could get 10 cents a bushel more than they do for the article which they produce in the largest quantities. How do they expect us in the older provinces to provide better means of transportation if the farmers of Ontario and Quebec and the other provinces as well as the manufacturers are to be handicapped by the very policy they are voting for? If these hon. gentlemen would join us in voting down this preferential tariff, and give us an opportunity of doing something to help them, they would find a justification for their votes; but until they do something for the country, I fail to see how they are going to justify themselves to their consitutents. In 1899 Canada exported 327,486 bushels of rye to Great Britain, to Germany we did not send a bushel, but the United States sent to Germany 4,036,554 bushels. By the preferential tariff we have turned that market fully over to the United States. Of barley Canada exported to Great Britain in 1901 2,386,000 bushels, to Germany we did not send a bushel, shut out by the preferential tariff; but the United States sent to Germany 3,385,140 bushels in 1900. Of oats Canada exported in 1901 8,155,000 bushels, but not a single bushel to Germany—the second best market in the world closed to us by reason of the preferential tariff. Of oats the United States sent to Germany in 1900 1,295,609 bushels. Of pease Canada exported to Great Britain in 1901 3,664,389 bushels, and only 60,351 bushels to Germany. In 1901 Canada exported 310,416 bushels of beans to Great Britain, we did not send a dollar's worth to Germany. The same thing applies to butter, of which Canada exported in 1901 16,335,526 pounds, but we did not send a pound to Germany, shut out by reason of the preferential tariff.

Now, I wish to draw attention to this fact, that notwithstanding that we are excluded from the second best market in the world for our agricultural products, we are to-day taking large quantities of manufactured goods from Germany. We took last year $7,021,405 worth, not including the German goods which were smuggled through the ports of Great Britain by reason of the preferential tariff. We exported to Germany $2,141,552 worth; but these exports were not the home products of Canada. Of home products we only sent her $1,374,716 worth, so that practically our trade with Germany was only fifth or sixth class. Belgium, with a population of 6,000,000, took from us more goods than Germany. In 1901 Belgium took from us $1,728,484, whereas, Germany, with a population of 56,000,000, only took from us $1,374,716 worth. We took from Belgium $3,828,450 worth, or about one-half of what we took from Germany.

I assume that the hon. the Minister of Customs has gone on a journey or he is asleep. If the latter, I hope he sleeps soundly, but I would have been very glad indeed if he had given me the light of his presence. I can assure him that whenever he speaks in this House, I shall, if possible, always be present to hear what he says. Not because what he says is always so very entertaining or interesting, but because I always like to know, when I have to reply to an hon. gentleman, what he has said in order that I may not misrepresent him. When the hon. gentleman said that this government had reduced the rate of taxation, I declare just as emphatically that they have not, but on the contrary, have increased it, and I should have been glad had the minister been in his place to hear the arguments I advance in support of my contention, and to point out the errors, if he conceived there were any, in these arguments. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for the kind attention given to my remarks.

Mr. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not rise at this stage of the discussion, and at this advanced hour of the night, to participate at any length in the debate that is now in progress. I may even say, that it was not my intention, after the many speeches we have heard, to have intervened in the debate; but I feel it to be my duty to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), who has directly appealed to me. I must confess to my astonishment at the new role played by the hon. gentleman who has constituted himself the guardian of public morality, and the champion of the province of Quebec. This is quite a new departure from the record of the hon. gentleman and his friends on the other side of the House. I should rather say that if I wished to account for the splendid isolation—to use a word that is now classical—in which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) finds himself, I should assign no other cause for it than the unwarrantable language used by his own colleagues on the other side of the House.

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), referring to the census, asked whether, after the disclosures made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, in connection with the parish of St. Jean de Matha, in the county of Joliette, it ought to be inferred that all the census enumerators in 1891 have been perjurers? Sir, that was not the charge made by the Minister of Agriculture. I listened very attentively to his speech, the other day. He did not say that

the census enumerators had deliberately perjured themselves, nor did he state that they had received ambiguous instructions, through which they were enabled to stuff the census ; but he said that some enumerators in the province of Quebec, and in other provinces of the Dominion, had unduly swelled the numbers, and exceeded their instructions. Moreover, apart from the county of Joliette, still more shocking facts have been brought to light.

The same conditions, as I said, prevailed also in the other provinces. The hon. member for Bothwell was at a loss to understand how a parish priest, the reverend Mr. Morin, could have presumed to write a letter, in order to contradict facts that had been sworn to by the census enumerator. The hon. gentleman failed to understand how a priest, who has been a resident in this country but for a couple of years, could have given an exact enumeration of the people living in the parish of St. Jean de Matha in 1891. I think all the hon. gentleman's doubts would be removed did he know how scrupulously the registers are kept by the Roman Catholic priests in the province of Quebec.

In each Roman Catholic parish, registers are kept by the parish priest, in which the acts of civil status, such as the acts of birth, of marriage, of burial and the number of communicants are inscribed. In a parish like St. Jean de Matha, where you can hardly find five Protestants, I hesitate not to say that the name of every man, woman and child in the parish is inscribed in those registers, and those registers, mark you, are handed down from generation to generation. It is a well known fact, that there is no religious denomination in the world, the ministers of which keep the registers of civil status with greater care than is shown by the ministers of the denomination to which I may say—though in no spirit of vain glory—that I am proud to belong. Those registers have been kept in our Roman Catholic parishes from time immemorial ; and should you pay a visit to the early settlements of Quebec, you would be surprised to find old dusty registers dating from the French dominion. As early as 1536, under Francis I—and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier may bear witness to what I say—through an ordinance which has become famous, the Roman Catholic priests were bound to keep the registers of civil status in their parishes, missions or chapels. Duplicates of those registers are deposited in the prothonotary's office of the Superior Court.

Mr. F. D. MONK. (Translation.) Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? Does he think that he has succeeded in clearing the province of Quebec from the charge levelled against it, and from the imputation cast on its honour by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) ?

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) Surely, the hon. gentleman is not in earnest, when he so unfairly brings to task the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The hon. minister did not say that the shocking state of affairs described by him prevailed in the province of Quebec alone, because he showed that there had been stuffing of the lists in the counties of Colchester, West Huron, Cornwall, Antigonish and Annapolis.

Mr. F. D. MONK. (Translation.) The hon. minister said it was worse in the province of Quebec than in the other provinces.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) Does the hon. gentleman think that from the fact that a census enumerator is denounced for having violated his oath and having perjured himself, it follows that the whole province of Quebec is besmirched, and that the charge of perjury is fastened upon the whole people of Quebec ? One cannot expect to find absolute perfection here below, even in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, when I rose to address the House, in the French language, I wished to speak out my mind, and so to say, to unbosom myself to the House, as to the general policy of the government ; and I am now going to address myself to this task. Let me say, first, that they were labouring under a strange delusion, who, after 1896, fancied that the Conservatives had laid down their arms. As a matter of fact, the Conservative party were not long in assuming the offensive again. The Liberal party, they said, composed as they are of unruly soldiers and sharp-shooters, will not fail in creating such a disturbance in the conditions of the country with their fiscal policy, as will cause to rise in arms against them the trade interests and the manufacturers of the country. They also said : ' The Conservative party, strongly rooted as they are in the soil, having at their command the long enjoyed assistance of high and powerful influences, supplied as they are with the sinews of war by generous and large-hearted followers, will not be long in resuming the reins of power. As giant Antæus, in the fable, acquired new strength every time he touched the earth, so, they said, the Conservative party will gain fresh energy, and be nerved to new exertions from their crushing defeat. There was not to be found a single man among the Conservatives, who did not believe that the check the party had met with was but a temporary one, and that at the next sound of the bugle the rout of the Liberals would be complete, and their defeat irretrievable.

Mr. Speaker, it is very true that faith will move mountains. But, after the general elections of 1900, and the recent by-elections, our opponents, to use the language of poetry, had to come down from the paradise dreamed of, and to face the cold and stern realities of existence.

I referred, a little while ago, to the splendid isolation in which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier finds himself, a man to whose talents and strength of mind I am happy to pay homage. He is not by no manner of means to blame for that isolation in which he finds himself. The guilty party is the electorate, or should my hon. friend like it better, I shall say that the guilty party is the Conservative party ; because their political record for the last twenty years is one of intestine quarrels, and of family feuds ; so that the hon. gentleman, when surveying the ruins heaped up all around him, may well exclaim : 'Ceci a tué cela.' It was those suicidal quarrels that killed the party.

However, let the hon. gentleman cheer up and remember that parties are by no means eternal. Till brighter days dawn, let him not forget to look after the electorate. I heard, a little while ago, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) tell us a little story, which gives an insight into our political manners. He told us that in 1877, Mr. Laurier, who had just become a minister in the Mackenzie administration, was running in the county of Arthabasca, and that his opponents circulated the report, in the backwood parishes, that he was a Protestant minister. The story told by the hon. member for Halton is perfectly true, and it goes to show—although those who make such silly appeals to prejudices and passions generally fall short of their design—that in the province from which I come they stop at no language, however strong, at no imputations, to compass the defeat of a Liberal. I said that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier knew that the acquaintance of the electorate was worth cultivating. As an instance, I may tell the House that last fall, he addressed the members of the Club Morin of Montreal, and that he did not hesitate to represent the right hon. prime minister as most unworthy of the confidence of his fellow-countrymen. I have not the verbatim report of that speech in hand, but I have here an extract from the Toronto Mail of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman. Here are the headlines :

Laurier Fails in Duty to Quebec. His Premiership of No Aid to French Canadians. Notable Speech by F. D. Monk.

And the 'Mail' goes on to say :

By the very nature of his position Sir Wilfrid Laurier was obliged every day to make concessions. In the same way when the subsidies to the Provinces came up for consideration Prince Edward Island received a bonus. New Brunswick will also receive one, but Quebec's claims are left without consideration. The same thing applied to Experimental farms. Every other province had one, but Quebec was left out. In the Immigration Department, conducted by Mr. Sifton, the French Canadians were practically eliminated. The immigration was directed to the far west, to the detriment of Quebec. Referring to the Montreal harbour works, Mr. Monk said that the necessary works have been delayed for years simply because the government is afraid to do anything for the province of Quebec, which gives Canada its Prime Minister. All along the line Mr. Monk claimed that Quebec Province had gained nothing, but, on the contrary, had lost in prestige and advantages by having one of its own sons at the head of the government.

Those appeals to racial prejudices and passions among French Canadians, against the government, have had the result contemplated by our opponents.

Take, for instance, the county of Laval, where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has succeeded in having a young man of talent returned to parliament. It must be borne in mind that there were two Liberal candidates in the field, and that but for the split in the Liberal ranks, Mr. Wilson, the government candidate would have carried the county. Take as another instance, the county of Beauharnois. Now, in that county, if the old majority of 1900 was not polled in favour of the Liberal candidate, let us not forget that it was owing to the fact that 300 voters of Valleyfield had neglected to have their names registered on the voters' lists. But for that neglect, our fried, Mr. Loy would have been returned by a larger majority. In the electoral division of St. James, Montreal, the fact that the majority polled by our candidate was smaller than formerly —and it is a matter of public notoriety—is due to the split in the Liberal ranks. Let it suffice to say that, up to the very day preceding nomination day, there were two and even three Liberal candidates in the field.

Mr. Speaker, the capital grievance formulated by our opponents against the government is that they have no well defined fiscal policy. The name of Mr. Alexander Mackenzie, the old Liberal leader, has been evoked during this debate, and it has been stated that he was the apostle of free trade ; that his successor, the Hon. Edward Blake had, in his Malverne speech in 1882, pronounced in favour of moderate protection; that later on, the right hon. Prime Minister had successively advocated such platforms as unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, commercial union, a revenue tariff policy, and that finally he had become a worshipper at the shrine of protection pure and simple.

Now, what are the facts ? In 1896, when the Liberal party, after they had passed twenty years in the cold shades of opposition, were put at the head of public affairs by the will of the people, a commission was appointed which held its sittings in the different parts of the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and obtained all kinds of information, during their investigation, from all classes of the community ; and after having gone thoroughly into those informations and grievances, during the session of 1897, the hon. Minister of Finance framed his fiscal policy, and as a consequence, the Fielding tariff was put in force.

What were the results of that policy ? An unprecedented era of prosperity was ushered in and a fresh impetus given to trade and industry.

Of course, Sir, the ideal which is cherished by all friends of liberty is free trade as it is understood in Great Britain. But there is many a slip between the cup and the lip. In a young country like ours, placed as it is in the immediate neighbourhood of the great American republic, I do not know of any rigid and unalterable principle that may be laid down in fiscal matters. Of course our infant industries need protection, but that protection should not be eternal. All depends on the conditions of the country. Did not the hon. Minister of Finance state, upon two different occasions, that the manufacturers should prepare and make provision for the time when, their industries having been built up, the mouldering branches would be lopped off and the duties reduced ? This is a most wholesome warning by which all the interested parties should profit. As I said, in matters fiscal, there is no absolute and fixed principle, and everything depends on circumstances. In the course of this debate, reference was made to the names of Cobden and Bright, the two champions of free trade in England. But does anybody pretend to say that, had they lived under Cromwell, those two champions of commercial freedom would have taken the position they did take in this century ? Was not Sir John Macdonald himself, prior to 1872, a free trader ? And yet, in 1878, he evolved into a full-fledged protectionist. Did not Sir Robert Peel, in 1846, move for the abolition of the Corn Laws, thus passing from protection to free trade ? It was the same statesman who, on the 29th of June, 1846, gave utterance to the following words :

> When proposals are made, apparently at variance with the course which ministers have heretofore pursued, and subjecting them to the charge of inconsistency—it is perhaps advantageous for this country, and for the general character of public men, that the proposal of measures of that kind, under such circumstances, should entail that which is supposed to be the fitting punishment, namely, expulsion from office..... In relinquishing power, I shall leave a name, severely censured I fear by many who, on public grounds, deeply regret the severance of party ties..... I shall surrender power severely censured also by others who, from no interested motives, adhere to the principle of protection, considering the maintenance of it to be essential to the welfare and interests of the country. I shall leave a name execrated by every monopolist who, from less honourable motives, clamours for protection because it conduces to his own individual benefit ; but it may be that I shall leave a name sometimes remembered with expressions of good will in the abodes of those whose lot is to labour, and to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow, when they shall recruit their exhausted strength with abundant and untaxed food, the sweeter because it is no longer leavened by a sense of injustice.

Now, listen to the utterances of Mr. McKinley, the apostle of protection in the United States, when on the day before his assassination, he delivered an address before the immense audience gathered on the exhibition grounds of the world's fair at Buffalo :

> The period of exclusiveness is past.
> The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem.
> Commercial wars are unprofitable.
> A policy of good-will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals.
> Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times. Measures of retaliation are not.

So. Mr. McKinley, who was the champion of high tariffs in the United States, stated that he was in favour of reciprocity treaties, and of entering into negotiations with the South American republics and Canada. All which goes to show, as I said, that the fiscal policy of a country is a growth of the times and circumstances.

But, Sir, to adopt the amendment now under discussion would be to take a step backwards, and to revert to the policy of 1879 ; for if you compare the amendment with the motion brought down by Sir John Macdonald in February, 1878, you will find that they tally, and that the wording is exactly the same. Now, is it desirable for this country to revert to that policy ? In this connection, I beg to submit to the House a few figures, in a tabulated form, which speak for themselves :

Increase for trade of Canada, over 1896..	$150,515,526
Increase for exports of agricultural produce and animals, over 1896.	40,377,553
Increase for exports of cheese, over 1896..	6,740,380
Increase for exports of butter over 1896	2,243,574
Increase for exports of bacon over 1896..	7,111,900
Deposits in banks, in 1895—Conservative regime	183,103,038
Deposits in banks, in 1901—Liberal regime..	315,000,000
Deposits in savings banks, in 1895—Conservative regime	44,450,498
Deposits in savings banks, in 1901—Liberal regime	75,000,000

With such increases, Sir, I say that we have no reason to regret the old regime, to which the hon. leader of the opposition would fain have us revert. The prosperity of the country is so palpable, so clear, that there is no need of statistics to prove it. Why, then, should we revert to the old state of things ?

However, there is also a dark side to the picture. The census, it must be confessed, was a disappointment to all of us. The population of Canada has not increased in the ratio that we had reason to expect it would. Still, from the standpoint of the province of Quebec, I find that we have room to rejoice ; for, from the census re-

ports, not only have Montreal and Quebec added to their numbers, but Valleyfield, St. Hyacinthe, Shawinigan also show an increase. As to the city of Quebec, I am glad to say that it is developing so rapidly that, before many years have elapsed, by reason of its geographical position, it will prove a most dangerous rival to Montreal. I sincerely rejoice in the progress made by the city of Quebec, within the last ten years; the more so, as I have the honour of being one of the representatives from the Quebec region.

Not only have our manufacturing centres progressed; but I wish to emphasize the fact that the increase of population was more particularly marked in the regions opened up to settlement, such as the country to the north of Montreal, the Gatineau Valley, the Temiscaming region, the Lake St. John valley and the Gaspé district. I have no hesitation in saying that in those vast regions there is room for thousands and thousands of hardy settlers who will find there a rich and friendly soil and vast natural resources, yet undeveloped. Those results, I must admit, are due to the labours of our colonization and repatriation societies and to the Quebec government who have spared no efforts, within the last five years, to promote the cause of colonization. In this connection, I may be allowed to quote from a report of the department of colonization for 1901. I find, page 203, that Mr. Lussier, the representative of two railway companies, publishes a tabulated statement showing that, from June, 1900, to June, 1901, 16,011 French Canadians have come back to Canada. The accuracy of those statistics cannot be called in question.

While I am dealing with this question, I would like to offer a suggestion to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). I have no doubt but that the Galicians and the Doukhobors are first-class settlers; but I am free to say that I place more reliance on those Canadians who, though living for the time being in the United States, would be delighted to come back to Canada, should they be offered proper inducements to that effect. I have before me a tabulated statement recently published in the American papers, showing the number of French Canadians in the United States:—

Maine	85,000
New Hampshire	95,000
Vermont	70,000
Massachusetts	310,000
Rhode Island	80,000
Connecticut	60,000
New York	130,000
New Jersey	3,000
Pennsylvania	4,000
Illinois	50,000
Ohio	8,000
Michigan	140,000
Wisconsin	50,000
Minnesota	60,000
Kansas	8,000
Dakota, north and south	15,000
Washington	7,000
Montana	8,000
Washington	7,000
Oregon	5,000
California	10,000
Other states and territories	30,000
Total for the United States.	1,228,000

I humbly suggest to the hon. minister that if he did appoint reliable and competent agents, whose business it would be to do missionary work in the French Canadian centres in the United States, it would result in bringing back to Canada thousands of French Canadians. What I say of the French Canadians applies to many Anglo-Canadians as well who, within the last 25 years, have gone over to the neighbouring states.

From the census question to the readjustment of the subsidy paid by the Dominion government to the provinces is a natural transition. There is, in our constitution, a provision which is most unfair to the two great provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I refer to clause 118 of the British North America Act which provides that the federal grant of 80 cents per head of the population shall remain at that fixed rate, for Ontario and Quebec, whose population is based on the census of 1861; whereas, so far as the other provinces are concerned, that grant of 80 cents per head of their population shall be increased by each subsequent decennial census. Clause 118 reads as follows:—

118. Grants to Provinces.

The following sums shall be paid yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures:—

Ontario	$80,000
Quebec	70,000
Nova Scotia	60,000
New Brunswick	50,000
	$260,000

And an annual grant in aid of each province shall be made, equal to eighty cents per head of the population, as ascertained by the census of one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and in the case of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, by each subsequent decennial census until the population of each of those two provinces amounts to four hundred thousand souls, at which rate such grant shall thereafter remain. Such grants shall be in full settlement of all future demands on Canada, and shall be paid half yearly in advance to each province; but the government of Canada shall deduct from such grants, as against any province, all sums chargeable as interest on the public debt of that province in excess of the several amounts stipulated in this Act.

I say without the least hesitation that this section of the federal Act is most unfair to Ontario and Quebec.

As a matter of fact the west and the maritime provinces, with a total population

of 1,240,000 souls, receive an annual grant of $1,016,649, while Ontario, with a population twice as large, only receives $1,116,572, and Quebec with a population larger by one third, only receives $893,528, or 11 per 100 less than these more favoured provinces. I have just said that this section is unfair, and I shall endeavour to prove it. Here is a comparative tabulated statement giving the decreasing progression per capita of the federal grant of 80 cents paid to the province of Quebec, and also the increasing progression per capita of the amount contributed by the province to the federal revenue :—

Years.	Federal Revenue per head.	Federal Subsidy per head.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
1861	4 05	0 80
1871	5 50	0 75
1881	6 83	0 65
1891	7 96	0 60
1901	9 48	0 55

So, in 1861, the province of Quebec, for the administration of local affairs, received 20 per cent of its contribution to the federal revenue ; but from decade to decade, the rate has decreased from 20 per cent to 14 per cent, from 14 to 9, from 9 to 7, and at last from 7 to 5½ per cent per head of our population ; that is to say, when the proportion of the federal revenue derived from the province of Quebec has increased by 135 per cent, the rate of the subsidy has decreased by 33 per cent. In other words, from 1867 to 1901, our contribution to the federal treasury amounted to over $412,000,000, and the total subsidy paid to the province during the same period, was only $39,315,232.

As far as Ontario is concerned, we are met with a still greater anomaly. From 1867 to 1901, that province has contributed to the federal treasury a total sum of $617,558,902, and the total grant paid to that province, during the same period only amounted to $49,142,368. In that province also, the per capita contribution to the federal revenue has increased by 135 per cent, and the per capita subsidy has decreased by 36½ per cent.

During all that period the other provinces of the Dominion have been receiving 80 cents per head of the population, and in that way they have secured from the Dominion treasury an additional subsidy of $10,410,000, as shown by the following table :—

SURPLUS of the federal subsidy paid to the Maritime Provinces and the West.

——	1871.	1881.	1891.	1901.	Total.
	$	$	$	$	$
Nova Scotia	46,000	56,000	55,000	56,000	2,140,000
New Brunswick	27,000	55,000	56,000	63,000	2,010,000
Prince Edward Island	11,000	23,000	23,000	18,000	750,000
Manitoba	.....	33,000	107,000	182,000	3,220,000
British Columbia	.....	13,000	62,000	154,000	2,290,000
Total from 1871 to 1901	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,410,000

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the same rule had been applied to the two larger provinces, the province of Quebec, for her share would have received from 1867 to 1901, $9,500,000 more, and Ontario would be the richer by $18,000,000. During the present decade, the Quebec yearly subsidy would be $403,253 larger, and the Ontario yearly subsidy would be $617,500 larger.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, in these figures are to be sought the causes that have paralysed, to a certain extent, the development of the two great provinces. The situation is certainly abnormal, to say the least. Why, Sir, the federal government pays annually 80 cents for every immigrant, be he a Chinaman, a Doukhobor or a Galician, that settles in the other provinces, while Ontario and Quebec never had a single dollar for any of the Canadians born since the census of 1861, nor for any of the immigrants that have settled within the limits of these provinces since that date. I say that the revision of the federal constitution in the direction I have outlined is a necessity. Every year the federal government come out with a large surplus, and if they were willing to deal fairly with the two older provinces, which were truly the constituent parts of confederation, they would put in the estimates, under the head of 'federal subsidy,' an additional sum of $1,020,765, that is to say, $403,255 for the province of Quebec and $617,510 for the province of Ontario.

The revision of the constitution in this direction is a pressing need, for in their present situation, there is no inducement to these provinces to increase their population, since every addition to that population

is a new burden upon local revenue and the profit to be derived therefrom goes to the federal treasury.

The provinces that have constituted the federal power must be in a position to carry on effectively the administration of local affairs. Their revenue is out of proportion to the heavy expenditures they have to meet. I do not think I am going too far in saying that they have been deprived of the sources of revenue they should have.

In 1867, the Fathers of Confederation made provision for an amount of $1,500,000 to meet the cost of provincial administration. But it stands to reason that this amount is altogether inadequate, considering their increased population and their increased territory. The expenditure has increased in proportion to the new needs of the provinces. Sir A. T. Galt, the then Minister of Finance, said that a sum of $1,500,000 would amply cover the expenditure for the maintenance of asylums, the administration of justice and other branches of the service. But he had not foreseen the extraordinary development of the provinces. I shall give the House a few figures compiled from the Public Accounts of the province of Quebec.

In 1868, the cost of maintaining the asylums was $97,946.63 ; in 1900, that same service entailed for the province an expenditure of $348,000. The cost of administering justice was $322,000 in 1868, and $661,242.37 in 1900. To-day, the annual subsidy paid by the province to charitable institutions is $100,000 ; the local government pays $184,845 for colonization and $173,759 for agriculture. I maintain that even with the strictest economy it is impossible to curtail by a single dollar these necessary expenditures.

As far as the administration of justice is concerned—I mean criminal justice—we must not overlook the fact that the provinces are, after all, only enforcing federal laws. We must not forget that the expenditure under that head is increasing from year to year, and it is only reasonable that the Dominion authorities should be called upon to provide for the enforcement of their own laws.

The provinces are entitled to live. In the position in which they are, under section 118 of the British North America Act, as the saying goes, they exist, but they do not live. We are told by the champions of federalism : 'There are three ways, for the provinces, to extricate themselves from the entanglement in which they find themselves to-day, that is : direct taxation, loans, sale of public property.'

As far as the province of Quebec is concerned, I might say that the people of that province want no more taxes, no more loans. As to public property, is it right, is it wise to sell it, and deprive thereby our children of their inheritance ?

This is by no means a new question ; it is a question above party politics. In 1883, the first minister of the province of Quebec, Mr. Mousseau, leader of a Conservative administration forwarded to the federal authorities a memorandum to that effect, and the treasurer of the day, the Hon. Mr. Wurtele, held the same views, as did also his predecessor in office, Mr. Robertson.

Later on in 1887, under a Liberal administration, the Hon. Mr. Mercier convened the prime ministers of the different provinces of the Dominion to a conference which was held in Quebec, and resolutions to the same effect were passed with the endorsation of the present first minister of Ontario, Mr. Ross, and the then premiers of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick (Messrs. Fielding and Blair). I do not wish to encroach in the least upon federal rights. Every one is familiar with the title of the pamphlet published by Siéyes, when the States-General were called together in 1789 : 'What is the Third estate? Nothing. What can it be ? Everything.' I say likewise: What are the provinces under the Confederation Act? Nothing, or almost nothing. What can they be ? Something !

Before concluding these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word or two on the question of imperialism, with which the political atmosphere is fairly saturated just now. The South African war, the sending of the contingents, the past and future colonial conventions, editorials published in newspapers and periodicals here and England, a certain decision given by the Privy Council, of which I had occasion to speak in this House, such are the causes that have given rise to a movement hailed with enthusiasm by some and fiercely denounced by others.

To my mind, imperialism made its appearance in this country under three different forms. We had, first of all, political imperialism, then commercial imperialism, and lastly, sentimental imperialism.

Political imperialism, or imperial federation would entail the creation of an imperial parliament, where would meet the representatives of all the colonies. A most zealous promoter of that contemplated federation, a member of the bar, in Montreal, gave the following redistribution of seats in this parliament in London :—

England	465
Wales	30
Scotland	72
Ireland	103
Canada	90
Australia	63
	750

Need I say that such a plan could not stand a thorough examination? Who would ever think of sitting in parliament three thousand miles away from Canada to consider and discuss measures affecting Canadian interests with representatives from India, Cape Colony or Australia ? What would be the influence of ninety Canadian members in a parliament numbering 750

members ? Such a question is settled as soon as it is stated. But then the imperial federation league is no more ; there is no more reason to dread that imperialistic system. Moreover, let us bear in mind that at the colonial conference of 1897, the Prime Minister of Canada himself presented a resolution stating that the political intercourse between England and her colonies should not be interfered with. We know that that resolution was carried by the unanimous vote of all the colonial premiers present at the jubilee festivities.

And lately we have gathered from the correspondence that passed between the Colonial Secretary and the Canadian authorities that the political connection between both countries would not even be discussed, but that the question of our trade relations alone would be debated at the conference following the coronation celebration.

I now come to commercial imperialism which in its concrete form is a policy of reciprocal trade preference within the empire. I have always thought, Mr. Speaker, that to ensure the validity of a contract the co-operation of two parties was required.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask if he favours the present one-sided preference ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Undoubtedly, I favour that one-sided preference because it tends to alleviate the burden of taxation that lay heavy upon the consumers under the old tariff. The volume of our trade with England peremptorily demonstrates that fact. True it is that the colonies, particularly Canada, would be delighted to supply with their produce, the markets of Great Britain, all other nations being excluded. But it must be borne in mind that, barring a few enthusiasts, such as Sir Howard Vincent and others, that proposal has been rejected by the most prominent statesmen of Great Britain. The English people, with their practical common sense, are aware that that reciprocal trade preference, while it would promote colonial trade, would also prompt other nations to fiercely retaliate. Let me quote from a speech delivered in June, 1901, by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, speaking on the resolution of Mr. Fowler, M.P., asking for a 33⅓ per cent reduction of duty on sugar imported from the colonies or His Majesty's Dominions :—

> The Chancellor of the Exchequer said he did not see how it would be possible to make distinctions in the treatment of the colonial products ; and this opened up a prospect of material reductions in the yield of revenue. In pursuance of the same policy, Canada might ask that a duty should be imposed on all corn and flour imported not produced in Canada (hear, hear), and similar claims might be advanced on behalf of Canadian timber, Australian wool, and meat from New Zealand (hear, hear), and so on, through all articles preference would be claimed for colonial produce. (Hear, hear.) But this was not all. When he had done all that, which he supposed would be by mutual concessions, foreign countries would make similar offers for reciprocal treatment, and what would be the answer ? If we agreed, then the colonial preference in favour of the empire would disappear, and we would be caught in the meshes of the 'most favoured nation' clause. (Hear, hear.) If, on the other hand, we refuse to foreign nations the treatment extended to our colonies, what would happen ? We had an export trade with foreign countries double the amount of the trade with our colonies, and were we prepared to risk the loss of this trade by declining to give to foreign countries in return of the same concessions the treatment we gave to the colonies ? He warned the committee of this—that he was aware that while he was speaking there was a strong feeling in Germany upon this subject ; and, if parliament were so ill-advised as to adopt the proposal of his hon. friend, we would run very serious risk of losing that most-favoured-nation treatment for our commerce with Germany we now enjoyed. (Hear, hear.) Having regard to what he had said, he trusted the committee would refrain from imposing on a Chancellor of the Exchequer such difficult conditions as his hon. friend proposed. He believed they would be injurious both to this country and to the colonies, and were based on an entirely mistaken idea of the right fiscal policy. He said that apart from any antiquated notions of free trade to which his hon. friend had alluded and for the reason he had endeavoured to place before the committee, with every desire to assist West Indian trade, he declined to take a path which would lead to as bad a fiscal mistake as this country could make. (Hear, hear.) It would be a reversal of a policy which had been successful in promoting our foreign and colonial trade for the last 40 years. (Cheers.)

This reply from the Chancellor of the Exchequer ends the debate. I could also quote from the correspondence that passed two years ago between the Postmaster General of Canada and the Duke of Devonshire, and even from a speech recently delivered by Mr. Asquith, one of the leaders of the Liberal-Unionist party, for in both cases the plan of a reciprocal trade preference between Great Britain and her colonies was pronounced impracticable.

What is there left of all that agitation ? Sentimental imperialism.

That sentimental imperialism exists I admit, and I may add that should it rest upon the most absolute freedom, upon a mutual regard for the privileges of the various parts of the empire ; should it aim at a higher development of civilization, art and literature, I do not see any objection to it. What I dread is not words, but deeds. It must not be forgotten that Canada has freely and willingly done her large share to uphold and extend the influence of the empire on this continent. I shall quote a few figures from an eminent publicist :

Surrender of territory embracing Maine, Wisconsin, Oregon, etc., 300,000,000 acres at $1 per acre..	$300,000,000
Building of the Intercolonial Railway.	30,000,000
Expenditure incurred through the Fenian raid	2,000,000
African contingents	2,000,000

Purchase of the North-west	$ 1,500,000
Building of the C.P.R...	100,000,000
Expenditure on militia since 1867 ..	35,000,000
	$470,500,000

I have just mentioned the expenditure incurred through our sending contingents to South Africa. You should hear what the hon. gentlemen opposite have to say on that score in the province of Quebec. When a by-election took place in the county of Laval, in January last, Mr. Bergeron, the former member for Beauharnois, who was fighting by the side of his leader, the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) publicly stated in my presence that the government had exacted a tribute of blood, by sending Canadian troops to a foreign land. However, that same Mr. Bergeron had said, in 1899, at a banquet in the province of New Brunswick, before an English audience, that the government was in duty bound to send to the Transvaal, not one thousand, but five thousand men.

Mr. MONK. Is the hon. gentleman aware that Mr. Bergeron has denied having uttered those words in the province of New Brunswick and in the county of Laval ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Bergeron did state at a banquet in Moncton, in the presence of Mr. Foster, the former Minister of Finance, that the Laurier administration should send five thousand men to the Transvaal. His statements were published in the leading Conservative organ, 'The Star', of Montreal. As to what he said in the county of Laval, I know this much. A meeting was held at St. Martin ; I was replying to my hon. friend, the member for Jacques Cartier, and Mr. Bergeron, who came next, made the statement which I have just attributed to him. I have still a vivid recollection of what transpired on that day.

The former member from Beauharnois took a very prominent part in the contest in Laval, and if I am correctly informed, he delivered similar utterances in other parishes of that constituency. That is the way our opponents wage war on the government in the province of Quebec.

True it is, Mr. Speaker, that I, as a Canadian, would rather see our volunteers go to the front to repel the enemy, should they ever invade our territory. However, I realize that being of French extraction, I cannot be moved by the same sentiments that cause my fellow-countrymen of English origin to tingle in sympathy with the mother country, when they hear of what takes place on the battlefields of South Africa. How could they remain insensible while this gigantic struggle is going on, in which England's supremacy is at stake ? I should be false to that old chivalrous spirit of France, which characterizes my own race, were I to deny them the privilege to go and fight for the flag of Great Britain.

The members of the contingents who are serving in South Africa are under no obligation to do so. They have volunteered their services, and how, I ask, could any one find fault with it ?

At all events, it is on record that when the secession war broke out no fewer than 35,000 Canadians enlisted in the American army. If these men were permitted to serve under a foreign flag how could we object to their enlisting under the British flag which, after all, is our own flag ? I, as a Canadian, love England because of her enlightened parliamentarism, and because for the last fifty years she has acknowledged our rights, privileges and political liberties. I know that in some quarters the sending of the contingents has given rise to a campaign of prejudices against the province of Quebec. My fellow-countrymen have been taunted with a lack of loyalty, on that occasion. At this late hour, I do not propose to refute those slanderous statements. In concluding, I shall merely quote one sentence from Gambetta. The war of 1870 was over, every Frenchman, irrespective of party ties, was weeping over the loss of Alsace and Lorraine. Every one was breathing 'revenge'. But soon after the political parties turned to practical use that rallying word to overthrow the republic. When addressing his constituents at Belleville, the great orator said : Revenge ! gentlemen, let us always think of it, but let us never mention it ! In Canada, we have too frequently made an abusive use of words and of the noblest feelings, therefore shall I say : Loyalty, gentlemen, let us always think of it, but let us never mention it !

Mr. RUFUS H. POPE (Compton). Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is scarcely necessary for me to apologize for rising at this late hour, or at this early hour, as an hon. gentleman reminds me, to make a few remarks in connection with the subject before the House. I sometimes regret, Sir, that the rules of this House do not permit morning meetings during a long debate of this character, as I think that possibly we might in this way dispose of these debates from day to day much more rapidly and without so much night work.

If it were necessary to seek something in support of the Conservative policy of the last twenty-five years, if we felt the need of arguments on which to base an opinion as to whether those men who preceded us in the leadership of that great party, placed before the people of this country a proper policy when they inaugurated and put in force the national policy, we could find nothing more convincing than the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite in the debate which is just about to close. Scarcely one of them dared to address the House without offering some excuse for supporting the government. From ocean to ocean, from all the provinces of Canada, they have come here, representing nearly all the varied interests of this country, and in advocating the requirements of those in-

terests as affecting their various provinces and constituencies, they have pleaded with the government to do something, and finding all their pleadings futile and unheeded, they find themselves compelled to offer an apology to this House for the vote they are going to give on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, the men who conceived and put in force the national policy have nearly all passed away from the political arena. They have nearly all retired from active political life, and consequently we who are in active political life to-day ought to be able to view their work dispassionately. Do we think, when we look at the upbuilding of Canada, which followed the great work of retrievement performed by the Conservative party as soon as they found themselves intrusted with power in 1878, when we remember the condition of Canada under the so-called tariff of free trade policy—if hon. gentlemen choose to call it so—of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and when we contrast that condition with the position of this country in 1896, when the late government left office, we cannot but admit that from 1878 to 1896 a glorious work was done as regards the development of the intelligence of our people, the increase of our prosperity, and the promotion of our better education. Look at our increase in wealth, as demonstrated by our bank account, look in any direction of life you choose, you cannot fail to recognize the immense benefits which this country has enjoyed through the policy and administration of the Conservative party. And during all that period of time from 1878 to 1896, the Conservative party were fought to the bitter end by hon. gentlemen upon the other side, and when I heard the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his valedictory remarks the other day, preparing for his departure from public life to that safe and comfortable seat which the right hon. the first minister has waiting for him in Toronto—and we must remember that no Liberal was ever known to leave one office on salary until he got his hands safely upon another—I could not help but think that that hon. gentleman might have spared himself some of the outbursts to which he gave vent upon that occasion. When he went back into the past history of Canada, even though that history was built up by the Conservative party—I would like to see any Liberal go back into a past history and not find it built up by the Conservative party, I would like to see him search for a page that he would not be ashamed of which could possibly belong to gentlemen on the other side—I say that when the hon. gentleman went back into our past history he might have done something more worthy of his valedictory remarks than to search out the darkest pages of corruption which he could find in connection with the Conservative administration of twenty years. It is not my intention to go very far in the direction of reply to that hon. gentleman, but as he stood there, engaged in this congenial occupation, I thought that there was some recent history more worthy of his vitriolic attack than that which he singled out for his splenetic outburst.

I fancied that there were other issues besides McGreevy and Langevin to which he could have applied his caustic speech. For, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir, is after all a man who did great public service to Canada, a man whose name, notwithstanding the misfortune he met with in political life, stands higher to-day in Canada than the name of Sir Richard Cartwright will ever stand. I say, Sir, that he might have thought of the names of Cap. Sullivan, of Bole, of Pritchard, of Vance, and of that kindly gentleman Mr. Preston, who hugged the whole machine as worthy of mention. He could have gone to the local amateurs in West Huron, or he might dabble in the graves of statesmen who have passed out, in the province of Quebec. He could have raked up the memory of the administration of the Hon. Henri Mercier. He could have placed that in the category of evil things. He could have told this House about Mr. Pacaud, a man without reputation when that hon. gentleman came into power and a pauper, and he could have told this House and this country that he stole from the province of Quebec thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars, which he spent in an effort to put into power the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, and he might have said that the very deposit that was made in that hon. gentleman's interest in Richmond and Wolfe was some of that stolen money. Mr. Speaker, I will not follow this subject further. We know that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I regret to say it, is weakening physically and that with this physical decline possibly there comes mental decline as well. He is not now so capable of throwing off the spores of disease and contagion, and I think his weakness has had an effect upon his mind by absorption, the absorption of the corruption around him.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Chair, chair.

Mr. POPE. Chair, chair again.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is disgraceful.

Mr. POPE. The hon. Minister of Justice seems somewhat angry. I am not referring to him. Why should he interrupt me? Cannot he stand a little reference of this sort? We stood it from the hon. gentleman the other day. Hon. gentlemen opposite will get from me precisely what they sent over across the floor of this House, and if I can give change back with interest I will do it. I am not selfish in that particular.

I cannot understand why the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce should have gone so far out of his way to offer what I consider insult upon insult to the history of certain hon. gentlemen who have passed out of political life in this country. Of these great men I call the late Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald, the greatest man who fought the battle of Canada against men who went around pleading to the electors of Canada to sell this country to the United States under commercial union, under any sort of flag, making their speeches and shouldering their muskets in the Saskatchewan, but the old Tory line that fought them inside and outside of this House was composed of the great men whose names will live down through history so long as Canadian history continues to be read. Now we will leave that hon. gentleman in that position with these kindly remarks that I have considered it my duty to bestow upon him.

In order to carry out any policy, be it free trade or national, it is essential that one party or the other shall agree upon a substantial line of principle that may be formulated into a policy and put into force for the advantage, or disadvantage, as the case may be, of the country. Consider the exhibition we have had from the other side of the House. Among the hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this debate we have seen differences of opinion, but, there is a vacant chair on the opposite side of the House that has not been occupied since the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke. I am now referring to the chair which belongs to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). He has not been in his chair. They dare not even bring him into this House. In fact, so great has the difference of opinion become between these hon. gentlemen that not only is this House not big enough for him, but they have had to ship him down to the United States. I would like to hear from the hon. Minister of Public Works. I would like to hear him stand up in this House and support the free trade doctrines and warnings given to the hon. gentlemen who sit on the opposite side of the House by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, if they dare to go one inch in advance in the direction of protection. They never can. However, we are to have an exhibition of what their principle is. We have been promised it but we have to wait twelve months, at the end of which time we are to hear again from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Once more we are delayed from year to year, but I am here to say that with all the diversified opinions that exist on the other side of the House, with the differences that are to be found between the different provinces and between the different nationalities, represented on the other side of the House, with the jealousies, with the knives that are not always in the pockets of one minister but are directed against a colleague, we cannot expect them to bring down to this House a decided policy of protection for the benefit of the Canadian people. That, they cannot do. I do not take their past history into account. There was a day when I had some respect for those things which were called principles by hon. gentlemen opposite, but the last six years have entirely wiped that out. I am too busy a man to try to hunt up the history of these hon. gentlemen. We know that there is only this difference of opinion existing amongst these hon. gentlemen. There was that sympathetic meeting between the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleague the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), a few days ago, when the right hon. gentleman noticed with great pain that the face of the hon. Minister of Railways betokened illness, and he suggested a long rest and retirement from his portfolio. But the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, true as he ought to be to his chieftain, faithful as that hon. gentleman ought to be for the kind consideration that has been bestowed upon him by office by the right hon. gentleman, said : My dear premier, if I go we will go together. Then, they say that they are going twelve months from to-day to offer to this country a united and definite policy, that they are going to come down here twelve months from to-day and say to the people : We believe in protection. But there is not one of them who dared rise and speak except the hon. gentleman who gave us his valedictory, and say what we were going to have, and even he hesitated.

I must not forget the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)), I see he is not in his seat, but that is not my fault. I was interested and amused by the hon. member's speech. I have never been a great admirer of the hon. gentleman—I do not suppose he expects better of me—but with all the peculiar feeling I have toward that hon. gentleman, I do not wish him any worse luck or any greater punishment than to be obliged to sit with the mixture they have over there. I was reading—and I wish to apologize for it, I was going to say to you, Mr. Speaker, but I mean to this side of the House—the old speeches that have been delivered by the hon. member for North Norfolk when his party was previously in power from 1873 to 1878. I read also speeches of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce and others. And as I read those speeches, I realized how true it is that history repeats itself. Elected by false promises, this government has a following of a most confiding character. As I read the speeches of the hon. member for North Norfolk, I observed that as a prophet he was a dead failure. My advice to any man in this country, if he does not want to get stuck is to be sure not to follow the advice

of that hon. gentleman. If he does he will never get there—he will always be wrong. I heard the hon. gentleman with astonishment the other evening when he said, in effect: What is the use of trying to build up great industrial markets in this country north of the American line? He told us that it would cost us so much money to build factories in Canada, that Canada had better go back on her history and forget herself. So long as the hon. gentleman holds these opinions, and hon. gentlemen opposite are satisfied to have him hold them, we do not want him to change sides in this House. Sir, if the hour has arrived when we are afraid to face the responsibility of building a nation north of the American line; if we can see no better future than that which the hon. member for North Norfolk offers us, then I say let us give up the race by annexation to the United States—let us have a policy with some sort of a future to it. But I do not believe it. I believe that, with a bold policy for the upbuilding of our industries, for the protection of the labour and brain of young Canadians, with a strong, well-defined transportation policy; with a matured and definite policy for developing the resources of this country and the turning of our raw materials into finished goods for consumption here and for export to the outside world, we shall make our Canada a great nation. It is such a policy as that that I am prepared to support. That is the reason that I am prepared to vote for the resolution moved by the leader of the opposition. Not that it suited me altogether——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. POPE. That is all right. The resolution that I would have preferred would be a resolution for a Chinese wall all round. I would have a resolution so framed that no immigrant should come in here who was not clean and capable of being made into a true citizen of Canada. I would have preferred a resolution saying that no man shall remain inside the Dominion of Canada who will not take up arms and fight for Canada and the empire. There are many things that I would have liked that resolution to contain. But the resolution declares plainly that the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite is not satisfactory. And I know that it is not satisfactory, and I know why. It is an imitation of the product of the weakest moments of the Conservative party when in power—it is an imitation of our faults, not our qualities. It was not a national policy we left them, in my judgment, but the wreck of what had been a national policy. We must not forget how hon. gentlemen opposite went up and down this country seeking to destroy that policy. We must not forget particularly how the Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke wherever he could get an audience, and wrote in any of the reviews that would publish his articles, doing everything he could to decry the country. He decried the great west, and he spoke of the provinces down by the sea as mere fragments. There was no element of the country from its manufacturers to the geographical divisions of the Dominion that the hon. gentleman did not decry. He did his best to convince the people that the national policy was made only for the manufacturers and the monopolists. And even the men who framed that policy, owing to the work of that hon. gentleman were not able to enforce as strong a policy as they would have liked to do. I am not ashamed to stand up here and say so. But when these gentlemen come to us now and say: By copying all the weakest elements of your history, by taking the most miserable of your products, we seek to win grace from the people of Canada, we ask the electors to bow to us, it is hardly to be wondered at that I will heartily support the resolution that condemns their policy.

Now, the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) dwelt upon the fact that we had not offered a resolution against the expenditure, and that this particular resolution had not embodied that idea. If we were to frame a resolution that would denounce all the faults of hon. gentlemen opposite there would not be paper enough manufactured at Eddy's mills during the next twenty days to print it all. The hon. gentleman should have been fair enough and reasonable enough to recognize the resolution that was moved in the House last session and that was read by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). I cannot forgive the hon. Minister of Customs for that. His memory went back for a period of twenty years and picked out many things that he desired to have remembered. Surely, a man with such a remarkable memory ought to have remembered the resolution of last session. Now, we do not object—at least speaking for myself, and though I can only speak for myself, I do not object—to the size of the expenditure. That is not what frightens me.

It is what we get for this $55,000,000. I say the Minister of Finance has no right to allow one dollar to go out of that treasury which does not go for a work that can be declared to be for the general benefit of Canada. When we see our money being used to build wharfs for private parties, wharfs down by the sea that lead to nowhere, that are only so much additional value to private property when we see them spending our money in every direction upon private works, municipal works and provincial works, and neglecting the great arteries of transportation by which the products of our great west may be carried to the seaboard, I say we have a right to protest, we have a right to cry: Halt, gentlemen, and show us what you are spending this money for.

Near the close of last session, before the Minister of Public Works became a re-

sident of the United States, when it was possible for him to remain in this country, even amongst people who fight like blazes, this question came up, and I asked the hon. gentleman to show me where he was expending this money. I said, what are you doing with that 50,000,000 odd dollars that you are expending, in place of the $38,000,000 of a few years ago? He said, the hon. gentleman is intelligent? I said, not sufficiently intelligent for that. And he rose and informed me that he was deepening the St. Lawrence channel, that he was working in some harbours of the great lakes, and doing canal work as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what government since confederation has not been doing this kind of work and has not spent many millions upon it. Sir, it is astonishing to me to hear hon. gentlemen splitting up a cent into quarters and fractions even smaller, to prove whether taxation has been increased in this country or not. There has been some of the finest figuring done by hon. gentlemen opposite to prove that $57,000,000 is less than $38,000,000 that I ever saw.

Now, we know what the population of Canada is, it has just been counted. Of course hon. gentlemen are not satisfied with their count. They are grumbling and trying to blame it off on something that happened ten years ago. We had an exhibition here yesterday by the Minister of Agriculture, which was met to-day by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), and coming from the section of country from which the Minister of Agriculture comes, I am bound to recognize that hon. gentleman in the cabinet as my representative, but I must say, after the exposition that was given of the tactics of that hon. gentleman by the hon. member for Bothwell, even I myself, and that is going a long way, felt ashamed of him. That the hon. gentleman can understand how a family could increase so rapidly, I could appreciate that; he has not been in that business—at least I suppose he has not.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Customs made to the hon. gentlemen opposite a very strong appeal to support him. I was struck by the tone of his voice—I do not say his little voice—when he asked them to wait, grant us one year more. I believe he will get every Liberal vote in this House. I do not believe that even the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) who is known to be a free trader, will resist that appeal, not absolute, but so near absolute, that what was lacking was made up by the size of the voice that delivered it.

Now, Sir, if we wanted other evidence that hon. gentlemen opposite are divided we had it in the speech of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), and his description of the causes which lost them Laval. He says there were three candidates. Well, they are not only divided in Laval but they are divided in this House, and I came to the conclusion three years ago, and so stated publicly, that I did not believe we would ever have from hon. gentlemen opposite any other great proposition than one for them to remain in power. I am of that opinion still. I do not believe we will ever receive from them a change of policy excepting what is wrung from them. But that we shall ever receive from them a national policy worthy of the great and growing possibilities of Canada, as the national policy was worthy of Canada in 1878, I do not believe it. For that reason I am prepared to support the resolution of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, which says that the policy of the government is not satisfactory. We want a policy that will make it possible for Canada, not only to retain her own markets, but to encroach upon the markets of the world, instead of being a slaughter market for other countries. We want moreover a bold policy of transportation. This patch work policy of transportation which hon. gentlemen opposite are offering us, we want nothing of it. I would not like to say that they are not sincere in their peculiar propositions regarding transportation, but if they are sincere in the peculiarities of their proposition, they do not appreciate what transportation means in Canada. We must provide means to get out our grain products from the great west, that country which is to be the home of millions of people, and which is destined to make of Canada a far greater country than even its founders ever anticipated. There are many thousands of people going in there to-day, and I say that if the Conservative party was right in 1878 in building one railroad into that country before there was a solitary soul in it, the time has arrived, if we are going to relieve that country of the crop of four years hence and to take it down to the sea, when we must adopt some plan very different from that hon. gentlemen have suggested.

If we do not meet that situation with a bold national policy, a policy affecting not only the tariff but also the transportation question, we shall have a cry from the great western country far louder than we have heard hitherto. If the mere handful of people now settled there could overtax the capacity of the Canadian Pacific Railway, what will be the case after the hundreds of thousands of people who are now going in multiply the productions of the country. I may be told that we shall have the Canadian Northern Railway. You can put in the Canadian Northern, and then another Canadian Northern, and still you will be unable to meet the possibilities of that great country. More than that, when the product reaches Fort William, what preparation are you making for bringing it down through Canadian waters? And after you get it to Montreal or to Quebec, where is your fast line of steamers to take it across the At-

lantic and land it in the European markets, so that the men who are living in the western part of Canada will be able to realize as good a price for their wheat as the people in the western states? If we expect to settle up our great west with people from the western states, as it is boasted we are doing, we must afford them facilities equal to those which they have left behind, or they will be dissatisfied; and it would be better that we had not 50 per cent of the immigration which we are boasting of to-day. The responsibility for all this rests on this government. I have the greatest possible confidence in that country. I have travelled over it many times, and always with the greatest pleasure—not alone to see the vast resources of the country and the fertility of the soil; but every time I travel over that railroad, it reminds me of the time when hon. gentlemen opposite sat on this side of the House and denounced our policy and belittled that country. It makes me proud that I am a Conservative, and proud of the history of the Conservative party. I believe hon. gentlemen opposite are in power at the right time. If there ever was a time in the history of Canada when the country ought to be governed by the Liberal party, it is in good times, when the country can take care of itself. It is a good thing for the Conservative party to have a rest on this side of the House, where we can formulate the larger national policy of an Imperial character, as we watch the gentlemen on the other side of the House amusing themselves after their peculiar manner. As we watch them, we will prepare the public mind of Canada to receive the broader ideas that will be forthcoming in the near future. When the hour arrives for Canada to move forward once more, she will have to turn to the party that has always been the progressive party of Canada; and we will give her a policy bold and well defined—a policy whose watchword will be Canada for the Canadians every time, which will hold the market of this country for our own people. What shall we say to England? Shall we say, as the right hon. gentleman did when he went over there: We have sacrificed ourselves at your feet, and we do not want anything in return? Not much; we will not say that. We will say to Mr. Chamberlain, who is in my judgment one of the brightest and cleverest men in public life anywhere on the globe to-day: What do you want to do with this empire? Do you want to build it strong in all its parts? You do not want to take our hearts out. No; you want our hearts; you want them to be kept loyal, because we never know when we may want to use them. We want to make Canada a great part of the empire. I know there are some gentlemen—supporters of the government—who do not like imperialism, and who are going through the province of Quebec attempting to scare the French Canadians at the results of imperialism. I say to the French Canadians, whether in this House or in the province of Quebec, are you not enjoying the greatest liberties that any Frenchman, either in France or in any other part of the world, are enjoying? And under what flag are you enjoying these great liberties? Under the British flag. Then let us fight for that flag. I have confidence in the sound sense of the French Canadians, and I do not believe that the three or four men to whom I have refered are going to shake the habitant from his good sense and clear sightedness. When he realizes that he is going to have a better price in the British market for his butter, his pork and his other products, under a commercial zollverein, nothing under the sun will induce me to believe that we shall not have behind us the French Canadians of the province of Quebec. I can understand that to-day, following the lead of the right hon. gentleman so faithfully as they have done, they are dazed. Why would they not be dazed? For twenty years they were taught the doctrine of free trade; for some years they were taught the doctrine of commercial union; other years it was unrestricted reciprocity; then they were led to give England a preference without getting anything in return. Do you suppose that the French Canadian people, who have followed the right hon. gentleman so sympathetically and so blindly, would not be dazed? I understand that at the moment I am speaking there are puzzling thoughts in their minds. But I have great faith in those people. They will realize that if Canada is to be great, it must be under an empire; if it is not under one empire, it must be under another; and I believe they will be as true and faithful under a flag which has given them so many blessings as the English speaking people of Canada are. I know that in the province of Quebec appeals have been made for many years to race prejudices and to nationalism. There has never been an election in the province of Quebec in which one side or the other has not been accused of making national speeches and appealing to national sentiments. Sir, we have to rear up in the province of Quebec men who are free from that sectionalism, and my belief is that we can do so by presenting to them broader and better ideas than those of provincialism or the narrowness of the confines of Canada, great as it is. But as a Canadian and a representative in this House, I fully realize the duty I have to perform. My salary is given to me as a member of the House of Commons of Canada, and in that capacity I have to bend all my energies to the accomplishment of that which is nearest to us, namely, the development of the country which we represent. Sir, in the resolution before us, I think more of the first part of it than I do of the last. I believe in a policy that will

make Canada what we would like to see it become, a country worthy of the widest ambitions and thoughts of the great men who laid its foundations. And I trust that when the hour comes—it will not come to-night because I know that after the sympathetic appeal of the Minister of Customs we cannot expect a single vote from hon. gentlemen opposite—but the time is sure to come when public opinion will be found in our favour, and when that day comes we will formulate a policy for the government of Canada that will protect all interests in Canada, that will give Canadian markets to the Canadian people, be the duties we impose export or import, specific or ad valorem. That policy which we shall propound will be one which will carry out, only in a more extended degree, the objects aimed at by the policy which our political fathers adopted in 1878.

Mr. G. W. GANONG (Charlotte). At this late hour of the debate, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose taking up a great deal of time, and I assure you that I should not have ventured to address the House had I not believed that it was a duty I owed my constituents and the country as well. I believe that it is but just that I should give credit to the present government for the wonderful record of progress they have made in certain lines. Since this government has assumed office, it has assumed as well the functions of Divine Providence. Of that we have ample illustration in the speeches of the Ministers of Finance and Customs. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) wonders where the Minister of Customs can be. He is probably out giving Providence a few pointers. Or if not, he is praying that he may be forgiven, after the speech delivered by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), for if certainly anything can have the effect of converting that hon. gentleman, it will be that speech. These hon. gentlemen, since they have come into power, have not considered Providence at all. All our great crops were Grit crops; our increased productions of minerals were Grit minerals; the productions of our forests were Grit products. Well, they have indeed a lot on their hands, for the whole world is just in the position which Canada is enjoying, so that they must be running the rest of the world, including the great republic to the south, the United States.

But this is not the only point on which I wish to congratulate these hon. gentlemen. I am interested in trade matters, and I am always very much interested in seeing up-to-date methods in trade. In this country there was a certain line of trade which, up to within a few years ago, was done on two different principles. I refer to the clothing trade. One was the shoddy ready-made clothing, and the other clothing made to order, when a man went in and gave his measure. But in these late days, a new development has manifested itself, and we have now the fit-reform trade. Well, we had in 1896 what was termed the Reform party, but to-day we have a fit-reform government—nothing more, nothing less. Analyse the speeches delivered in this budget debate, and if they do not prove that we have to-day a fit-reform government, there never was a fit-reform business in this country.

The first principle laid down by these gentlemen is to be elected, no matter in what way or shape or form. First get your election, and as I listened to my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), whom I could not understand, unfortunately not being versed in the French tongue, I was wondering whether he was telling us anything about the election in Gaspé in 1896. I was wondering whether he told us what was represented to be correct—and I believe it is—that he is the only gentleman in the House of Commons of Canada whoever repudiated his own father. I wonder whether he told the House that his father had been sworn in as returning officer in his own district under a false name. I trow, Mr. Speaker, that he was careful not to say anything about that incident. We have also some hon. gentlemen in this House with records. What about the representative from the county of West Huron (Mr. Holmes)? No doubt he was told: Get elected and we have a fit-reform suit ready for you. We will fit you, and all you have to do is to get elected. We have also another gentleman who came here recently from the St. James division in Montreal (Mr. Brunet). It did not make much difference apparently how he got here. These hon. gentlemen opposite found a place for him, and you will no doubt find him voting to-night for this fit-reform government. Then there is the county of Victoria, N.B., where the worst fraud ever perpetrated on a community was perpetrated in the last election. I would not like to say that the hon. gentleman who sits in this House for that county to-day (Mr. Costigan) was conversant with all the facts, because I think he lived too long in a Tory administration to be guilty of what was done, but there are gentlemen in this House who could give you, Sir, a full account of all that took place. They could tell you that the day before the elections, the opposition candidate was bought off in order to obtain the hon. gentleman's election by acclamation in that county. No doubt he too will vote for this fit-reform government. They have a suit all ready for him. What about the representative from Nipissing (Mr. McCool)? The election in that county was a credit to the Liberal party, and you will find that hon. gentleman also with a fit-reform suit on voting with his party. Then there are West Queen's (Mr. Farquharson) and Westmoreland, N.B. (Mr. Emmerson). Why we

had two would-be Ministers of Marine and Fisheries down there, and it is a surprising fact that when they got there they found another gentleman had the fit-reform suit on, a $7,000 suit. I really feel sorry for those two gentlemen. They have my sympathy, but they should have been honest and told the people that they never expected the portfolio, or else they should have held the government to its pledge and voted against it. The latter would have been the honourable part. I am sure that the hon. member for South Oxford (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is another shining example. We have that hon. gentleman stating that he went back on all his principles for the sake of his party. It certainly is a great incentive to decency and honesty, when a gentleman who has occupied so high a position in the councils of his party, will make such a statement publicly, and when that statement was not only made by him but confirmed by his own leader.

You can look over the whole combination, and you will find it in just about the same position. Take the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). In the statement he made, he told us that he was in accord with the right hon. leader of the government when he went over to the United States to talk. He might just as well have told us that he had a commission from that gentleman. Shortly after that, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) rose to speak, and while he was speaking the hon. member for North Norfolk was over receiving the congratulations of the First Minister, the Minister of Finance and other members of the government. And the hon. member for Russell talked against protection. Why, I heard that hon. gentleman deliver one of the strongest protection speeches ever heard in this House—but it was to protect W. C. Edwards. When it was proposed to build a railway to his timber limits, he spoke strongly. What was his excuse? Why, it would set fire to the neighbouring country. But, what cares he if you burn a workingman's heart out with the worst fire, the fear of starvation? Such is their consistency. Then we have the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd). His suit is fit-reform, and fits him to a nicety. All he asks is that the suit should be made in Brantford. He did not get through before he besought the government to hitch his cheap wagon and the cheap horse of the hon. member for Assiniboia. Then there is the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) who has been so silent. You will not hear anything from him to-night. He is a great protectionist, but he will vote just the same. Then there is a gentleman from whom you heard years ago, long before I came here. You will find his speeches occupying pages of 'Hansard'—ten thousand of them or more—the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). Prohibition! but when he got here the chief artist, the right hon. leader of the government brought him into line, fitted his little suit upon him and told him that prohibition would not do for the province of Quebec. And the hon. gentleman has voted with them ever since—just the same old fit-reform suit. Then we have the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison). He does not care much if only you will load up lead heavily enough. All he asks is 'protect my own little interests.' I have for years felt sorry for that hon. gentleman. He went out to look over the Yukon, and came back conscientiously determined to get up and make a speech—the hardest effort of his life—to justify the government's management of that country. And I believe that he has regretted it ever since. No doubt he will be here with his new suit on. I do not pretend to know what the country thinks, but I believe that the country will say of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that they have had more buffoonery from him on questions requiring thought than from any other hon. gentleman on either side of the House. I believe that the right hon. gentleman who runs the circus over there knew just what class of suit to put on that hon. gentleman. He also has his fit-reform suit. And the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade)—where does he find himself? He tells us that it is not correct to say that every man in this House is a protectionist to some extent, that there are men on that side that are protectionists to a certain degree and others who wish to be free traders as far as they possibly can be. They have all kinds over there, but they have all walked into the fit-reform place and been fitted. Then you will all vote right when the time comes. Then, there is the hon. senior member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall). I believe that he has some little wish to be honest once in a while. He says that he defies us on this side to show whereby a protective tariff can help the fishermen of this country, or the fruit-growers, or the gold miners, the silver or the lead miners. He does not agree with the hon. member for New Westminster. And, a little further on he says he accepts it as a tentative measure, and only for the present, when we find it difficult to keep our population at home and find it necessary in order to keep some of our manufactures going. He is honest. He says that it is necessary to keep the manufactures going in order to keep our people at home. Then I believe, we have an hon. gentleman in the House who has stated that the government could not change its policy faster than he could. We have not heard from that hon. gentleman, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). I am afraid we shall not see our hon. friend, the minister who will have the making of these fit-reform suits next year. I believe that that duty is to be delegated to the Minister of Public Works (Hon.

Mr. Tarte). He is not here, we are not to have an opportunity of seeing him vote to-night. He probably would have voted with the opposition if he had been present. Outside of these I have mentioned, there are three types left on the other side of the House. In the opinion of the public, the fit-reform suits of some of the ministers are getting very baggy with the rake-off. I would not like to say they are, but it is easy to see, when you read the papers that there are suggestions coming from all quarters, even from good Liberal newspapers, that these trousers are getting very baggy with the rake-off. Then there is the class represented by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Maclaren). He does not want to do any thinking for himself, but is willing to let Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Fielding think for him. There are quite a number who will vote on the opinions of others. Then, you have a much larger class typified by the hon. memeer for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) who is wearing a fifty-three-thousand-dollar fit-reform suit. And this is the kind of mixture you have to run a government that is supposed to be in the best interests of the country. I would suggest that the right hon. gentleman put a sign up over the door 'Great Fit-Reform Government.' It is a shame to disgrace the Reform party any longer. Let you people take your proper title. And I am sure that when the respected leader of the government—for I am sure that we have all respect and regard for him—we hope when he goes to the other side of the water, as he is to do in the near future, he will take back the Cobden medal, and also that some of his good friends will furnish him with a banner bearing a legend to the effect that he is the leader of the greatest aggregation ever known in the world—the leader of the only fit-reform party the world has ever known. I think, that under these conditions, it is high time that some party had a declared policy, and so I shall be very glad indeed to support the resolution of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Borden, Halifax) :

YEAS.

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Avery,
Barker,
Bennett,
Birkett,
Blain,
Borden (Halifax),
Boyd,
Brock,
Broder,
Bruce,
Carscallen,
Casgrain,
Clancy,
Clare,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Culbert,
Earle,
Fowler,
Ganong,
Gilmour,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Halliday,
Henderson,
Hughes (Victoria),
Ingram,
Johnston (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,
Kemp,
Kendrey,
Kidd,
Lancaster,
LaRivière,
Lavell,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
Léonard,
MacLaren (Perth),
McGowan,
McIntosh,
McLeod,
Monk,
Morin,
Osler,
Pope,
Porter,
Pringle,
Roche (Marquette),
Rosamond,
Sherritt,
Simmons,
Sproule,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Tolton,
Vrooman,
Ward,
Wilmot,
Wilson.—61.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Argers,
Archambault,
Bazinet,
Beith,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bernier,
Blair,
Borden (King's, N.S.),
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Brunet,
Bureau,
Calvert,
Calvin,
Campbell,
Carbonneau,
Carroll,
Champagne,
Copp,
Costigan,
Davis,
Delisle,
Demers (Lévis),
Demers (St. John),
Douglas,
Dugas,
Edwards,
Emmerson,
Erb,
Ethier,
Farquharson,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Fortier,
Gallery,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gibson,
Girard,
Guthrie,
Harwood,
Heyd,
Horsey,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hyman,
Johnston (Cape Breton),
Johnston (Lambton),
Kendall,
Lang,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assom'n),
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Legris,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Logan,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Mackie,
MacKinnon,
MacLaren (Hunt'n),
McColl,
McCreary,
McEwen,
McGugan,
McIsaac,
McLennan,
Madore,
Marcil (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martineau,
Matheson,
Meigs,
Mignault,
Monet,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Murray,
Oliver,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Power,
Préfontaine,
Proulx,
Puttee,
Reid (Restigouche),
Riley,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Ontario),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Rousseau,
Russell,
Schell,
Scott,
Sifton,
Smith (Vancouver),
Stephens,
Stewart,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Talbot,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Turcot,
Turgeon,
Wade,
Wright.—117.

PAIRS.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Christie,	Roddick,
Cartwright, Sir R.,	Tupper, Sir Hibbert
Fraser,	Bell,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Charlton,	Maclean,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Bickerdike,	Cargill,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Gould,	Smith (Wentworth),
Cowan,	Richardson,
Maxwell,	Gourley,
Holmes,	Robinson (Northumberland),
McCarthy,	Hale,
Tarte,	Seagram,
McCool,	Ball,

Amendment (Mr. Borden, Halifax) negatived; main motion agreed to and House went into committee of Ways and Means.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I do not imagine that at this hour the committee will desire to proceed with any business, I therefore move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 3.15 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 9, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RAILWAY COMMISSION.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 104) to revise and consolidate the law respecting railways. He said: In introducing this Bill, of which I have given notice, I shall have to ask the attention of the House while I endeavour to give a brief explanation of its general character. The object is to establish a railway commission in Canada. It is not my purpose at this stage to enter into any elaborate argument to convince the House that the principle of the measure is one which ought to receive the assent of parliament, because I feel warranted in assuming, from the very general expressions of opinion which, for the last three or four years, have been made by hon. members on both sides, that this branch of parliament is disposed to look with favour upon the establishment of a railway commission in Canada, and I think it may be fairly taken for granted that there is throughout Canada, especially in the province of Ontario and the western country, a very strong opinion indeed in the same direction. It may be said that there is not the same acute interest taken in the general question of a railway commission in the province of Quebec or in the maritime provinces, although I should be very loth to say that there might not be found also a strong feeling there. That feeling, however, has not found expression to the same extent. The newspaper press has not declared itself in the same pronounced manner in these provinces as it has in Ontario and the western portion of the Dominion.

There is also another reason which occurs to me why it is not needful that I should at this stage urge upon the House that the principle of the measure is one we ought to adopt. I take it that a study of the two very able reports made by Prof. Maclean, which have been generally distributed, must have tended to throw a flood of light on the question and have drawn the minds of hon. members, to a greater extent even than formerly, to the consideration of the principle of this Bill.

I would like to say, with reference to that report, that very much credit indeed devolves on the gentleman who made it. It would be difficult for any one to have approached the question with a more impartial mind and to have discussed it more judiciously, thoughtfully and exhaustively than it has been by Mr. Maclean. He does not appear to have been imbued with any determination to reach any particular results, but to have studied the whole question with a calm and judicial mind, and I believe that gentlemen who have studied his two reports will agree with me that he has presented his views in a moderate and modest manner and given only what conclusions he felt justified in reaching by reason of the facts of the case generally.

It will be my purpose, therefore, in the brief observations I may make on this Bill, to confine myself almost entirely to as clear an explanation as I can give of the general provisions of the measure. I shall not go into the various sections minutely, but shall endeavour to present to the House the general form in which the government has felt that it could properly present this measure, leaving—I think properly—the discussion of the details of the working out of the principle to a later period. One of the things that must naturally suggest itself to the mind of a person who has ever engaged in the preparation of a measure of this kind is that it is not always safe to be guided by the experience, or even by the action, of states and governments outside our own. The conditions which exist in Canada are very exceptional indeed. As our territory extends from one ocean to the other, our country must give rise, from a railroad point of view, to difficulties and must suggest pro-

blems which do not appear to the same extent in other countries. Another point of difficulty is that, as compared with other countries, our territory is sparsely settled. You have not the same body of population as you have in the United States to give local support to trans-continental lines. The object, therefore, of those who have to do with the operation of our great railway lines crossing the continent must be to realize the best results possible from their through traffic, as they cannot rely with confident expectation upon a sufficiency of local traffic for the railway. Then, of necessity, the enormous distance over which the produce of the west must be carried by rail before it can come into competition with the products of countries more favoured in that regard creates, no doubt, and 'naturally creates,' grievances and complaints among people who are not able, in their own individual cases, or in the case of their own class or section, to realize the effect upon the operation of the railway or the difficulties of the situation. Therefore, complaints against the railways, or against their rates or the manner in which they are operated, though they may be general are not necessarily well founded; and, having regard to the proper principle which should govern rates upon these lines, cannot necessarily be fully satisfied. I have in mind this leading fact—that the people of the western country regard the present condition of affairs as unsatisfactory because, they say, the rates which they must pay upon their products which seek a foreign market are more onerous than the traffic can properly bear, as they must compete in the open market with those whose products are carried at a less cost and can therefore be sold with a profit at lower prices, or at the same prices with a better profit. The people of the west feel that there must be something necessarily wrong in a system which subjects them to such burdens, and which cannot afford them what they regard as adequate protection. I am not going to say that there are not reasonable grounds for complaint—I am not going to deal with that point. It is proposed in this Bill that that question shall be dealt with by an independent, and we trust a competent tribunal. I only remark upon the point now for the purpose of directing the attention of the House to the fact that it does not follow, because there are complaints, that those complaints are capable of adequate relief. The long distances the products of the west have to be carried, the fact that the railways have to depend practically upon one-way traffic to the eastern seaboard, very little going westward except the supplies demanded by the producers—these things give rise to practical difficulties in railway experience and should be given reasonable consideration at the hands of parliament or of whoever is administering this law when it has been placed upon the statute-book. I think we may fairly keep in view the fact that the questions which will arise under such conditions are questions which can not be arbitrarily disposed of by specific action, but we must invest the men whom we may select and charge with the responsibility of carrying out the law with discretion as to how and to what extent the remedy can and ought to be applied. I do not wish, that, because this Bill is being introduced and because, as I imagine, it will ultimately find its way into the body of our laws, it should be thought that the government are under any misconception as to the results which may be expected to flow from it. I do not wish to encourage expectations on the part of the people at large that we are devising a scheme by which ideal results can be achieved and every grievance of a substantial character can be removed—a scheme whereby the disadvantages of distance, climatic conditions and of one-way traffic will be annihilated, a scheme whereby we can do all that people call upon us to in the premises. I say this in order that we may put ourselves fairly before parliament and the country. At the same time, while I give expression to this idea, I do not imagine that it will be found impossible with the proper working of the Bill that we are submitting for the consideration of parliament, that very large beneficial results will follow.

As I have remarked already, we see in the newspaper press of Ontario most widespread dissatisfaction with the administration of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and strong and repeated calls upon parliament to pass a Bill which shall create a railway commission. The conditions which exist in Ontario are conditions which create naturally, and I had almost said necessarily, difficulties in the management and the operations of railways. We are so situated that the great railways which are traversing a large portion of the province of Ontario are looking for traffic from the United States at one end to be carried through Canada and deposited in the United States at the other end. In doing that they have to enter into active and keen competition with the railways which traverse wholly United States territory, and in that competition they are obliged to make such rates as will enable them to secure a portion of that business. Now these prevailing conditions of our railways in Canada give rise to this difficulty, that people who have the same classes of freights, are producing the same kind of goods and are desirous of reaching the same foreign markets, find that for the carriage of their products from points at a distance perhaps one-half or even less than the distance over which they have to pass when they traverse Canada from a point in the United States to another point in the United States, they are obliged to pay larger proportionate rates

than those Canadian producers who are utilizing Canadian railways and whose products are seeking the same markets; and they draw the inference that there must be some defect in a system which permits Canadian railways to carry those products from United States territory into another point of United States territory at a less cost per ton or per mile than it costs Canadian producers to carry goods to the same points. Naturally, therefore, they complain, and they complain loudly, and they are looking forward to the establishment of a railway commission in the expectation that it will tend to relieve them, to some extent at least, of this burden which they regard as onerous and unfair. You will see in this fact a sufficient reason, I think, to justify the opinion which prevails so largely in the province of Ontario as to the necessity of a railway commission. I expect that a commission of this character will afford a considerable measure of relief to people who are complaining in this way, though I fear it will not relieve them to the extent which they expect.

Now, having by way of preliminary, outlined the object, let us turn to the Bill. The Bill is largely framed for the purpose of constituting and putting into operation a railway commission. It also makes provisions with regard to a great many other matters. While it is a Bill to create a railway commission, it is at the same time a complete revision and codification of the existing railway law passed in 1888, and of all the amendments which have since been made. We thought that it was no use taking the subject up at all unless we presented in one single measure all the provisions of a general character which relate to the construction, the maintenance, and operation of our railways. There was need for a considerable revision of the existing law, not in particulars of great moment, but in many minor particulars which would contribute to the convenience of the board in carrying out the work of the commission, and aid them more efficiently to enforce the regulations, and which would be at the same time explanatory of certain provisions in the existing law about which there may be doubt. We have, therefore, had this whole law carefully revised and consolidated, and although the creation of a railway commission is the chief object, this and other points have been taken up and dealt with at the same time. I think I may properly describe the Bill which is now submitted as a bona fide and earnest endeavour to create a railway commission with such powers and furnished with such jurisdiction as will afford the fullest possible opportunity of working out this question to a successful issue. We have had before us the experience of other countries, we have had before us the experience of England and of the various states of the union, as well as of the inter-State Commerce Law of the United States. These have been studied and their defects have been examined. The difficulties in enforcing their laws have been ascertained, and so far as it was possible in our judgment we have made better provisions for successfully operating a railway commission.

With the enactment of this Bill, therefore, and I may say as a consequence of it, the present Railway Committee of the Privy Council passes away. It was not thought desirable that we should retain the Railway Committee to exercise any of the powers which it now exercises. There are some directions in which I think one who has acted upon that committee for some years might fairly say that the committee has done efficient work. I am not going to say that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is an ideal tribunal. I think it would be impossible for any tribunal whose members are charged with all the duties and responsibilities of Ministers of the Crown, to do the work which devolves upon the Railway Committee in a thoroughly efficient manner. Still there are some branches of the duties heretofore imposed upon that committee which I claim they have most efficiently discharged. I think there has been, and there will be, no grave complaints made against the efficiency of the Railway Committee unless it be in respect of the regulation and control of freight rates upon railways. Outside of that subject, I think the Railway Committee has discharged its functions efficiently, and in saying this I refer to the Railway Committee as it has existed at any time in the past as well as to-day. For myself I would not be disposed to listen to any reason for the abolition of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council did I not recognize, and did we not all recognize, that that committee has not the time, nor the opportunity, nor the facilities for taking up minute questions respecting the control and regulation of traffic upon railways, and the rates and tolls to be charged by them; this is work that could be done more efficiently by a tribunal specially constituted for that purpose.

Now we propose to transfer to the board which constitutes the railway commission all the powers which are now possessed by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and as I shall point out to you, we are extending and enlarging these powers. As far as we have been able to gather from the experience of other railway courts of commission we have felt that there were defects which it would be possible to remedy and by extending and enlarging the powers of the railway commission over those which have been hitherto or elsewhere constituted we have thought that we have made a judicious move in the direction of improvement and greater efficiency. We have, therefore, given them all the powers hitherto possessed by the Railway Commit-

tee, and added to those powers. We have introduced, it will be found, no doubt, entirely new provisions, and some perhaps which may be regarded by some hon. gentlemen as extremely radical. Some of these provisions we will examine a little later on. The chief features of this Bill then are the constitution of a railway commission and the regulation of tolls. These are the two main and capital features of the measure. As to the board of railway commission, we have defined what the constitution shall be and we have in this Bill defined the number of the commisioners, we have defined the tenure of office, we have declared under what conditions changes may take place and we have introduced other necessary provisions of that character, but, we have done so, I want to say now, with this intention in our minds: We have reached the best conclusion which we have been able to reach as to the constitution of the board and as to the other features which I have just mentioned, but, the main principle being maintained, we are not at all deceiving ourselves with the idea that we have exhausted all the wisdom in the particular detailed provisions that we make in respect to these matters and we will be quite prepared in a spirit of fairness and liberality to listen, to weigh and to judge any suggestions which may be made to us from either side of the House. We have thought it necessary, in constituting a commission of this kind, that it should be so constituted as that we will be able to secure the very best material which our country affords for this purpose. We feel that we ought to afford the widest possible opportunity within it to make the choice, because, Mr. Speaker, as this question impresses itself upon my mind, the character, the capacity, the wisdom and the selection of the men is everything. Unless this country can afford us men of the right stamp, men of independence of character, of firmness and of fairness, men who have experience in business, experience in railway operation, experience in law, unless the country can afford us these conditions, then, we cannot look with any reasonable hope to find that the operation of the commision will be successful. We have, therefore, to give to these men such a tenure as will invite the men that we want to come and take their seats upon this board. We have to give them a tenure long enough to induce them to give up any business in which they may be engaged and which may be profitable. Then, we have to pay them well. We have to give them a long enough tenure and we have to pay them reasonably well, because, if we do not do both of these things we cannot with confidence hope to secure men of the capacity and of the calibre that we require. Further, we propose that the board shall consist of three members. Perhaps, in the opinion of some hon. gentlemen, that will not be enough. That is a question that we are not unwilling to consider, but it appears to us that three members of the commission, rightly selected and chosen are enough to dispose of the questions which will come before the commission, and to do it efficiently. We propose that the term of office of the three commissioners will be ten years, with eligibility to be reappointed, and that no member of the commission may be removed except upon an address of both Houses of parliament. We have not, in the Bill which will be laid on the Table, filled the blanks as to the age limit. We have not filled the blanks as to the salaries which will be attached, but it appears to us reasonable that with the commission constituted, the chairman, upon whom will devolve, I suppose, naturally, a somewhat heavier responsibility than that which will fall to other members, such as the responsibility which devolves upon judges and so forth, should be allowed an additional salary beyond that which we will allow to the other two members of the board. We have not filled the blanks, however, in regard to the age limit or to the amount of the salary.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the qualifications of the men, the personnel?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not defined the qualifications of the men. I was going on to say that in our minds, and it is proper that I should state it, because I am speaking with the authority of the government, and therefore what is said as respects the selection of the men for this purpose would be as binding as if it were contained in the statute, at all events, as it affects our appointments, that there ought to be on that commission one person having a somewhat lengthened experience in law, a man who would be qualified to fill a position on the bench. We have thought that if we could get a man who has had some railway experience, some experience as to railway legislation and railway operation, and as to questions arising in connection with railway controversies, so much the better. If such a man can be found, we ought to find him and he ought to be appointed. We think we ought to have a railway man also, and when I say a railway man I mean one who has not only been trained in railway work in all its branches, but one who would have considerable knowledge in reference to matters of transportation, traffic arrangements, freight rates and questions of that kind. We have thought that the third member of the commission should be selected from the general community, a man having some business experience in reference to transportation. I do not care to what particular class of business he may belong. I do not say that such a man need necessarily have been in merchantile life, that he need necessarily have been a manufacturer, or a large producer, a farmer for instance, who has had

large business with railways, but I would leave it open so that any one of that character, in any of these classes, who was found or believed to possess the necessary qualifications, might be chosen as a member of the commission. The powers conferred upon the board, I think I have already sufficiently indicated, and that I need not weary the House at greater length upon that point, further than to say this: That we have made some material changes in the existing law in a direction which we believe will commend them to all who have had anything to do with railway business and railway controversy. We are proposing that the railway commission shall have power finally to determine all questions of fact subject only to an appeal to the Governor General in Council. We do not believe that it would be expedient that this tribunal should have its decision on questions of fact subject to any revision by the courts, and for several reasons. In the first place, surely three gentlemen of the standing and character that I have named ought to be as competent as any tribunal you could set up to determine what the facts are in any given case which may come before them. If you grant an appeal, you allow a tribunal which has not heard the witnesses, and which has not special training and experience to determine upon the matter and to sit in judgment upon the findings of this specially qualified commission. I do not think that is expedient. Moreover, we hope that this measure will have the effect of very materially restricting litigation, which has been found to be a serious menace to the successful operation of the railway commission in the United States. Any one who has read the report of Mr. McLean will recollect his statement that taking the years in which railway commissions have been in operation in the United States, there has been an average of four years between the time when litigation is commenced and when it has terminated. We think it is desirable; indeed we think it imperative on us to prevent the possibility of persons who feel they may have grievances against railways not being able to have their cases determined within a reasonable time. We have therefore asked parliament to say that the decision of this tribunal shall be final, subject only to revision by the Privy Council, and that there shall be an appeal to no other tribunal.

We propose in this Bill to give the power to the railway commission to control the rates. Under the present law the Privy Council fixes the maxima and minima rates—very seldom of course fixing minima rates but there are cases. Any variation which the railway company wishes to make within the maximum rate, they have it in their power at present to make that variation. We have provided here a new way by which we think that we will afford the fullest measure of protection to the persons who are using the railway and to the railway itself. We propose to divide the traffic upon the railway into three distinct classes. First, there is the ordinary traffic; second there is the commodity traffic; and next there is the competitive traffic. With respect to the ordinary traffic which I think will be the largest portion of the traffic, we propose to confer upon the railway commission the power to fix or sanction what rates shall be charged. We propose to say that upon a schedule of tariff for ordinary traffic being submitted by the railway company to the board, the board may say that that rate shall be charged and that no higher rate or no lower rate shall be charged—except under conditions which are subsequently provided for. The railway commission will fix and control the rate for the ordinary traffic which embraces everything that is not specially regarded as competitive, and which is not specially included in the commodity traffic. What the commodity class means is this: The board may authorize certain classes of merchandise to be taken out of the ordinary traffic class and put in a special class to be called the commodity class; or, having once put a certain article in the commodity class it may retransfer it to the ordinary class. As to the commodity class the board declares what shall be the maxima and minima rates and it is only with respect to the commodity class that that varying rate is permissive.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What constitutes the commodity class?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All classes of goods which at the request of the shipper or at the request of the railway company, the board may think it desirable to take out of the ordinary class which is at a fixed rate of freight, and transfer to this commodity class. This commodity class is very well known in the operation of railways. We have decided that as to the control the board may exercise over this commodity traffic, it would be well that it should have the power to fix a maximum or minimum rate and between these the railway company may make its choice. When the company does make its choice, then while the schedule is in force it must publish that schedule in the fullest possible manner; post it in the offices and otherwise bring it to the knowledge of the public so that every one may know what the commodity rate is.

The competitive class is a class which it will be seen at once arises in connection with business to which no regular tariff can possibly be made to apply. We have got to recognize that the conditions are constantly varying and altering; new competitors are coming into the field, and a railway company cannot possibly be held strictly and rigidly to any particular rate when it is confronted with a keen and vigor-

ous competitor. As to competitive business, all laws recognize that there can be no arbitrary hard and fast rule laid down.

We are proposing to do in this regard what can only be done if you are to establish a working system at all, that is, to vest in the commission in whom we would be presumed to have confidence, the discretion of fixing the rate to be allowed to be charged by a railway in respect to its competitive business. The competition arises immediately in our own country, and also from outside in many cases. It may arise from railroads of from any other kind of transportation; but the competition existing and being made known to the commission, it becomes the duty and the power of the commission to say what rate may be made; and, in order that there may be no improper restraint upon the operating of the railways and the arranging of their rates, in order that the business may not be blocked, we have a clause which allows the railway company, when it is applied to for a competitive rate, to give it without consultation with the board; but it immediately notifies the board of the rate fixed, and, if, the board approves of it, it remains the rate as respects competitive business on that class of goods until some other conditions arise. We have endeavoured to provide in the Bill against any unnecessary hampering of the operations of the railroads, and to afford them every means of meeting urgent, pressing demands, as they may arise.

We are proposing to impose somewhat heavy penalties on the railroads in case they violate the provisions of this law. In order that the public may be kept fully informed of the tariffs that are in operation, we impose a penalty on any railway company which does not see that every station is supplied with adequate notices of what these rates are.

The classification of freight traffic is another subject. At present all freight classification is practically determined by the Governor in Council. The railways now meet in their associations for the purpose of determining business. They agree among themselves upon what they call a joint freight classification, which is applicable to all the railways unless some are specially excepted; and under the existing law the Governor in Council may confirm or may refuse confirmation of this classification, and changes may have to be made to meet the views of the government. We propose to transfer that power from the Governor in Council to the railway commission.

We have made provisions which we trust and believe will be found useful in respect to foreign traffic, as to which a great many complicated questions arise. We have vested a very large discretion, I may say full discretion, in the commission, as respects the regulation of both traffic from foreign countries into and through Canada, and traffic from Canada into foreign countries. We have provisions which, if enforced, will compel railway companies which have connections with lines running into other countries, to make proper and regular arrangements with those lines, so that there may be some uniformity and equity in the rates imposed on that portion of the traffic which may be Canadian and on that portion which may be carried through Canadian territory.

We have thought a good deal on the question of the long and the short haul, a question which is fruitful of complaint and a very difficult one to solve. The provision which we have made covering that intricate and complicated problem is to leave the railway commission to deal with each case as it arises, save and except that we forbid the imposition of higher rates for the shorter distance as compared with the longer distance when the shorter is included in the longer; and we only except from the general operation of that clause those instances in which it has been made to appear—

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does that apply to foreign traffic?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The long and the short haul question arises more especially in our own country.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It arises principally in competition with foreign traffic. Suppose there is a shorter distance within our own territory as compared with the foreign traffic, would you apply the rule then?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We cannot apply exactly the same rule, because we do not control the whole traffic. I have already stated that as respects traffic to and from foreign countries, we have given the board powers which, if they are exercised, would be found, I think, to ensure equitable rates and equitable connections between railroads that are carrying our produce and connecting with outside roads and roads carrrying into the country and connecting with inside roads. But in respect to the long and the short haul generally, we control all lines in our own country, and it is only there that we can legislate in respect to these matters.

Mr. BARKER. Will this commission cover lake, canal and river navigation as well?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, we have clauses which embrace water communication. I think I have pretty well covered the important features of the Bill. I have gone into these matters perhaps at undue length. I have

not done so with a view of having a discussion upon the measure now. I know that such a discussion could not conveniently take place. The Bill will be in the hands of hon. members as speedily as it can possibly be supplied, and I hope at an early day to be able to move it to a second reading.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the intention to have this railway commission control or manage the government railways of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not embrace the management of the Canadian government railways.

Mr. INGRAM. That is to say, it would have no more to do with the government railways than with any other railway in the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nothing more.

Mr. INGRAM. Another question I would like to ask the hon. gentleman. Is it proposed that the classification of freights shall be in the hands of the commission, and that the railway associations which have heretofore classified the rates and the grades of freight subject to the approval of the Governor in Council shall not continue to do so without the approval of the commission ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They do not classify the rates. They simply classify the freights.

Mr. INGRAM. And they state what the rates shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. What I want to know is whether it is the intention that the commission shall classify these rates and compel the railway companies to adopt them ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is contemplated that the railway companies will continue, as they have done in the past, to submit their classifications for approval, but instead of submitting them for the approval of the Governor in Council they will submit them for the approval of the railway board.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the commission have any control over the freight rates on the government railways ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not heard any complaints of the freight rates on government railways, except by some gentlemen who think they are too low. The commission will have the general powers vested in the Railway Committee, but in a larger degree.

Mr. SPROULE. Will these powers apply to government railways as well as those controlled by private companies ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not stated specifically in the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If they are to have any application whatever to government railways, it seems to me that that ought to be specially mentioned. The ordinary principles of construction would lead to the conclusion, that, unless specially mentioned, they would not be included. If the hon. minister thinks that there have been no complaints with regard to the rates on government railways, I can assure him he is mistaken.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not heard of any.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) I know that it was broadly asserted in Nova Scotia, a year and a half or two years ago, that the rate on freight from Montreal to Sydney was lower than the rate from Halifax to Sydney. I do not know whether that was the case or not, but I know that it was complained of. What we desire to know is whether complaints of that kind regarding the Intercolonial Railway will be dealt with by this railway commission, or whether its jurisdiction is to be restricted to railways owned by private corporations. The provisions of the Bill should be made perfectly plain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The government railways are not specially mentioned in the Bill, nor are they specifically mentioned in the law constituting the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. But the government railways have always deferred to the tariff schedules adopted by the Governor in Council. There never has been any question raised as regards the jurisdiction of the Governor in Council in the matter. I think that the hon. member is correct in saying that complaints have been made that the rates have been too low on the Intercolonial Railway, but I have not heard any complaints, which we would regard seriously, that our rates are too high.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). We would like to know distinctly if the hon. gentleman proposes to give this commission the same control over the government railways as he does over all others ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am leaving that question just exactly where it is now. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council have control over railways generally, and the same conditions which exist now will exist under this Bill. If, as a matter of absolute law, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has jurisdiction over the government railways, the railway commission will have like jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. That does not answer the question. The hon. minister has told us that he is going to give this commission new and extensive powers, and I ask him whether or not he proposes to give it the same power over government railways that he does over other railways, or does he propose to let the government manage their railways without reference to the railway commission, unless they please to let that commission say something about them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not proposed making any specific provision at all with reference to government railways. At the same time, when we get into committee on the Bill, we might fairly discuss that point.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he is going to do away with what is called the classification of rates ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman propose to follow the principle adopted by the commission in the United States, and compel the railway companies to hang up a schedule of their freight rates in all their railway stations and compel the government railways to do the same ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We compel all the railway companies to do that and impose penalties when they do not, and we are giving the railway board power to enforce all orders and regulations which they deem necessary to prevent any infraction or evasion of the law.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Must the government freight rate schedules be hung up in the Intercolonial Railway station so that the public may know what rates they are paying ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt the schedules of rates are hung up in the Intercolonial Railway stations, and we are not making any change in that respect. I have seen them hung up myself.

Mr. OSLER. The question is, does the government intend, when this commission is appointed, to enforce the same rule in connection with government railways as they do in connection with private railways, namely, to see that at every station the rates are hung up, whether they be hung up now or not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have said that I am not making any special provisions regarding government railways at all, but I am leaving the matter in that respect exactly as it is to-day under the present Railway Committee.

Mr. OSLER. That does not answer the question in any shape or form, I want to know whether in the future this will be done ? I should judge from his answer that it will not.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). I understand the hon. minister to propose to leave the government railways outside the powers of this commission. I cannot understand his language in any other way, and we should be quite clear on that point. I would also ask him whether this commission will have power, in any way, to deal with vessel rates ? For example a railway may make a through rate, partly on rail and partly on vessel and again on rail. Will the commission have power to deal with such questions as that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will have the fullest possible powers we can give it, and if the hon. gentleman finds that these powers are not as complete as they ought to be, I would gladly consider any suggestion coming from him.

Mr. BARKER. It may be important that we should have this information early, because there are many interests involved. There are vessels that are owned in Canada by companies that run in connection with railways, there are vessels owned by railways; and I think it would be important to know whether the hon. gentleman proposes to treat these vessel owners practically as railway companies. I also understood the hon. gentleman to say that he does not intend that the government railway shall be subject to the orders of this commission, but that the government railway shall remain as it is to-day, subject only to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. If I am wrong in that——

Mr. SPROULE. I think he said that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council was to be done away with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) will find, when the Bill is put in his hands, that there is a section or a portion of a section—somewhere between section 275 and section 280, I think—which specifically deals with the class of traffic to which he refers—traffic which is part water and part railway, or railway at the two ends and water in the middle.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis). I desire to ask a question with regard to a point which may be found important. As I understand it, this Bill proposes to abolish the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. It might be important to the interests of the government that certain provisions of the Railway Act—that is, certain powers of that committee—should be conferred upon the proposed Board, so as to enable it to deal with the government railways. I

refer particularly to the matter of through rating, and of facilities. It might be desirable that this commission should have compulsory powers in matters of through rating and granting of facilities in connection with and in the interest of the government railways. I would ask the minister if, in the discussion of the Bill at a later stage, he is prepared to consider a matter of that sort, so that the House may be entirely free to discuss this phase of the matter, which may prove very important ?

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I do not intend to discuss this Bill at this stage. I am afraid that some utterances of mine in this House may be found on record in favour of a railway commission. But they are utterances of long ago. At present I have a leaning in the same direction as the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), believing that the proper power to regulate these things, after all, is the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, a body that is more directly responsible to parliament, and not a commission appointed as a judge is or as the Auditor General is, and not subject to our correction or revision, not subject, above all, to our removal. As I understand it, the powers the hon. minister attempts to give to this commission include the power to fix tolls, and not only the fixing of the tolls submitted to them by a company for their approval, but the power of saying to a railway company : You shall charge no other rate than the rate we think is the right one. They are to have the fixing of the tolls for the traffic of all the railways throughout the Dominion. I suppose that when the power is given to that commission of fixing maximum and minimum rates, they shall be rates that shall apply equally, pari passu, to every railway in the Dominion, that they shall not have the right to say to one company : You shall charge such and such tolls and to another : You shall charge such and such tolls, but that there shall be a maximum and a minimum for distance, with the consideration which the minister proposes that there shall be this one class of freight and another that he calls commodity freight and another which he calls international or competitive. And I suppose that these rates, the maximum and the minimum, once fixed, shall be applied to all the railroads throughout the Dominion.

An hon. MEMBER. Government railways, too.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As I understand the minister, he does not intend it to apply to government railways, but it is only applicable to other railways throughout the Dominion. I have not looked into the Bill, do not know its scope, but, to my mind, if that is the scope he proposes it to have, the Bill is a very dangerous one. It may interfere seriously with private rights; it may interfere with contracts which, at present exist between different railways and the government of Canada. It is true, we have the power of eminent domain in this parliament as much as they have in the Imperial parliament, and can exercise it as we please. But that right should never be exercised or be attempted to be exercised when it interferes with a contract solemnly entered into between the people of Canada and the different railways. I venture to say that a power of that kind given to a commission to fix rates absolutely at their own volition is a power which will interfere seriously with several such contracts which now exist. I shall not discuss the question fully, but shall look into this measure. But, generally, my predilection in these matters is the same as that of the minister. The hon. gentleman says that this Bill has been virtually urged upon him by petitions from the people of Ontario and the North-west, and that he doubts very much if the results which they anticipate will flow from the Act. I have no doubt whatever that those results will not flow from the Act. I am a firm believer in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and would prefer that, even as it is now constituted, to a commission. I think every considerable element in the country have confidence in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, aside from all questions of which government may be in power, believing that both the interests of the railways and the interests of the public will be guarded and that justice will be faithfully administered. There is also the fact that I have just stated—that they are amenable to parliament and the people. But, this commission will be entirely independent of parliament, and I do not believe in constituting such a tribunal. I believe in not binding the future parliaments of Canada. I believe that future parliaments should be left with absolute power, as we have, and that we should not impose upon them a tribunal which they cannot alter or remove at any time. I do not believe in these officers being permanent officers receiving large salaries and not removable. That is the primary objection I have to the Bill. It has not been shown that this commission is a necessity in this country. I think the present tribunal which steps in between the railways and individuals in reference to freight, is a good one. If the Minister of Railways and Canals had a branch attached to his department specially for the purpose of looking into freight rates and correcting anomalies such as he mentions, it might be an advantage and assistance to the department. The minister states that another part of the Bill codifies the laws at present in force in order to simplify them, but without making any material change. The only real change, he says, the establishment of this commission, is called for by public opinion in Ontario and the North-west ; he does not say that in Que-

bec and the lower provinces there is any growing sentiment in favour of this commission. He hardly boasts of being the parent of the Bill he introduces. It is evidently as he says, a Bill forced on him by public opinion, and one to which he does not give a very hearty sanction. I agree with him that there is not at present sufficient public opinion urging such a radical change as giving over the control of railways to a commission. As I understand him, this commission has larger powers than any other commission in the world. It has absolute power on every railroad in this country of fixing the maximum and minimum rates. If the law, or an Order in Council, fixed the maximum and minimum rates, and the regulation of the tolls within those extremes were left to a commission, it would be all right ; but to give to three or four men in this country the power of holding up every railroad in the country, without keeping them under parliamentary control, is a very serious matter. As I understand the minister, this commission are to have full jurisdiction over every question left to them, the only appeal is to the Governor in Council. Surely if the commission infringe upon any law of the country they ought to be subject to the courts of the land. I think they would be subject to the courts, notwithstanding this Bill, if the commission assumed to interpret a law, or if they did any act contrary to the law of the land ; I think then the court would step in and declare what the law actually is. However, it is an extraordinary power to give them. I suppose they have power to decide every question of fact. I do not know whether this Bill could remove that power from the courts altogether, I think the courts would decide whether the commission could exercise that jurisdiction. But so far as possible it is made a final court of appeal. It may be necessary in certain cases that it should be a court of final appeal. As I said before, I do not intend to discuss the Bill fully until I have seen all its provisions. But as far as I have heard the Minister of Railways and Canals, he has not yet offered any sufficient justification for the introduction of the measure which he proposes.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). Without seeing the Bill, of course I cannot say very much about it at present. I would like to ask the minister if I understood him right when he said there were two reports of Prof. McLean, and if so, are they both included in this pamphlet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. KEMP. I think the minister ought to make up his mind that so far as the regulation of tolls is concerned upon government railways, they ought to come within the scope of this commission, if it is created. So far as the general management of government railways is concerned, I do not think that would be a reasonable proposition ; but government railways are in competition with other railways, and if the rates of these other railways are regulated by the commission, it is only fair that the rates made by officers of the government railways should be under the same control. I think the Bill would be very defective, and would not appeal to the sense of this House, if such an exception were made. I have heard a good deal of discussion in regard to the creation of a railway commission, and I have at times taken part in such discussion. I have never consented, in any observations that I have made, to the appointment of a railway commission, although perhaps a railway commission, organized under certain conditions, might be of great benefit. It would depend altogether on the constitution of the commission, and upon the powers delegated to it. The hon. minister, in describing the constitution of the commission, as I understood him, said that it would be composed first of all of a gentleman versed in the law, another member would be a railway man, and in regard to the third appointment it seemed to me that the hon. minister was a little vague. It appears that the agitation which has brought this Bill into existence has come from the public and not from the railways. I take it that the railways have not pressed upon the minister the establishment of a commission such as he has outlined. Now, I consider that the most important appointment upon that commission would be a business man, a shipper, a man who has had large experience in dealing with railways from a shipper's standpoint. As I said before, the composition of this commission is a very important matter, it needs to be composed of strong men mentally, intelligent men, men with broad views, and men who will be able to face, in the discussion of railway rates, some of the most difficult problems that have to be faced in commercial life. I confess that at this stage it is impossible for me to give my consent to this Bill, and later on I shall have more to say about it. I would like, however, to inquire from the minister what provision he has made for the public being heard before this commission. So far as the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is concerned, I understand the greatest complaint of the public has been that they have not had an opportunity of being represented at the meetings of the railway committee, to make their interests heard and to see that such interests are considered. I think the Bill should have some provision in it by which the public may be represented in some manner.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has. I may say moreover, that there is a provision that the commission may be migratory in its sittings, they may go wherever necessity may arise.

Mr. KEMP. It would be a very serious thing, if the members constituting this commission, being independent of parliament, should be able, as they might, as the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has said, to actually hold up our railways. But there is another side to this question. At present while the only controlling power over railways is the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, it is quite possible for the railways to hold up the public ; and I have no hesitation in saying that the public can give very good evidence that they have in many cases been held up. I do not care, Mr. Speaker, to make any further remarks upon this subject now, but I will reserve my further remarks until the Bill is printed.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I think it would be better to allow the minister to introduce his Bill and then we will have an opportunity of reading the Bill and finding out exactly what it contains so that we may be able to discuss it intelligently afterwards. We are only wasting time.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, unlike the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) I think I am quite within my rights in discussing this Bill in this House when I think proper to do so, and I propose to discuss it so long as I am complying with the rules of the House. I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), that so far as I have been able to follow the statement he has made to-day, it is not clear as to whether the commission will have the power or the right to control the rates on government railways. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that unless his Bill is perfectly clear that the commission will have power to control the rates on government railways this Bill is of no use whatever, and he is making no improvement on the present system. I will show the hon. gentleman why I make that statement. This commission has power to control the rates of the railways in this country. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway run east of Montreal to certain points. The Canadian Pacific Railway state to a man who wishes to ship freight, that they will ship that freight for so much a pound to an eastern point. The shipper may not be satisfied with the rate given by the Canadian Pacific Railway. He goes to the Grand Trunk Railway and asks them for their best rate on that freight. The Grand Trunk Railway get from that shipper the amount the Canadian Pacific Railway are going to charge him and they say to the shipper that the Canadian Pacific Railway are violating the law by giving him a rate of that description. Under these circumstances their only redress is to appeal to the railway commission. They will enter a complaint before the commissioners and they will expect to get redress. If they are dissatisfied they will appeal to the Governor in Council, which is the last court of appeal. The government railway is running out of Montreal. Does the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals mean to tell me, that, in case of an appeal being entered before him as one of those interested in the decision of the Governor in Council, he and his friends who have control of the government railway, are in possession of information which shows that notwithstanding the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway had violated the law in giving a rate which it should not have given the government railways are giving a rate that is much less than the rate given by the Canadian Pacific Railway ? The whole thing would be a farce, and let me ask if, in the framing of these rates, of which the commission have to approve, the hon. gentleman means to say that the government railways of this country are going to get an interchange of freight with western railways if they themselves are allowed to violate any rules they wish. They certainly would not. The only way you can administer the rates properly is by classifying the freights and rates uniformly, thus making every railway in the Dominion of Canada subject to the commisssioners. The commissioners must have full control, and if you do that, you can control the government railways. They certainly have been violating rates every year since I have been in parliament. The commissioners should be given the sole control, and there must be no indefinite sound on that question. I want to say that I did not rise for the purpose of discussing the Bill, but I wish to take this opportunity of impressing upon the hon. minister the fact that if he wants to meet the wishes of a large portion of the people of this country he must see to it that government railways must be more subject to the commission than they have been subject to the head of the department in the past.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to know that the government have at last seen fit to bring down this measure providing for the appointment of a railway commission. I have not had the opportunity of going through the Bill, and therefore I am not in a position to say anything in regard to the details. But, the fact that the Bill has been brought down is sufficient for the time being. Later on when we shall have had an opportunity of going through the provisions of the Bill, I think it will be found to be fairly workable. In reference to the criticism of some hon. gentlemen, and more particularly to that of the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), I would say that it is very evident that that hon. gentleman is not in favour of an appointment of a railway commission at all. He seems

to think that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is sufficient. As I have stated before in this House, it is a well known fact that the trade and business of this country have grown at such a rate that it is impossible for the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to handle the business it should handle in connection with matters of this kind that come before it. As a matter of fact, we know, from our own experience in the west this year, that the people there have lost a great amount of money from the fact that we have had no body of this kind to regulate the railways of the country. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) alluded to the fact that the pressure of public opinion had been brought to bear on the government and that it had a great deal to do with the bringing down of this measure. I think it is gratifying to know that the government are awake to the fact that a commission of this kind is necessary and that they are ready and anxious to meet the opinions of the people. The hon. gentleman said that the railways are not asking for this commission. I do not think that any hon. gentleman in this House, or out of it, believes that the railway companies want a railway commission. They have had everything their own way for a great many years and they are perfectly satisfied, but the people who are advocating this measure believe that it is about time that railway companies were placed under proper regulation. We want a body appointed that will see that there is no discrimination in rates. I suppose that the people of the older portions of the country have not suffered as much as we have in the west, because, in a great many cases, we in the west have been paying double the freight rates that have been paid by the people in the east. I suppose this is a matter that might have been brought before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, still, it can be better dealt with by a commission on the spot. I have alluded to the fact that the people in the west this last season lost a great deal of money on account of not having proper control over the railways of the North-west Territories. I do not blame the Canadian Pacific Railway for not being able to move the crop we had this last season in the short time at their disposal, but I do blame the Canadian Pacific Railway for one thing, and it is the fact that while they had 7,000 freight cars in that part of the country during the time the grain was being moved out of the country, 4,000 cars were used for the purpose of hauling merchandise, and only 3,000 were left for the use of the people to take out grain. Further than that, some of these cars that went through with grain to Fort William were allowed to remain there for days and days. Sometimes 8 or 10 days would elapse before these freight cars were returned, waiting for return freights instead of being sent back to assist the people in getting the grain out of the country. The loss to which I have referred occurs in this way: The people who buy grain buy it on the basis of December delivery. If the grain buyers know that they can get the grain out of the country before the close of navigation they will pay 6 cents a bushel more than they will pay if the grain is to be stored at the head of the lakes over the winter. The grain buyers, knowing that there was going to be a congestion and that the grain was not going to be taken out of the country before the close of navigation, started in October buying on the basis of having to store the grain at the head of the lakes during the winter. While I do not expect that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be able to move all the grain out in the short time at their disposal, still, I think they could have made a better arrangement in that direction than they did, and if there had been a proper distribution of cars so that the people who are entitled to get cars, the farmers and small traders, could receive a fair supply, they would have been able to obtain a greater price for the grain than they did, and the people would have benefited to a great extent by that fact. If there had been a proper distribution of cars so that the farmers and small traders could get cars when they required them, the people of the western country would have received a better price for their grain, and they would have been much better off than they are. I think this railway commission will be beneficial to the people for the settlement of small disputes. There are a certain class of disputes between individuals and railway companies which can be settled by this commission and which could not be settled by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Claims against railway companies burning buildings and for killing cattle can be submitted to this commission, whereas the ordinary man is not able to come to Ottawa to present his claim before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council here, and if he goes to the courts he knows that these wealthy corporations will drag him from court to court to the Privy Council in England itself, and bankrupt him before he can obtain justice. If this commission is properly constituted, as I hope it will, it can consider all these complaints, and in this way a great many claims against railway companies will be settled which otherwise would not be settled. Nothwithstanding what the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has said, I believe that the feeling of this House on both sides, as evidenced by the resolution passed by it some time ago, is strongly in favour of the appointment of a railway commission. I believe that when this Bill comes to be considered in detail, the joint wisdom of both sides of the House can make a very good and wise law out of it.

I fancy that three commissioners will be sufficient, and I would be in favour of getting the very best men we can get. Even if we had to pay $40,000 a year for a really first-class railway man to put at the head of that commission as chairman, it would be money well spent and the people of this country would reap immense advantage from it. When we come to discuss the Bill in detail all these matters will of course be considered.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT, 1890—AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 105) to amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Bill is intended to amend section 42 of the Bills of Exchange Act. It is intended to settle a doubtful point as to the rights of the drawee with respect to the dating of his acceptance of a sight draft. Section 42 is as follows :—

When a Bill is duly presented for acceptance and is not accepted on the date of presentment or within two days thereafter the person presenting it must treat it as dishonoured by not accepting it ; if he does not the holder shall loose his right of recourse against the drawer and endorser.

A doubt has arisen with respect of the right of the drawee to date the acceptance. The acceptance must be within the date of acceptance or two days thereafter. A doubt has arisen as to whether if he accepts within the two days he must date his acceptance of the date of presentment, or as the date he actually accepts. It appears that the lawyers have managed to find elements of controversy on that point, and in order to put it beyond dispute, and at the request of the Bankers' Association, I have introduced this Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does it provide ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. On the date of actual acceptance.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT FARM AT LONGUEUIL.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. At whose request was the property known as the government farm, in Longueuil, county of Chambly, put up at auction ?
2. Were any private offers made for the land, and if so, by whom, and when ?
3. By whom was the land purchased ?
4. In whose name is the deed thereof ?
5. What was the purchase, and how much has the government received in cash for the same ?
6. How much of said farm was reserved, and to whom, and why was any portion so reserved?

Mr. DAVIS.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. Mr. Geoffrion, M.P.
2. No.
3. Robert Campbell.
4. Land has not been patented.
5. $31,100, of which $7,750 has been paid.
6. About seven acres, three acres each to the Protestant and the Roman Catholic School Commissioners of Longueuil, P.Q., for the purposes of a school site, and a small triangular piece of land deeded to the Crown on condition it would never be disposed of.

THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. What interpretation has the Gold Commissioner of the Yukon placed upon the Orders in Council of June 12th and 29th, and December 7th, 1901, granting certain rights known as the Treadgold Concession ?
2. Has the Gold Commissioner interpreted these Orders in Council as granting to the concessionaries all lapsed claims ?
3. If so, what has been the effect of such interpretation ?
4. Has such interpretation, or any other interpretation or ruling by the Gold Commissioner, had the effect of closing any and what mining claims or areas of the central or other portions of the Klondyke mining district to locations by free miners ?
5. How many claims have already fallen into the concession under any such ruling or interpretation of the Gold Commissioner ?
6. Is it true that about 3,500 claims have already fallen into the concession under such ruling or interpretation ?
7. What is the total area of the claims which have already fallen into the concession under such ruling or interpretation ?
8. Does the government consider that the Gold Commissioner's interpretation or ruling is correct ?
9. What are the exact terms of the Orders in Council above referred to ?
10. What are the exact terms of the concession known as the Treadgold Concession ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. The gold commissioner interpreted that clause 10 of the Order in Council of the 12th of June, 1901, did not give exclusive right to Treadgold Concession to re-locate claims. No report has been received from the gold commissioner as to his interpretation of the orders of the 29th of June and 7th of December, 1901.
2. The answer to No. 1 replies to this question.
3. No report has been received from the gold commissioner as to the effect of the

interpretation placed by him on the order of the 12th of June, 1901.

4. The gold commissioner has not reported the number of claims and area closed under the interpretation placed by him on the Order in Council of the 12th of June, 1901.

5. No report has been received from the gold commissioner as to the number of claims which fell into the concession under his interpretation of the Order in Council of the 12th of June, 1901.

6. The reply to question No. 5 is an answer to this question.

7. The reply to question No. 5 is in answer to this question.

8. The Department of the Interior considered that the gold commissioner's interpretation of the Order in Council of the 12th of June, 1901, was correct.

9. The Order in Council, copies of which have been laid on the Table of the House, give the exact terms.

10. The terms of the concession are specified in the Orders in Council which have been laid on the Table of the House.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS—ARREARS OF WAGES.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Are there any arrears of wages due workmen in the Department of Public Works ?

2. Why is the department in arrears with regard to the payment of its workmen ?

3. How many workmen are employed by the Department of Public Works in the county of Beauharnois ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Yes, the heating staff at Ottawa was not paid for March.

2. The firing season being longer than usual this year and the price of coal higher, the appropriation was exhausted.

3. None.

THE INSPECTOR OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES FOR THREE RIVERS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Does Mr. Gravel, inspector of weights and measures for the district of Three Rivers, reside and keep his office at the chief place of his district ?

2. Does he make the inspections himself, or by whom has he them made ?

3. Where does he live ?

4. What amount has he received for salary, &c., from the government since July, 1901, up to the present ?

5. What amount has he collected for the public treasury since July, 1901, up to the present ?

6. What work has he done since July, 1901, up to the present ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier) :

1. The head office is at Three Rivers, but he does not reside there.

2. The inspections are made by Mr. Gravel and his two assistants.

3. Louiseville.

4. Mr. Gravel has, since July 1st, last, received as salary $749.97 and contingencies $237.70.

5. Collections for work performed by himself were, for same period, $549.55.

6. Has inspected the counties of Champlain, Richelieu, Maskinonge, St. Maurice and at head office at Three Rivers.

ISSUE OF A CIRCULAR.

Mr. BELAND asked :

1. Is the government aware that the following circular, signed 'P. Landry,' has been sent from the Senate of Canada into the counties of the province of Quebec :—

'(Confidential.) Ottawa, Senate, April, 1902.

'Sir,—I send you a form which I ask you to be good enough to fill in as soon as possible.

'1st. By putting down the names and surnames of the persons engaged in the employments mentioned in the form.

'2nd. By having each of these names followed by one of the following marks :—

'X. If he is a Conservative.

'O. If he is a Liberal.

'?. If he is doubtful.

'3rd. By distinguishing the councillors as follows, placing the names on the lines A for the councillors elected this year ; on the lines B for the councillors elected last year ; on the lines C for the councillors elected in 1900 ; and by placing after the name of the mayor one of the three letters A, B or C, according as the mayor has been elected this year, last year or in 1900.

'4th. By naming the hotelkeepers and drivers according to their importance and efficiency, beginning with the most commendable.

'5th. By naming the two most prominent Conservative leaders and the two most prominent Liberal leaders.

'6th. By adding after the name of the secretary-treasurer your estimation of that officer, who may be an intelligent partisan, scrupulous, or a skilful, dangerous adversary, to be watched.

'7th. By giving information, as far as possible, of the number of copies of each of the newspapers received in the parish.

'8th. By supplying in the space reserved for remarks all that you think has been omitted in this form and which might be considered as useful information. I shall be happy to receive any suggestions you may be pleased to make. You need not prepay your reply if you address it to me at the Senate, Ottawa. I will ask you as a favour to have your reply reach me as soon as possible.

'I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

'P. LANDRY.

'To avoid any possible misunderstanding, do not forget to place after each name the mark suggested in paragraph No. 2.'

2. Is the signer, P. Landry, employed by the government in connection with the census ?

3. If so, since when, and what is his salary ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, I beg to give the answer, which is: No.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF PULLMAN CARS.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Does the government know that for the past three years the Pullman Car Company has constructed and repaired all the Pullman cars in use in this country in the United States, instead of having them constructed and repaired in the Grand Trunk Company's workshops at Montreal, as was practised for a number of years?

2. Does the government know that this change deprives the workmen of Montreal of several hundred thousands of dollars, which was expended there before the change in question?

3. Does the government know that this change, injurious to the working class, is due to the alteration of the Canadian tariff made by the present administration?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). No representations to this effect have been made to the government.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PENSIONS.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

Has the government decided to give pensions to partially or totally disabled members of the several Canadian contingents serving in South Africa; or to the relatives of members of those contingents who lost their lives during term of service?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). Under the terms of enlistment, members of the Canadian contingents are entitled to the same pensions from the Imperial government as members of Imperial corps. The government has not considered the question of adding to such pensions so granted.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PURCHASE OF HORSES.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

Why were no western horses purchased for the third contingent?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). The horses for the second Canadian Mounted Rifles were purchased and paid for by the Imperial government, and the contractor was at liberty to purchase where he chose. I am informed that 200 horses were purchased at Brandon.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

George M. Loy, Esq., member for the electoral district of Beauharnois, introduced by Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Mr. Bernier.

THE CORONATION CONTINGENT.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in the event of a military force being sent from Canada to the approaching Coronation ceremonies, such force should be composed in its entirety of officers and men who have seen active service on Canadian contingents in South Africa.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when I had the honour of placing this resolution on the Order paper I thought I was doing an almost unnecessary act. But, to my amazement, I have seen within the past few weeks a statement made—whether officially or not, I am not prepared to say, but, no doubt, we shall hear this afternoon—that the men who placed their services at the disposal of the country in the hour of need are not to be regarded in the contingent that is to be sent to the coming Coronation ceremonies. It will be a matter of surprise to the people if the fact is officially stated that those who, in the hour of the country's extremity without fear gave their services to the empire, are to be passed over when this contingent is to be sent to Great Britain. Scarce can be found a city, town or hamlet in this whole Dominion in which since this unfortunate war has arisen, there are not people who have sorrowed at the loss of relatives in that far away land or have not rejoiced at the safe return of their kinsmen who had gone upon their perilous errand to uphold the country's flag. I can hardly believe the statement, which, from time to time, appears in the press, that the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden), I suppose, in consonance with the wishes of the ministry, intends to ignore the application of those who served with these contingents in South Africa and to give places on the Coronation contingent to men who have not seen active service. It will be rather startling to know that the men who have returned from South Africa are to be left aside, and that carpet knights are to engage in the festivities that are to attend the great pageant which is to take place in Great Britain. I cannot and will not believe that this is to be done until I hear the statement made by the Minister of Militia and Defence himself. I trust that when the minister makes his official statement on this subject the House and the country will be gratified by learning that every man who went forth in the hour of trial—for it was an hour of trial for Great Britain and her colonies—are to be first considered in forming the Coronation contingent, and that their places are not to be taken by men who were not, I will not say brave enough, but who were not ready, to go on that occasion. I await with considerable anxiety, as I know the whole country does, the statement of the minister. And, in the further remarks which I may make, I trust that I shall be able to offer commendation and congratulation to the minister that he has made the statement that every man who tendered his services on the contingents for South Africa, whether as a private or as an officer, and who wishes to go to Great Britain as a member of the contingent on the occasion of the Coronation, will be ac-

cepted, provided that he had the honour and glory of serving on behalf of his country in the South Africa troubles.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). I have a great deal of pleasure in at once putting an end to that anxiety which my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has been labouring under so long. This notice has been on the paper since the first week of the session, and I am sorry that my hon. friend should have kept himself unnecessarily in that condition of anxiety, when, by moving this motion at any one of the opportunities that have offered—probably a dozen—he could have terminated—

Mr. BENNETT. If the minister will pardon me for a moment, I would say that, several times when the Order was called, it stood at the request of the government.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I was here at least half a dozen of times when the hon. gentleman could have moved it. However, that does not matter very much. My hon. friend says that, in his opinion, the contingent that is to be sent to the Coronation to represent the Canadian militia should be composed exclusively of men who have served in South Africa. I would like to ask my hon. friend why he would exclude the men who served, for instance, in the North-west rebellion? They served their country as faithfully as did those who went to South Africa. It seems to me that to state the proposition of my hon. friend is to at once make evident the answer, and that answer is that, while we should include in the Coronation contingent representatives of the different corps that have served in South Africa, it is equally important that we should include representatives of every part of the Dominion and all branches of the militia—that, in fact, you should make this Coronation contingent thoroughly representative of the militia of Canada as far as possible. My hon. friend speaks of ignoring the men who fought in South Africa. There is no intention of ignoring them. But my hon. friend wants to ignore the scores of men who wished to go to South Africa but could not get an opportunity to do so. I think that those men who were denied the opportunity of going to South Africa have a right to representation on the Coronation contingent as well as those who did go to South Africa. All I can say now to my hon. friend and to the House is that I propose to recommend to the government that we should send a contingent composed of 580 men, representative of all the different branches of the Canadian militia; that the different corps in the various districts of Canada should be fairly represented numerically; that the selection should be made with reference to the numbers enrolled in the militia in each district; and that we will endeavour to have it truly representative of the force of this Dominion which will show to the people of England and to the people of the empire as clearly as possible the kind of militia force we have in this country. I repeat that we shall take care that fair representation is given the men who have done such splendid service in the war in South Africa.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to ask the minister what period these men are likely to be away, and who is to pay them?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The Imperial government have offered, as in the case of the jubilee contingent, free lodgings, barracks, and rations to the men for one month, and barrack accommodation for the officers. We have not really developed the scheme yet, but my present idea is that the force should sail for England about the 7th of June, and leave England to return during the first week in July. The men will be paid by the Canadian government.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). While I would not feel like going quite as far as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), still I think there is a good deal in his contention, that other things being equal, preference should be given to those members of the militia who went to South Africa. There is no doubt that the eyes and the attention of the Canadian people are to-day very much on those men. They have given evidence, not only of their loyalty to the country, but of their desire to maintain the prestige of the country, to maintain British law and British order in a very distant part of the empire. In doing so they have been obliged to undergo perils and hardships that are not usually incident to the militia service of the country; and if any recognition could be shown them beyond that which is shown the ordinary militia man in Canada, I am quite sure it would meet with the approval of the Canadian people, and agree with what they regard as a sense of justice. I think there is a good deal in the contention of the hon. minister that the various portions of the militia force should be fairly represented, because in going there they will be regarded as samples of the militia of Canada belonging to the various branches. But it might not be possible to do that properly if you confined the selection to those who went out to South Africa. Still, there is no doubt many will have the privilege of going by virtue of the influence they will be able to bring to bear upon the Minister of Militia and Defence, and the influence which these young men can bring to bear upon that same power if they desire to go. While the South African men might not command the same attention and indulgence that others do, I think that in consid-

eration of what they have done for the country, every allowance should be made for them, and other things being equal, as many as possible of the young men who went out to maintain law and order in that distant country should be selected for the contingent.

Mr. BENNETT. When I placed the order on the paper, I was at a loss to know how many men would compose this contingent, and therefore I thought it well to say that it should be composed exclusively of men who had returned from South Africa. I was aware of the fact that in that unfortunate trouble some 5,000 of Canada's best men had answered to the call of duty, and I am thankful to know to-day, from all the information I have heard, that over 500 of those young men have returned safe to Canada. When I placed the order on the paper in that way, saying that the force should be composed in its entirety of those men, it was because I did not know how many the government proposed to send, and I thought that, of all others, those who had gone out to South Africa should have the first claim. Talk about the corps being representative, talk about it being regarded with great applause in Great Britain by reason of its being representative of all the various corps of the militia, I tell the minister that if it were known that every man who marched in procession under the Canadian flag and under the British flag, had borne arms in South Africa, the hurrahs of the crowd would be much greater than if it were known that they were simply marching as representatives of the different militia corps of this country. The minister smiles. Well, Sir, all I can say is that I do not believe it will be regarded as a smiling matter throughout this country when it is known that gentlemen are about to attach themselves to the corps of this country in order to take part in this most peaceful errand. on this junketing tour, at this time when everything of the best will be at their disposal, and who, I am bound to say, in many instances, never threatened the government or any department of the government with an intimation that they wished to go under the guns in South Africa. Now, regarding the question of the North-west representatives, the force is going to be a large one, some 550 men, and I am bound to say that if other applications are received than exclusively from men who have been to South Africa, there will not be many vacant places for men who are in the North-west. Once again let me say there are young men in every town and county in all the provinces who have been to South Africa, and I say it is unfair to them, when they were prepared to give up the best they had, to risk their lives and give up their situations in many cases, that now when there is to be this gorgeous pageant in Great Britain, these young men are to be told by the minister that because they are not representative Canadians from a militia point of view, a place of honour is to be denied them. I say the feeling in Canada is universal that no more representative men could be found for the contingent than the men who, in the hour of trial, were ready to go under the guns and under the British flag in South Africa. I trust that even yet the minister will change his opinion, and will say that every man who can show that he has been in the South African war will be given an opportunity of going.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) will withdraw his motion under the circumstances ?

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister will add to his former statement that any man who has seen active service in the troubles in South Africa shall have the first claim, then I will seriously consider it.

Mr. M. V. AVERY (Addington). I would suggest that an addition be made to those eligible to go. There are quite a number who would like to go and I think I would extend the limit so that it would give more of the members of the militia who wish to go an opportunity of going. I would suggest making the force a little larger.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The number is fixed by the war office, or by the Imperial government. Five hundred and eighty is the maximum number that we are allowed to send.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to understand from the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence whether any special consideration is to be given to the men who served in South Africa. Is there any consideration, in sending this force to London, to be given to the men who served in South Africa, or who tendered their services ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think I stated that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not quite understand it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will repeat it then. What I said, or what I intended to say, was that the corps which had been sent to South Africa would be represented on this contingent. That is what I intended to say and that statement I will repeat. As to special consideration, I scarcely understand how any further special consideration could be given than that. We wish to make it a thoroughly representative corps and it will of necessity include representatives from every one of the contingents that went to South Africa including that of Lord Strathcona.

Mr. BENNETT. Under these circumstances it is quite plain to my mind that the men who offered their services and who have been in South Africa are not to be accorded the place of honour, because it would be the place of honour, as a matter of right and consequently I must ask for a division.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Before the motion is put, I would like to ask the hon. minister another question, if it would not result in the divulging of any secrets. Is it true that the minister has applications from several thousand officers and men to go on that contingent, and that only about 60 applications have been received to go to South Africa with the contingent to be sent out? Is it true that there are these large numbers who want to go on a junketing tour and only 60 who want to go to South Africa?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am happy to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria), that we have more applications to go to South Africa than we have to go with the Coronation contingent.

Mr. BENNETT. They know that there is a better chance.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. And that a great many officers who did want to go on the Coronation contingent, since the determination has been arrived at to send another contingent to South Africa, have withdrawn their names and now wish to be sent to South Africa.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). I want to say one or two words before this motion is put and to make a suggestion. If the hon. minister will put it to the applicants who are anxious to go to the Coronation, I have sufficient confidence in the appreciation of the volunteers of Canada to feel that they will all give way so that those who stood under the guns, to use that expression, and went out and risked their lives, while many of their comrades remained at home, may have an opportunity of going and that they will all say: 'If there are not enough places to go around, send the boys who went out and represented the country in this war. I cannot see why those who served in South Africa ought not to have the first choice? I do not believe it is probable that as many as 580 will apply but if we did not give any special recognition to those who had performed that splendid service in South Africa, I think it would show that we were wanting in appreciation. It is all very well for us here in this happy land, in this peaceful country, so far away that we cannot hear the thunder of the guns there; we remain here, but those boys of their own accord went out and represented us as volunteers. If we had sent out 5,000 instead of 1,000, and I would like to have seen 5,000 sent out, or 10,000, they would have rallied as is shown by the number mustering for this latest contingent. It is only fair that we should extend some consideration to these volunteers and if we did not do so I think we would be wanting in appreciation. That is the only reason why I am saying this just now. I am sure that if there are enough of those who performed this voluntary service in South Africa to fill the contingent, that others will be willing to take second place and allow them to go. Let me add one word to what was said by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) who brought this motion forward. If you send 580 of the boys who were in South Africa with their uniforms they wore when they came back, many of them soiled, some of them blood stained, nothing would be a greater addition to the parade and nothing would more please the people of Canada and the people of the British empire than an exhibition of that sort. I would not care if the contingent were not quite so representative in one sense as in another. What do they represent? How did we get our liberties and how have they been held? How have Christianity and civilization been spread? We have helped to hold them. We have helped by legislating here but had it not been for the men who have gone without consideration of danger of hardship or death to bear their share in battle this British empire would not have been what it is, and but for such actions could not remain. So, I say that we should offer the first choice to the boys who deserve it most, and if they do not fill the places, then send others.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Mr. Speaker, I claim to be second to none in appreciation of the services that the brave men who fought for Canada and for the empire in South Africa rendered, but it seems to me that the hon. gentlemen opposite have not well considered the motion before the House when they speak for it and when they propose to support it. Not only have we these men in Canada who have seen service in South Africa, but we have large numbers of men who saw service in the North-west rebellion, and before that in the Fenian raids. Had the motion of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) been to the effect that those men should be chosen from the thousands of men who had seen active service in defence of Canada or the empire, then, I would have felt disposed to support it, but as I understand it he wishes the whole contingent to be drawn from those men who saw service in South Africa. To me this seems to be a decided reflection upon the rest of the militia force in Canada. We have in the active militia to-day some 40,000 men all told and but a small portion of these men have seen service in South Africa. Whenever a call has been issued to the volunteers for active service in South Africa that call has been responded to by two or three times the num-

ber of men who were able to go, and yet this resolution would prevent the acceptance of those men who volunteered for service but whose services were not accepted simply because the number was limited.

Mr. BENNETT. If the House will consent I will propose a change in the motion by substituting for the words 'should be composed in its entirety,' 'should be composed in the main.' I would be quite willing to accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman and make that amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON. I fancy that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence is the proper person to consider any proposition of that kind, and I would wish to go on with my remarks as it is nearly six o'clock, for only two or three minutes more. I would say that not only have we the men who went to South Africa, but there are the men who fought in the North-west rebellion and the men who fought in the Fenian raid. There are many good men to-day in the active militia who went out in the Fenian raids. I have them in my own regiment and if there was a large number of men in the militia who never volunteered to go to South Africa I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to say that it was cowardice that kept them from volunteering. They did not volunteer to go to South Africa for the good and sufficient reason that in many cases they had obligations at home which made it impossible for them to volunteer. And yet for years past these same men have been keeping up the militia force of Canada and have made it possible to send to South Africa these contingents which have brought such credit to our arms. This resolution proposes to turn down some 30,000 active militia men in Canada. It proposes in the case of the fine regiment in the county which my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) represents, to select some eight or ten men and to exclude 400 men who have done good service in the militia ranks of this country. In the case of my own regiment we have had some fifteen who volunteered and accepted service in South Africa, but we have 400 others to consider, and I for one would never consent to a motion of this kind which would debar these brave men from any participation in this Coronation trip, which has been so disrespectfully spoken of by the hon. member for East Simcoe as a junketing tour.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Thompson) has taken too much credit to the different militia corps because as a matter of fact a great many of the boys who went to South Africa were not connected with the militia at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. Ninety per cent of them.

Mr. BRODER. I can recall a good many who were not connected with any corps.

Mr. HEYD. How many ?

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. BRODER. The hon. gentleman is so bad at figures that there is no use counting them for him. He would not be in the number any way. I do not think that you should get together a lot of young men some five feet and some six feet in height, and send them over on this contingent. I think that the question of physique and appearance as well as bravery comes in on an occasion like this. I can quite understand the pride of Canadians in seeing that their country is represented by fine looking men at this ceremony, and for that reason a little latitude should be given in the choice. Sometimes a very small man may be a very good fighter, but he would not be taken as a specimen of the physique of the Canadian people. I am not boasting because I happen to be tall myself, but I take a little pride in the fact that the stateliness and athletic appearance of our Canadian people ought to be represented in that corps. For that reason we should modify this resolution. While we may give the small men a chance later on we want to give the big fellows a chance now.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis). I would draw attention to the fact that outside of the Canadian contingents that have gone to South Africa, quite a large number of our young Canadians have been serving the empire in the imperial army. To-day, I believe, a sad funeral cortege will be wending its way through the city of Halifax to the county of King's, which the Minister of Militia represents, bearing the body of young Lieut. Beverley Webster, late of the King's Own Regiment (a son of the opponent of the present Minister of Militia at the last election), a young officer who lost his life in the service of his country while holding a commission in the imperial service, which I believe was secured for him by the Minister of Militia. Two of three of our young men in Halifax have sacrificed their lives for their country while connected with the imperial troops. I may mention the names of young Lieut. Wood and Lieut. Hensley, who offered up their lives for their country in the South African war. Surely it is not well that we should forget that these young men have added lustre to the name of Canada. Surely it is not necessary for us to pass a resolution here to say that any particular branch of the service should be exclusively represented in the corps to be sent to the Coronation. I might also say that in the regiment at present garrisoning Halifax nine-tenths of the men would be delighted to be allowed to go to South Africa.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They have all volunteered now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WADE. They have all volunteered for South Africa now and there are thousands and tens of thousands of men in our Canadian Militia who are as anxious to go to

South Africa as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) was anxious to go, and who I believe would do as much credit to Canada as he did while he was there. I therefore say that it is not proper that we should make any distinction on this occasion. I believe we can safely leave it to that minister, who has laid upon the altar of his country such a great sacrifice, to select such men as he may deem proper to represent Canada. And if it should be a question of physique, then you had better take all the men from the province of Nova Scotia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. I beg to move an amendment which I think will meet the views of those who have offered objection to the resolution as proposed. This amendment I think meets with the approval of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). I move :

That the word 'entirely' in the main motion be expunged and the word 'principally' be substituted in lieu thereof.

I feel much sympathy with the motion as moved, for I believe that something is due to those brave men who fought for the empire in South Africa. I am of opinion that they should have an opportunity of visiting the mother country to which they rendered such glorious service.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Yale and Cariboo). The object of sending this contingent to the Coronation, as I understand it is, that every branch of the military service of Canada may be represented. The object is not to show to the people of Great Britain the physique of Canadians, because they are already well satisfied with that. The object being therefore to send representatives from every branch of the service, that can only be attained by following the suggestion offered by the Minister of Militia. No one would be more delighted than I, to give due preference to those Canadians who have served in the defence of the empire. No doubt the hon. minister will select, as he has stated he will, principally from the ranks of those who have served in South Africa ; and I for one would say, select liberally from those ranks, while at the same time giving others in the different branches of the service a right to be selected.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite understand why the contingent will not be representative of all the branches of the service in Canada if the men are selected in accordance with the suggestions made in this amendment. We are told by the hon. Minister of Militia that he desires this body of troops to be a fair representation of all the branches of the service in Canada. Well, I ask him whether it is not true that the contingents which have already gone to South Africa do fairly represent all the branches of the service in Canada ? If that is true, it seems to dispose of every objection raised also on that score by the hon. member for Haldimand, who states that 90 per cent of the men who have gone to South Africa are from volunteer regiments. That being the case, you have all branches of the service—infantry, cavalry, and artillery represented by them. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) made a suggestion which does not seem to have any practical bearing on this matter. He says that a number of our young men are serving in the imperial forces. That is true, but I do not see how the government of Canada can select them for this purpose. The motion of my hon. friend from East Simcoe probably required some modification. I agree that the men who served in the defence of their country in the North-west rebellion should be considered. But this particular occasion is one with which the empire is specially concerned, and the war in South Africa was one in which the whole empire was concerned. The ceremony that is to take place in London will have a particular significance in that respect, inasmuch as it concerns not the British Islands alone, but every portion of the empire as well. Therefore, I did regret to hear the Minister of Militia say that no special recognition is on this occasion to be given to the services of the Canadian troops in South Africa. It seems to me, without slighting for a moment the services performed by the gallant sons of Canada in the North-west in 1885, that the service in South Africa is one to which special significance should be attached in connection with the ceremony which is to take place in June next ; and when that force comes to be constituted, I hope special consideration will be given to the men who were engaged in that service. I do not for a moment desire to say a word in depreciation of the volunteer force of Canada or of the men who sought to serve in South Africa and were not afforded an opportunity to do so. I know that there are many such men in Canada—men who deserve well of the country ; but, notwithstanding that, I think the men who did go to South Africa and face the foe there and who performed their duty in such a way as to make the name of Canada a household word throughout the length and breadth of the empire, should be principally considered in the making up of this contingent which is to visit the mother country. I say that from the standpoint of the best interests of Canada and the empire. I think there is a great deal in the observation which has been made to-day that special attention would be given to our Canadian troops in June next in London if it were known that those troops were selected principally from among the men who had fought for the empire in South Africa. I hope, therefore, that the minister will give this matter a little further consideration, and that the expression of opinion he has made to-day will not be regarded by him as final.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not wish this debate to end with the impression given to the country which would be given by the statement that has just been made by the hon. leader of the opposition, that I had spoken in any way slightingly of the men who have served in South Africa.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Oh, no, I did not suggest that. All I said was that I understood the minister to say that no special consideration would be given to the Canadian troops who had served in South Africa; at least, I understood that he was not prepared to say that any special consideration would be given to them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What I did was to ask what was meant, by special consideration. As I understand, knowing something about military organizations, men who have served in the field receive medals for their service, and when they go on parade they wear those medals. They have that special distinction; but I never knew, in the imperial army, or anywhere else, any case in which a number of men were put together in a body as representing any particular battle or any particular service in which they had been engaged. I was going on to say that I think this House and this country will acquit me at any rate of any desire to say anything or do anything that would appear in any way to slight the men who have served in South Africa. I propose to put those men on a fair footing in relation to the other men who may compose the contingent; and those men are not the men to ask for anything more than that. The question has been asked, what remains of the objection? I ask, after the modification proposed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, what remains of the resolution? And surely, Mr. Speaker, after the six years of service that I have given, and after the record that the Militia Department has made in this country, it is not too much for me to ask that in this matter I be allowed to use my own discretion.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all correspondence, letters, claims, &c., addressed to the government in regard to the indemnity of Treffle Nantel, a guard at the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, who died on or about the 12th September, 1900; as well as all documents relating to that matter.—Mr. Léonard.

Return of any communications, reports, or other documents received by the government, or any member or department thereof, from Colonel Taylor, of Pittsburg, U.S.A., with reference to the deposits of coal and coal mining in South British Columbia, particularly the Crow's Nest Pass coal fields.—Mr. Bennett.

Copies of all letters, telegrams, and other correspondence between the Department of Labour and the officers of the Rossland Miners' Union and other persons, in reference to the alleged violations of the Alien Labour Act in connection with the Rossland miners' strike.—Mr. Smith (Vancouver).

Return indicating:—

1. The names of all grantees of permits to cut timber in the Yukon, to whom permits, licenses or leases have been issued since the 1st January, 1899.
2. The location of such grants.
3. The annual amount payable by the grantee, licensee or lessee.
4. The price or consideration of the grant.
5. The name in each case of the present holder or grant or lease, if transferred.
6. Whether each and every grant was publicly advertised for sale by auction.—Mr. Monk.

Copies of all correspondence, papers, letters, telegrams, &c., between the Department of Justice and the authorities of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, relating to the leave granted to the present warden, as well as that which passed respecting the superannuation of the said warden.—Mr. Léonard.

Statement showing:—

1. Into how many classes the employees of the Intercolonial Railway are divided.
2. The name, residence and the salary of each of the employees of the first class.
3. The name, residence and salary of each of those of the second class.
4. The number of those of the third class, and the total amount of the yearly salary paid them.—Mr. Léonard.

Return showing:—

1. The number of cattle, sheep and horses killed by engines on all Canadian railways during each year since 1890; (a) at points of intersection of highways; (b) elsewhere on the lines.
2. How many engines and cars, if any, were derailed or disabled on all Canadian railways during each year since 1890, owing to their striking cattle, sheep and horses; (a) at points of intersection of highways; (b) elsewhere on the lines.
3. How many railway employees and passengers, if any, were killed or injured on all Canadian railways during each year since 1890, on account of engines striking cattle, sheep and horses; (a) at points of intersection of highways; (b) elsewhere on the lines.
4. What is the total estimated value of the cattle, sheep and horses killed on all Canadian railways, during each year since 1890, owing to their being struck by engines.
5. What is the total estimated damage to rolling stock and other railway property on all Canadian railways during each year since 1890, caused by collisions with cattle, sheep and horses.
6. How many trains have been derailed or partly derailed on all Canadian railways during each year since 1890, owing to the action of frost on the road-bed at points where the old pit cattle-guards were in existence.—Mr. Erb.

1. For copies of all Orders in Council, petitions, applications, reports, telegrams, correspondence, grants, contracts, agreements, documents, and communications in writing relating to or concerning the grant to or concession to A. N. C. Treadgold, or to the Hydraulic Mining Syndicate, either separately or associated with A. N. C. Treadgold, of any claims, rights, and privileges on Bonanza, Bear and Hunker Creeks,

or their tributaries, or elsewhere in the Yukon Territory.

2. A description and plan showing the situation, location, area, and other particulars of all the claims, rights, and privileges so granted or conceded to the said A. N. C. Treadgold, or to the said Hydraulic Mining Syndicate, as aforesaid.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Return showing what licenses, during the year 1900, were issued, entitling the persons named therein to fish for oysters on the beds planted by the government in the harbour of Shediac. And also, showing to whom such licenses were issued, and on what dates they were respectively issued, and by whose authority they were issued in each instance, and whether such licenses, or any, and which of them were cancelled; and if so, how many, and on what date, and for what reason such licenses were cancelled; and what quantity of oysters was secured under such licenses during the period they were in force.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Statement of all moneys paid by the Dominion government to the province of Ontario during the calendar years 1900 and 1901, respectively; stating in each case how much of such moneys so paid was on account of subsidy, allowance for government, and interest, respectively. Also, copies of all telegrams, letters, or correspondence of any kind in any way relating to or connected with the transmission of such moneys.—Mr. Henderson.

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, affidavits and documents relating to the dismissal of Alphonse Thomas, as postmaster at La Prairie, P.Q.—Mr. Monk.

Copies of contracts by this government with Messrs. Poupore & Malone, for construction of wharf below Montreal; and also for construction of wharf at Sorel; and copies of specifications relating to both said works.—Mr. Monk.

Copy of petition dated on or about November 29, 1901, from the president of the Quebec Trades and Labour Council to the Department of Labour, and of all documents connected with said petition or mentioned therein, or correspondence ensuing therefrom in reference to the arbitration controversy or conflict between the Shoe Workers' Union of Quebec city and Mgr. L. N. Bégin, Archbishop of Quebec.—Mr. Puttee.

Copy of the report of Inspector McRae of the Indian Department relating to the investigation held by him respecting the complaint by the Restigouche Indians against Indian Agent Peters, together with all correspondence and documents in connection therewith.—Mr. Fowler.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 85) respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 90) to incorporate the British America Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Demers (St. Johns and Iberville).

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Nepigon Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

MEDICAL COUNCIL IN CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 11) to provide for the establishment of a medical council in Canada.—Mr. Roddick.

On section 6,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). What is the effect of sub-clause 3 ?

Mr. RODDICK. It means that this work cannot be begun until five provinces have decided to come into the council, and no province is obliged to enter the compact, but may go on giving licenses within its own provincial boundaries as at present. By paragraph F of section 4, I have met the objection regarding unconstitutionality. It is quite clear that this enactment cannot be ultra vires when each province affected by it must pass concurrent legislation before it can come into effect.

On section 10,

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill if he thinks this will enable the graduates of any one province to practice in another without difficulty. I notice there has been some difficulty in South Africa over the fact that the British doctors think they are so far in advance of our Canadian doctors that the Canadians should not be allowed to practice. I think it would be well if some provision could be made in this Bill, whereby a graduate, for example, of Nova Scotia, if he has a certificate from the governing body in Nova Scotia, could practice in Ontario, and vice versa. I think perhaps in this growing Dominion that both doctors and lawyers should be recognized in all the provinces, except in so far as may relate to the particular course of study required in each province. I think that would do much to facilitate matters. I think the certificate of any well known college in any province of this Dominion ought to be sufficient to permit the holder to practice in any part of the Dominion.

Mr. RODDICK. I may say in answer to my hon. friend that in order to get reciprocity with Great Britain, to which he evidently refers, and to be able to register in Great Britain so as to practice in South Africa or any other part of the empire, it will simply be necessary to pass a central examining board such as we propose to make.

Mr. FRASER. Will they accept it in Great Britain ?

Mr. RODDICK. At once. In 1886 they decided by Act of parliament that so soon as we had in this country a Dominion or central examining board, they would give registration to those having qualified before that board for any part of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FRASER. How about the provinces ?

Mr. RODDICK. They would come in under the same arrangement.

On section 10, subsection (iii).

The possession of a Canadian university degree alone, or of a certificate of provincial registration founded on such possession, obtained subject to the passage of this Act, shall not entitle the possessor thereof to be registered under this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Should that not be 'subsequent' to the passage of this Act instead of 'subject' to the passage of this Act ?

Mr. RODDICK. Yes, that is quite right—'subsequent to.' I think, however, the meaning is the same.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to designate a time after the passage of the Act and the only proper word would be 'subsequent.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think 'subsequent' would be better.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 16, subsection 3,

Mr. VROOMAN. I think under this clause that there would possibly be an injustice inflicted upon students who are engaged in the study of medicine. If this Bill becomes law, any young man obtaining a degree between now and the time that the local legislature legislates on this Bill, would not be able to receive a degree from this council until he passes his examination before this council. I think that would hardly be just to the young man. There should be some provision made for these young men who are studying medicine and passing their examination between now and the time the legislature legislates on this Bill. A young man who is studying medicine in the province of Ontario now, may get his license to practice, but possibly the province does not adopt this Bill for five years and then he will have to go up for examination before this council to get his degree. I think that would be an injustice to the young man.

Mr. RODDICK. How would you propose to deal with that ?

Mr. VROOMAN. If he has practised for six years he should be allowed to come under the operation of this Bill. A young man in Ontario could not be examined before this council until the local legislature has enacted this Bill which might be ten years hence.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If we knew what was wanted we might be able to frame the language to suit.

Mr. SPROULE. There will be a number of young men who will pass their examinations in their own province which will entitle them to register before this medical council is established. What Dr. Vrooman wants is to provide that when these young men have practiced six years they shall by virtue of the length of time they have been practicing come under this Act without going before the council for examination.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The fixed date is not to be from the passing of this Act, but from the date of the provincial legislation.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

On section 20,

The PRIME MINISTER. I would suggest to my hon. friend that this Bill be not further proceeded with this evening, but that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. The reason I make this appeal to my hon. friend is that I have been appealed to myself, especially from my own province, against the passage of the Bill ; and, to be perfectly candid, I must say to my hon. friend that I was a little prejudiced against it before I had taken cognizance of it. I was under the impression that it was going so far as to compel the medical profession in all parts of Canada nolens volens, to be incorporated ; but I see that subsection 3 of section 6 contains a provision which leaves the medical profession in any province free not to become part of this corporation. This in my estimation ought largely to remove the objection which existed in some quarters against the wide scope of this Bill. Therefore, I would suggest to my hon. friend that the Bill be left on the Order paper, so that before it goes to the final stage it may circulate amongst the medical profession, especially in the province from which he and I come, in order that they may become acquainted with it ; for I think my hon. friend will agree with me that it would be exceedingly inadvisable to carry the Bill to a hasty conclusion, without giving the profession ample opportunity to familiarize themselves with it, and, if it is not absolutely free from objections, to

make suggestions which would render it acceptable. The Bill is a very wide one, but I think it will on the whole serve a good purpose if it can be shown to be free from the objections which have been urged against it. Therefore, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BROCK. Before the suggestion of the Prime Minister is adopted, I wish to say that for some years past a very great interest has been taken in this measure in the province of Ontario, where the medical profession generally are very anxious that it should pass. I have seen some communications from the province of Quebec, signed by a few medical men who are opposed to it for some reason or other ; but, outside of these few men, I believe the great bulk of the medical profession throughout Canada are strongly in favour of it, and I do not think it should be delayed except for really important reasons. The hon. premier has indicated that he himself had some little prejudice against it, but that that prejudice has now been removed. That being the case, I think he might now urge upon his friends from the province of Quebec the great desirability of this measure. I think I am safe in saying that not only thousands of medical men in the other provinces, but also the vast majority of the profession in the province of Quebec, are in favour of it ; and its passage should not be delayed except for some good and valid reason, and not because of some little prejudice by which the medical profession are sometimes liable to be actuated—I say that with all respect to my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Roddick). The demand for this measure comes from one end of the Dominion of Canada to the other. I believe it will be found that one thousand medical men are in favour of it for every one who is opposed to it. Therefore, I would ask my hon. friend the leader of the government to facilitate the passage of this Bill at the earliest possible moment. I think I am safe in urging this, on the authority of the total medical profession of the province of Ontario and right through to the Pacific Ocean. Our desire is that Canada should be one country, and this Bill is one of the means of bringing about that end, and it should not be hampered by any little prejudices. Therefore, I would appeal to the premier to endeavour to remove the objections which are entertained against the Bill, and to allow it to go through at the earliest possible moment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think my hon. friend takes the proper view when he imagines that there is any desire to obstruct in any way the adoption of this measure. But it is a departure from the principle that has held in this country since confederation. We are departing from the principle that has hitherto existed governing the medical profession, and therefore I think that before it becomes law we should take care that all parties interested be made fully conversant with its provisions and be given the opportunity of expressing their views should they object to any of them. The Bill before the committee is not that which was introduced, as considerable modifications have been made. It provides specifically for provincial co-operation, in order to make it effective, we should see that the medical bodies which exist in the provinces, whose co-operation is required, should be given every opportunity to give it their careful study. It is not a question of consulting a few people in the province of Quebec. This is considered a serious matter in many of the provinces outside Quebec, and what we have to do is to educate the people of the different provinces to the idea that this is intended for their benefit, and to remove from them any idea that it in any way affects the privileges they now possess.

Mr. BROCK. I quite appreciate that this measure is considered very desirable, not only in the western provinces but in the province of Quebec as well, and I am anxious that no impression should be allowed to be created that it may be injurious to them in any way.

Mr. SPROULE. As there are many important amendments in the Bill as introduced, I would suggest that a sufficient number of copies be struck off to afford medical men all over the country an opportunity of examining it. I do not see any reasonable objection to holding it over so long as it can be got through some time this session.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Have copies been sent to the different provincial governments ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know, but I believe that members of this House have sent out copies to the medical men in their respective localities.

Mr. WADE. I would like copies to be sent to the medical boards in my province.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would it not be well to have a number of copies put at the disposal of each member to send out to those interested in the constituency he represents ?

Mr. PARMELEE. As chairman of the Printing Committee, knowing that this was an important Bill, I took the precaution of having a sufficient quantity printed to reach every medical man in Canada. I do not know that hon. members generally have perhaps appreciated sufficiently the importance of this measure, and sent it out to the medical boards in their different counties. The difficulty that I see in connection with the Bill is simply that it is dealing with the subject of education, which is one of those that have been delegated to the provinces.

If I felt sure that this was no encroachment on provincial autonomy, I should gladly support it. I think that the medical profession of the province of Quebec are largely in support of this measure, but we are naturally and reasonably jealous of any encroachment on the rights specially delegated to the provinces by the British North America Act. If that objection be removed, I believe that the Bill will be beneficial in its operation, and perhaps the medical profession in Quebec would realize more advantage from it than the medical profession in other parts of the Dominion, for this reason that our young men are proficient in both languages, and as in all our provinces there are localities where there is a mixed population, a young doctor from the province of Quebec could practice his profession in such mixed communities with greater chance of success than a practitioner tied down to one language. On the other hand, however, I believe in provincial autonomy. I believe in preserving all the rights guaranteed to us under the constitution, and if there was any possibility of this measure being an invasion of that automony, I should be opposed to it. I think that the suggestion of the right hon. the Prime Minister that this Bill should stand over until the medical profession in the various provinces have had time to study it in all its bearings, is a wise one. Nobody is anxious to take any hasty step or to invade in the slightest degree provincial rights or autonomy, and I am therefore quite willing to support the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman that the Bill should stand over for the time necessary to give the different medical boards the opportunity of studying all its provisions.

Mr. MONK. I would like very much to see the Bill stand over, because I believe that some members of the medical profession in Montreal have not appeared before the committee owing to a misunderstanding. I am fully convinced that when they have examined the Bill, probably some notions they have concerning it will disappear. Several French Canadian practitioners in the city of Montreal have told me that they were anxious to see it passed, as they believed it would be of great use to themselves, but none the less is it desirable that all parties interested should be given an opportunity of thoroughly studying it. I see no objection to our letting it stand over for the short delay required. I do not agree with the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmelee) that the question of education is touched by this measure. So far as I can understand, the Bill is not an educational Bill in any sense of the word. We would oppose it if it were. I think it is more a Bill coming within the purview of this legislature under the first part of section 91 of the British North America Act. It does not come under section 93 in any way, and I do not think it comes under section 92, but, as I have stated, under the opening lines of section 91. A subject which is for the general interest of Canada, I should call it. However, I should be glad to have a few days in order that our medical practitioners in Montreal may have a chance to see the Bill.

Mr. RODDICK. I accede with pleasure to the wish of the right hon. Prime Minister to postpone further consideration of the Bill. I may say that I have taken some trouble to distribute this Bill—not the very last edition, because it has only been here a few days—but with each fresh edition, I have taken the trouble to distribute it pretty generally in all the provinces. I am quite aware that sufficient time has hardly elapsed yet to allow the profession in distant parts of the country to fully consider the Bill. At the same time, I may say that I have telegrams or other communications from the various boards of the Dominion, practically all to the effect that they have no objection to the Bill. It is true I have nothing from the province of Quebec officially. I am exceedingly sorry that some leaders of the profession, including Dr. Lachapelle, who is the president of the council of the province of Quebec, could not find it convenient to be present at the committee meeting. He is looking into the matter. He has been always in favour of something of this kind, if autonomy is not disturbed. I feel that we shall have in a short time the entire profession of Quebec in our favour.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We had, last night, a rather late sitting, and, perhaps, I should best consult the interest and the wishes of the hon. members by moving the adjournment of the House, which I do.

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

The PRIME MINISTER. First, we shall take up some Bills, and then go into supply taking up the militia estimates.

Mr. EDWARD A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Before that motion is put, I would ask the right hon. leader of the government, as it is now only ten minutes past nine, to dispose of the next item, No. 3 of the Public Bills and Orders, which is my Bill to amend the Railway Act. I do not think the discussion will take long. As the matter will have to be disposed of some time this session, and as the hour is still early, I would ask the right hon. leader of the government to be kind enough to allow us to proceed with it before insisting on the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I see by the Order paper that the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) has been reported on adversely by the committee—that is, the committee recommend that it be not proceeded with further during the present session. As I understand the hon. gentleman wishes to have this reversed and to have the Bill proceeded with this session. The House is very thin—for due cause which we can all appreciate—and I would hope that my hon. friend would not bring such an important question as asking the reversal of the decision of a committee before such a thin House. That is why it seems to me better to adjourn.

Mr. LANCASTER. May I say, then, that I would ask the right hon. Prime Minister to facilitate my going on with this Bill at an early day. Thursday is now taken by the government, to-morrow being the first Thursday so taken. Otherwise this Bill would have come up to-morrow. So, it is pretty hard for one advocating this Bill to have it put off to-night when it could be taken up, unless the government will assist me to go on with it at an early day. I think I am entitled to ask that.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think that the hon. gentleman requires any pledge from me. I believe that if he is here on Monday evening this item will, in all probability be reached.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that there are a number of Private Bills on the Order paper. I understand that we are likely to have but one day a week devoted to business other than government business. If that is the case, it seems to me we might subject ourselves to the penance of doing a little work to-night.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Those who sat here until three o'clock this morning will hardly think so.

Mr. CHARLTON. But, if we have but one day a week, we shall have but little opportunity to do this public business.

The PRIME MINISTER. But my hon. friend has had Monday after Monday and other days as well to bring up the business, and again and again the House has adjourned at nine or ten o'clock having exhausted the Order paper. We are coming to the point of the session, when I think we can reasonably hope for the blessing of prorogation. But, if my hon. friend is here on Monday evening, probably the order of Public Bills and Orders will be reached. I see on the Order paper very few notices of motion that are likely to be debated. Of course, I cannot say with certainty, but I think it probable that Public Bills and Orders will be reached, and then my hon. friend will have an opportunity to discuss the items to which he refers.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9.25 p.m.

INDEX.

SECOND SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT, 1902.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div , Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved. Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4573 (ii).

Clinton, David, Postmaster at Wellington, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 613 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 2680 (ii).

Picton Public Buildings, Delay in Opening (Ques.) 1490 (i).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates, examination) 514 (i).

Yukon, Treadgold Concession, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4989 (ii).

Angers, Mr. C., *Charlevoix.*

L'Isle-au-Coudre Wharf, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3409 (ii).

Avery, Mr. M., *Addington.*

Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2464 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 465 (i) ; in Com., 3184 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Post Office (country postmasters) 3900 ; (Postmaster Lewis) 3909 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grande Vallée) 1041 (i).

Ball, Mr. Geo., *Nicolet.*

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) on M. for Com., 4662 (ii).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. to refer back to Com., 2061 (i).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4425, 4528 (ii).

Therien, Mr. H., Dismissal as Postmaster from Grandes Piles, Pet., &c. (M. for copy*) 3724 (ii).

Barker, Mr. Saml., *Hamilton.*

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 2146.

Fishery Awards and P.E.I., Premier's Speech (remarks) 3859 (ii).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Accounts, Vouchers, &c., (M. for ret.*) 529 (i).

——— Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3266 (ii).

——— Locomotives, Construction, Steaming Qualities, &c. (Ques.) 445 (i).

——— Revenue and Capital Account for 1901, &c. (M. for ret.*) 529 (i).

——— Rolling Stock, &c., Condition, &c., (M. for ret.*) 3724 (ii).

——— Steel Rails, Rolling Stock, &c., purchased in 1901, O.C.'s, Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 885, 886 (i).

——— Ties and Sleepers, Purchase, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 444, 2065 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4038 (ii).

Railway (commission) Consolidation Act. Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2446 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals : Trent Valley (Corry & Laverdure's claim) 4014 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1163, 1180 (i).

Militia (properties) 2552 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto harbour) 1275 (i).

Railways and Canals : I.C.R. (additional sidings) 3812; (bridges, strengthening) 3809 ; (car couplers) 4794 ; (Chaudière Junction, engine house) 4786 ; (Clergue's contract) 3791 ; (Drummond Co., &c.) 3527 ; (general vote) 3483 ; (Miramichi bridge spans) 3812 ; (rolling stock) 3814, 4784 ; conc., 5037 ; (St. John accommodation) 4786 ; (steel rails, &c.) 3781 ; conc., 5035 ; (Stellarton accommodation)

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—Con.
4788; (Sydney accommodation) 3806; P.E.I. (bridges) 3828; (Charlottetown accommodation) 4918; (Murray Harbour branch) conc., 5040 (ii).

Béland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 16 (i).
Circular issued by P. Landry, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2458 (i).
Fish Canners in B.C., Prof. Prince's Remarks (Ques.) 449, 613 (i).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 14) 1°*, 530 (i).

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa.*
Accountants Bill. *See* 'Chartered.'
Bell Telephone Co. of Can. (B. 143) 1°*, 3725 (ii).
Chartered Accountants (Dom.) incorp. (B. 160) 1°*, 4241; 2° m., 4571; on M. to present Rep. of Com., 4693; in Com., 4694 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 107) in Com., 4414.
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4671, 4680 (ii).
Joint Stock Co.'s B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 5061 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 3°, 4400 (ii).
Metropolitan Bank incorp. (B. 144) 1°*, 3725 (ii).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 961; on M. to ref. back to Com., 2061 (i).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4517 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, Relevancy of Deb., 4523 (ii).
Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4349 (ii).
Railway Act (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4598 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Exchequer court) 229 (i).
Public Works: Buildings, Yukon (Collinet, Mrs., dismissal, &c.) 4538; (official residences) 4546 (ii).

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*
Accountants, Chartered, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4574 (ii).
Agricultural and Manufacturing Products of Can., Aggregate Amount, &c. (Ques.) 747 (i).
Aladdin, Str., Quantity of Coal carried (Ques.) 884 (i).
Archibald, P. S. (M.) to have called as Witness in Pub. Accounts Com., 1395 (i).
Blue Books, Publication, &c. (remarks) 2731 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1685 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 770 (i).
Census Figures quoted by Sir Richard Cartwright (remarks) 1764 (i), 2731 (ii).
Coal carried by Chartered Strs. (Ques.) 884 (i).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Dismissals of Govt. Employees for political reasons (M. for ret.) 428 (i).
Eastern Extension Ry., N.S., Refund of Amounts paid by Counties, &c. (Ques.) 781 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4416 (ii).
Govt. Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).
——— M. for Ret., 428 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3239, 4036 (ii).
I. C. R. Employees, Number, Salaries, &c. (M for ret.*) 440 (i).
——— (Ques.) 132 (i).
Joint Stock Companies B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5059 (ii).
Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4360 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re Year Book* (remarks) 1764 (i), 2731 (ii).
Peter Jetson, Str., Quantity of Coal carried (Ques). 884 (i).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4039 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep. (M.) to ref. back, *re* P. S. Archibald, 1108, 1395; Neg. (Y. 56; N. 101) 1436 (i).
Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr *Charlton*) 276 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Parmelee*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3232 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4036 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, 1891) 4103; (experimental farms) 2899; (*Year Book*) 2906.
Civil Govt.: Agriculture (Chittick, F. C., promotion) 4965 (ii).
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1148 (i).
Fisheries (oyster culture) 555 (i).
Geological Survey (director, &c.) 4116 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Nfld., coast survey) 5028 (ii); (Traverse light) 527 (i).
Militia (Coronation contingent) 4263 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Dom. and Provl. arbitration) 4120 (ii).
Post Office (branch offices) 3887 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (Grosse Isle) 982; (quarantine stations) 982; N.S. (Halifax custom-house) 636; Ottawa (additional rooms, H. of C.) 564 (i), 4137; (elevators H. of C.) 4137 (ii); (telephones) 987 (i); (ventilation, H. of C.) 4140 (ii); Yukon (rentals, maintenance, &c.) 970 (i); Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 4142; N.S. (Drum Head breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Pictou island) 1009; (Washabuck wharf) 1009 (i); (Windsor dams) 4624; Telegraph Lines, Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4150; (pole contract) 4164 (ii).
Quarantine (unorganized districts) 2903 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Canso ferry service) 4295; (Windsor branch) 4292; P. E. I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4924; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4870 (ii).
Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren*) to Com. of Sup., 4398 (ii).
Yukon, Treadgold Syndicate, &c., Concessions (Ques.) 241 (i).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
American Tugs in Can. Waters, &c. (Ques.) 441.

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Anten Mills and Hendrie Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1681 (i).

Census, Simcoe, N. and E., Cost in 1891-1901 (Ques.) 2224 (i).

Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c. (prop. Res.) 2459 (i).

Craig, Judge, Interview *re* Yukon Irregularities: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

Crow's Nest Coal Fields, Cor. with U.S.A. Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2471 (i).

Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2864 (ii).

Judges of County Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3310; in Com. on B., 3946 (ii).

——— Legislation *re* Compulsory Retirement (Ques.) 131 (i).

Noble Bros., Claims, &c., Papers, &c. (remarks) 3926 (ii).

Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4349 (ii).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3371; (census, exodus, &c.) 4435 (ii); (general statistics) 342; (Glasgow exposition) 358; (*Patent Record*) 330; (*Year Book*) 336 (i).

Canals: Galops (entrance) 4023; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4023; Sault Ste. Marie (deepening entrances) 4004; Trent Valley (construction) 4004; (Corry & Laverdure's claim) 4010; (dredging, &c.) 4273; Welland (Port Colborne entrance) 4019 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Inland Revenue (salaries) 176; Labour Dept. (salaries) 195; Public Works (salaries) 178 (i).

Customs (American tugs in Can. waters) 3297; (revenue cruisers) 3297 (ii).

Fisheries (Noble Bros. award, &c.) 4228 (ii).

Justice: Yukon (legal adviser) 3592; (Sheriff Eilbeck) 3586; (witness fees) 3590 (ii).

Post Office (Barrie mail service) 3910; (LeSueur, Mr., superannuation) 3904; (mail service) 3914; (Midland postmaster) 3916 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Generally (armouries) 865; (contract or day labour) 674: Ont. (Clinton) 719; Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 674; (Sorel works) 674; Yukon (rents, maintenance, &c.) 972; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barrie wharf, repairs) 1217; (Goderich harbour) 1236; (Midland harbour) 1237; (Orillia wharf) 1241; (St. Joseph's wharf) 1264; (Tobermory harbour) 1247; Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1032; (Sorel wharf) 1053 (i); Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft to Dawson) 3293 (ii).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 391 (i).

Railways: I.C.R. (Drummond Co. rental) 3516, 3550; (Lévis accommodation) 3810; (locomotives) 3823; (Rivière du Loup engine shops) 3828; (rolling stock) 3823; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4284, 4292 (ii).

Tiverton SS., Grounding, &c., Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 2856 (ii).

Transportation on St. Lawrence, Amount spent, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3698 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Tubercular Test, Res. by Shorthorn Breeders Assen. (Ques.) 130 (i).

Yukon Irregularities and Interview with Judge Craig (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

Bernier, Hon. M. E. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *St. Hyacinthe.*

Coal Oil Inspection (remarks) 5074 (ii).

Inland Revenue Rep. (presented) 121 (i).

Fraudulent Sale Act, Inspection *re* Commercial Commodities (Ans.) 744 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 85 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 4569 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Inland Revenue (salaries) 176 (i).

Electric Light Inspection (salaries, &c.) 1201 (i).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1148; distillery duty) 1184 (i); (grain standards) 4258 (ii); (inspectors' salaries, &c.) 1147 (i): (rents, fue &c.) 4961 (ii).

Gas Inspection (salaries) 1201 (i).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1185; (inspectors' salaries, &c.) 1185; (metrical instruments) 1201 (i), 4961 (ii).

Three Rivers, Inspector Gravel, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2457 (i).

Tobacco Duties, Amount collected for 1901 (Ans.) 134 (i).

Bickerdike, Mr. Robt., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 38) M. to ref. back to Com., 2054; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 85) 2063 (i).

——— (B. 148) 1°*, 3919 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4515 (ii).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Binder Twine Advertisements, Circulars, &c. (Ques.) 410, 618, 885, 1439 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1490 (i).

Market Gardeners, Protection against Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3662.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3382; (census expenses) 4434; (cold storage) 2640; (creameries) 2654; (experimental farms) 2871; (fruit inspection) 2597, 2629 (ii); (general statistics) 343 (i); (poultry shipments) 2648.

Electric Light Inspection (salaries) 1201 (i).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1152, 1166 (i).

Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 544 (i).

Gas, &c., Inspection (salaries) 1201 (i).

Justice: Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 3594; Man. (land purchase) 3618 (ii).

Militia (properties) 2556 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (life-saving rewards) 515 (i).

Post Office (country postmasters) 3875; (mail contracts) 3910 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—N.B. (Marysville) 640 (i); Ont. (Port Colborne) 4616 (ii); Ottawa (H. of C., additions) 848; Que. (L'Assomption) 657; Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Skeena river) 1277; Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1220; (Blind River wharf) 1223; (Port Credit) 1228; (transportation) 597; Que. (Valleyfield, dredging) 1062 (i).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1189 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *St. John City.*
Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2661 (ii).
C.P.Ry. Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 3130 (ii).
Canals, Dom., Expenditure, Revenue, &c. since Confederation (Ans.) 784 (i).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2220 (i).
Chambly Canal, Wharf, &c., Maintenance by G.T.Ry. Co. (Ans.) 2069 (i).
Clergue's Contract, *re* Steel Rails, Quantity delivered, &c. (Ans.) 746 (i).
Cosmos Cotton Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 2670 (ii).
Financial Situation, Review, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4855 (ii).
Freight Rates, on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1205 (i).
Fruit Transportation, Excessive Ry. Charges, &c. (Ans.) 1109 (i).
Galops Rapids, Improvements, Personal Explanation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5020 (ii).
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) on M. for Com.. 4652 (ii).
Gilbert Blasting and Dredging Co., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 3155 (ii),
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4672 (ii).
I.C.R., Accidents through Cattle on Tracks (Ans.) 883 (i).
——— Barbour, John, Charges against, &c. (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
——— Coal carried by chartered Strs. (Ans.) 884.
——— Coal purchased in Canada (Ans.) 883 (i).
——— Ditching along Temiscouata Farm Lands, Damages, &c. (Ans.) 2677 (ii).
——— Expenditures, Inquiry by Pub. Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3240, 3245 (ii).
——— Fire Insurance on Locomotives, &c. (Ans.) 2854 (ii).
——— Freight Rates on Pig Iron, &c. (Ans.) 783.
——— Horne, Mr. R. T., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2068 (i).
——— Locomotives and Ry. Cars purchased from 1896 to 1902, on M. for Ret., 2681 (ii).
——— (Ans.) 1108 (i).
——— Mulgrave and Point Tupper Ferry Service, &c. (Ans.) 1684 (i).
——— Passes, on Inquiry for Ret., 4404 (ii).
——— St. John's Elevator, Amount of Grain handled, &c. (Ans.) 884 (i).
——— Ste. Monique Station, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 744 (i).
——— St. Octave Station, Tenderers, &c., Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2222 (i).
——— Steel Rails, &c., Quantity, &c, purchased, on M. (Mr. *Barker*) for Ret., 886 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Ties and Sleepers, Purchase, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2066 (i).
——— Tantramar Marsh Washout, Repairs, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1108 (i).
——— Trucks, &c. purchased (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
King Bros., Claim against Govt., Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 3308 (ii).
North Shore Power, Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3134 (ii).
Pacific Northern and Omineca Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 72 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 2669 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Southport to Murray Harbour, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4696 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1399 (i).
Railway Act (expropriation) Amt. (B. 155) 1° m., 4126; in Com., 4580, 4586 (ii).
Railways and Canals Rep. (presented) 129 (i).
Railway Commission. Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 131, 883 (i).
Railway (commission) Consolidation Act Amt. (B. 104) 1° m., 2431 (i).
——— (remarks) 4404 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Parmelee*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3222 (ii).
Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2673 (ii).
Ste. Catharine's Water Supply, &c. (Ans.) 883, 1866 (i).
——— *See* 'Welland.'
St. Lawrence Canal Employees, Amount paid, collected, from 1896-1901 (Ans.) 2222 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Carillon (dredging, &c.) 4281; Cornwall (lighting, &c.) 4294; (repairs, &c.) 4311; Culbute (damages, &c.) 4281, 4309; Farran's Point (enlargement) 4300; Galops (deepening, &c.) 4021, 4300; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4021; Generally (extra services) 4294, 4312; Georgian Bay (surveys) 4299; Lachine (electric plant) 4299; (lock repairs) 4035; (Mill Street paving) 4307; (waste weir) 4308; North Channel (dam) 4034; (enlargement) 4300; Quebec (boundaries) 4281; Rapide Plat (enlargement) 4304; (Gilbert Bros.) 4021; Rideau (Poonamalie causeway) 4270, 4917; Sault Ste. Marie (entrances) 4001, 4298; Soulanges (construction, &c.) 4019, 4304; Trent Valley (construction) 4004; conc., 5047; (Corry & Laverdure, claim) 4007; (dredging) 4270; (Lindsay and Fenelon road) 4270; (Peterborough dam) 4918; Welland (lock walls) 4306; (Montrose bridge) 4801; (obstructions) 4798; (Port Colborne entrance, &c.) 4019, 4306, 4798; (Port Dalhousie) 4306 (ii).
Civil Government: Railways and Canals (Dixon, F. A., promotion) 4782; (salaries) 3779 (ii).
Railways: Generally (Ry. Commission) 4305; (remarks) 2866; I. C. R. (general statement) 3411; (additional sidings) 3811, 4792; (air brakes) 3812; (bridges, strengthening) 3809, 4792; (Canso ferry service) 4294; (car couplers) 4794; (Clergue's contract) 3781; (Drummond Co., rental, &c.) 3515;

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways and Canals—Con.

(Eel River station) 4796; (engine house, Chaudière Junction) 4786; (expenditure, &c.) 3559; (Halifax accommodation) 4790; (Lévis accommodation) 3810; (mechanical supt.) 3813; (Miramichi bridge) 3813, 4794; (Moncton, accommodation) 4797; (Moncton, engine house) 3830; (Moncton, shops) 3828; (Mulgrave improvements) 4297; (new machinery) 3812, 4297; (Nicolet station) 4796; (North Sydney improvements) 4796; (operation, maintenance) 4310; (original construction) 3809; (Ouelle River spur line) 4796; (Pictou accommodation) 4795; (Pintsch gas equipment) 3812; (Point Tupper) 3828; (private cars) 3828; (Rivière du Loup yard) 3828; (Rockingham improvements) 4798; (rolling stock) 3813, 4297, 4783; (St. John, increased accommodation) 4786; (steel rails) 3781; (Stellarton accommodation) 4788; (Sussex engine house) 3829; (Sydney, accommodation) 3805, 4789; (Sydney, branch) 3996; (Sydney, bridge) 4795; (tools, machinery, &c.) 4297; Miscellaneous (salaries, engineers, &c.) 4292; P.E.I. (bridges) 3828; (Charlottetown accommodation) 4918; (Murray Harbour branch) 3862, 4000, 4282, 4292, 4921; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4861, 4871 (ii).

Tay Canal, Collections and Payments, &c. (Ans.) 2067 (i).

Temiscouata and I. C. R., Traffic Facilities in 1900-1 (Ans.) 1861 (i).

Transportation Distances, &c., Cost, &c. (Ans.) 136 (i).

Webb and Sunday Travelling over P. E. I. Ry. (Ans.) 4700 (ii).

Welland Canal, Depth, Quantity, &c. of Water, leased or available, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

——— Water Privileges, and Riordon Paper Co., Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 745 (i).

——— Water Supply, O. C. granting Power to St. Catharines, &c. (Ans.) 883, 1860 (i).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) on Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii).

Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. *re* Ry. Management (Ans.) 2942 (ii).

Yukon (British) Ry., Tolls and Charges, &c. (Ans.) 3638 (ii).

Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *McCreary*) on Sen. Amts., 4570 (ii).

Borden, Hon. F. W. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *King's, N.S.*

Cadets, R. M. C., Application *re* Coronation Contingent (Ans.) 3638 (ii).

Circular issued by P. Landry, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2458 (i).

Coronation Contigent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2461 (i).

——— Representation, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3837 (ii).

Courts Martial in Militia Force, Number, Offences, &c. (Ans.) 740 (i).

Fenian Raid Medals, Issue, &c. (Ans.) 1109 (i).

Borden, Hon. F. W.—*Con.*

G. O. C., Increase of Salary, &c. (Ans.) 614 (i).

Hutton-Hughes, Ret. ordered by Hse. (Ans.) 446.

Larose, Jos., Indemnity, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 624 (i).

London Drill Shed, Allotment of Armouries, &c. (Ans.) 1446 (i).

Militia and Defence, Report (presented) 1322 (i).

Militia Officers, Training, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2708 (ii).

Montreal Rifle Ranges, Amount expended, Tenderers, &c. (Ans.) 2223 (i).

N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2488 (ii).

Pensions granted in British Army *re* wounded (Ans.) 2679 (ii).

Permanent Corps, Total Cost (Ans.) 409 (i).

——— Total Strength (Ans.) 740 (i).

Peters Target at London Camp, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 446 (i).

Rifle Associations' Regulations, Pamphlet, French Translations (Ans.) 2223 (i).

Rifle Practice for Young Canadians, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 3157 (ii).

Royal Military College, Rep. of Commissioners (Ans.) 443 (i).

——— *See* 'Cadets.'

S. A. War, Canadian Casualties, Telegram read, 2191 (i).

——— Contingents, Land Grants to, &c. (Ans.) 1446 (i).

——— Horses purchased in N. W. T. for Fourth Contingent (Ans.) 2679 (ii).

——— Pensions to Canadians (Ans.) 2459 (i).

——— Small-pox Outbreak among Troops, &c. (Ans.) 1447 (i).

——— Socks for Third Contingent (Ans.) 3638.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, 1891) 4110 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 2533; (armouries, &c.) 4259; (contingencies) 2562; (Coronation contingent) 4262; (Dom. arsenals) 2565, 4261; (Esquimalt defences) 2565, 4261; (grants to associations) 2561; (Halifax garrison) 4947; (Larose, Jos., indemnity) 4947; (Major Hurdman, allowance) 4262; (medals, &c.) 4262 (ii); (pay and allowance) 1134 (i) 2512 (ii); (permanent force) 1141; (promotions) 1134 (i); (properties) 2550, 4260; (rifle ranges) 2566; (Royal Military College) 2562; (R. M. C., electric lighting) 4261; (salaries, &c.) 2548; (supplies, remounts, &c.) 2560; (Valleyfield riots) 4260 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Generally (armouries) 862; (Baddeck armoury) 862; (Dundas armoury) 863; N.B. (Sussex armoury) 867 (i).

VanWagner, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re* Removal (Ans.) 616 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*

Address, on The, 23 (i).

Alexander Gibson Ry. and Mfg. Co.'s B., on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to ref. Pet. to Com., 2846 (ii).

Anglo-German Commercial Treaties, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Copies, 795 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Auditor General's Rep., Publication in Parts, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 776 (i).

Bills of Exchange Act (1890) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2455 (i).

Bills, Govt., wthdn. (remarks) 4971 (ii).

——— *See* 'Private.'

Budget, The, 1310, 1323 (amt.) 1322, 1342 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1920 (i).

Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) *re* Letter of Sir Louis Davies, 762 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Cor., 148 (i).

Business of the Hse., Private Bills, &c. (remarks) 3920 (ii).

Cabinet Changes (remarks) 414 (i).

Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3513 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2622, 2666 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Act (tolls) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2940; in Com., 3934 (ii).

Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2196 (i).

Cattle Embargo by G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3984 (ii).

Census Figures quoted by Sir Richard Cartwright (remarks) 1764 (i).

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4575; on M. to present Rep. of Com., 4693; in Com., 4694 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 3933 (ii).

Civil Service Act (retirement) Amt. B. 124 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3776 (ii).

Clergue's Contract *re* Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 781 (i).

Coasting Trade of Can. B. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4609 (ii).

Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2464; on Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 2469 (i).

Cosmos Cotton Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 2671 (ii).

Customs Tariff (1897) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 3°, 4977 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act (homestead sales) Amt. B. 120 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3770 (ii).

Dom. Securities Company, Par. in N. Y. newspaper (remarks) 4428 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (appeal) Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2851; in Com., 3511.

Financial Situation, Review, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4810; Neg. (Y. 41; N. 84) 4859 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (sale) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4129 (ii).

Galops Rapids, Improvements, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5022 (ii).

Game Preservation Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com 3769 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4412 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take Precedence on Wednesdays, 2720 (ii).

——— *See* 'Business,' 'Private,' &c.

Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3715 (ii).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church, Incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2717, 3125; in Com., 4680 (ii).

Halifax Industrial School B. 151 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 4036; in Com., 4701 (ii).

Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2861, 2865 (ii).

Hamilton and Guelph Mail Service, Inquiry for Ret., 4465 (ii).

Hawbold's Cove, Beaver Cove, Cost of Breakwater (Ques.) 132 (i).

Hurley, Mr. J. M., Charges *re* W. Hastings Election, 4970 (ii).

Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3758; on M. for 3°, 3931; on Sen. Amts., 4801 (ii).

Indian River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 14 (Mr. *Beland*) on Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii).

Industrial Properties Preservation Treaty, &c., Par. in Newspapers *re* (remarks) 2146 (i).

Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4704 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4426-7 (ii).

I.C.R., Barbour, John, Dismissal, Charges against (Ques.) 2853 (ii).

——— Mulgrave and Point Tupper Ferry Service, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

——— Tantramar Marsh Washout, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1108 (i).

Joint Stock Companies incorp. B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4803, 5059 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3942 (ii).

Kaulbach, Postmaster at Musquodoboit, Dismissal, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4927 (ii).

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4128 (ii).

Magazines and Newspapers imported from G. B. and U. S., Value, &c. (Ques.) 2679 (ii).

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4504; on M. for 3°, 4578 (ii).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1130 (i); in Com., 4439; on M. for 3°, 4446 (ii).

Miller Creek Concessions, &c., Tel. (read) 4426-7.

——— (remarks) 4465 (ii).

Ministerial Changes, Explanation (remarks) on M. to adjn., 155 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 154 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4484 (ii).

North Bay Pier N.S., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 144

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3979 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Act (asst. commissioner) Amt. B. 147 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 3511 (ii).

——— Police Pensions B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 809 (i); in Com., 2487 (ii).

North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3133 (ii).

Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4604 (ii).

Oyster Beds in Shediac Bay, Licenses issued, Names, Dates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2473 (i).

——— (Ques.) 746, 1444 (i).

Pacific Northern and Omineca Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 72 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 2669 (ii).

Penalties Remission B. 151 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4579 (ii).

Petition of Right Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3936 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2495 (ii).

Port Dufferin Wharf, Cost of Shed, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2482; in Com., 4072 (ii).

Precedence in Canada for Official Functions, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 438 (i).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2746 (ii).

Private Bills and Govt. Business (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4567 (ii).

——— Suspension of Rules (remarks) 4464 (ii).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business,' &c.

Prorogation, Remarks, on M. to adjn., 4968 (ii).

Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1092 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3920 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 439 (i).

——— 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1410 (i).

Public Works Employees, Delay in Payments (remarks) 3779 (ii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2444 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to wthdrw., 4971 (ii).

——— (Expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4580, 4602 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3728 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Parmelee*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3228 (ii).

Redhead, N.S., Boat Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4998 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3862 (ii).

Ross Rifle Co 's incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2672 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

——— Manufacture, &c., Remarks in Com. of Ways and Means, 4975 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) in Com., 2193 (i).

S. A. War, Can. Contingent, &c., Par. in *La Patrie* (remarks) 1762 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 85 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 4569 (ii).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 1675 (i).

SS. Companies' Subsidies, Inquiry for Ret., 4466.

Stock Breeders (Mar.) Association incorp. B. 159 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4612 (ii).

Supply, Res. *re* Civil Govt. (remarks) 5071 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 4077; (cold storage) 371 (i); (experimental farms) 4966; (fruit inspection) 2600; (general statistics) 2835; (Pan-American exposition) 4967; (*Year Book*) 2817 (ii).

Canals: Galops (entrance) 4024; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4024; Trent (construction) 5052; (Corry & Laverdure's claim) 4014 (ii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (Chittick, F.C., promotion) 4965; Interior (salaries) 3062; Marine and Fisheries (Tyrwhitt, Mr., salary) 4958; Public Works (contingencies) 4137; (Desrochers, Mr., salary) 4535; Rys. and Canals (F. A. Dixon, promotion) 4534, 4782; (salaries) 3779; Trade and Commerce (clerical assistance) 4534 (ii); (printing, &c.) 533; (salaries) 531 (i).

Customs (salaries, &c.) 2924, 2929 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1167 (i); (rents, fuel, &c.) 4961 (ii).

Fisheries (bounty cheques) 553; (Can. exhibit) 553; (cold storage, deep sea) 559 (i); (hatcheries, P.E.I.) 4961 (ii); (inspectors, salaries, &c.) 533, 545 (i), 4228; (Noble Bros., award, &c.) 4236 (ii); (oyster culture) 555; (protection service) 552 (i).

Geological Survey (map engraving) 4948 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 2989; (contingencies) 3029 (ii).

Indians (half-breed commission) 4954; (legal expenses *re* liquor traffic) 3062 (ii).

Interior: Miscellaneous (maps, &c.) 4954; N.W.T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3086, 3112, 4948 (ii).

Justice: Generally (consolidation of statutes) 3622; (litigated expenses) 3620; Penitentiaries—B.C. (new wing) 3619; Dorchester (keepers' salaries) 3618; (general vote) 3593; (Prince Albert jail) 3620; Supreme Court (O'Regan, Jas., salary) 4965; Yukon (clerk of court) 3588; (judge's living allowance) 3584; (judge's salary) 3584; (law books) 3590; (legal advisers, &c.) 3590; (maintenance of prisoners) 2589; (Sheriff Eilbeck) 3587; (transport of prisoners) 3589 (ii).

Legislation: Library of Parlt. (statutes of Canada) 4966 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour) 4225; (St. Lawrence navigation) 5030 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Victoria, B.C. and Skagway) 4964 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 2548; (contingencies) 2562; (Dom. arsenal) 2565; (Esquimalt defences) 2565; (Halifax Garrison, Sievert, Pte.) 4947; (pay and allowance) 2532; (rifle ranges) conc., 5032; (Royal Military College) 2563; conc., 5033 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous (St. Vincent, &c., relief *re* volcanic eruption) 5031 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (furnishing crew, strs. built in Scotland) 4958; (Str. *Newfield*) 4958.

Post Office (branch office, Halifax) 3882; (charges against postmasters) 4929; (Marconi system) 3908; (parcel service) 3911; (salary increases) 4941; (petitions of right *re* contracts) 3917, 4931 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—B.C. (New Westminster) 4185; (Vancouver drill hall) 4186; (Williams Head station) 4614 (ii); (caretakers, &c.) 987 (i); Generally, 4186; (heating, &c.) 4189; (immigrant, repairs, &c.) 4616 (ii); (policy of Govt) 661 (i); (rents) 4615; (repairs, &c.) 4181; Man. (Winnipeg, furnace, &c.) 4616; (Winnipeg, immigrant shed) 4613 (ii); Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 642; N.B.; (St. John, custom-house) 641 (i); (St. John, immigrant shed) 642 (i), 4178 (ii); N.S. (Arichat, repairs, &c.) 635; (Iona wharf) 1002 (i); N.W.T. (Red Deer court-house) 4613; (Saskatoon immigrant shed) 4614; Ont. (Alexandria reformatory) 4184 (ii); (Fort William) 728 (i); (Hamilton warehouse) 4566 (ii); (London drill hall) 729; Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 560 (i); (eastern block, repairs to wall) 4565; (elevator attendants) 4615; (heating, &c.) 4138; (Major's Hill park) 4180; (rentals, &c.) 4139; (Rideau Hall, drain) 4566; (Rideau Hall, improvements) 4189 (ii); (royal mint) 560; (Victoria memorial museum) 564 (i); (Toronto, branch P.O.) 4565; (Toronto, P.O. locomobiles) 4187; (Toronto Junction P.O.) 4566; Que. (cartridge factory) 4180; (Drummondville) 4180 (ii); (Grosse Isle station) 645; (L'Assomption) 657; (Lévis cattle quarantine) 667 (i); (Peribonka) 4179; (Valleyfield) 4564; Yukon (Collinet, Mrs., dismissal, &c.) 4196, 4537; 4144, 4190, 4542 (ii), 968 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine, crib work) 4627; N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 4616 (ii); (Arnold's breakwater) 989 (i); (Bear river obstructions) 4621 (ii); (Black Point canal) 990; (Boularderie wharf) 997; (Burlington wharf) 999 (i); (Cape Cove breakwater) 4621; (Charlesville breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Clark's harbour) 990; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1001 (i); (Cribbon's Point wharf) 4621 (ii); (Drumhead breakwater) 1001; (Friar's Head harbour) 1002 (i); (Glace Bay) 4622; (Grand River channel) 4622 (ii); (Gunning Cove) 991; (Herring Cove breakwater) 1002; (Lower Cove breakwater) 1004; (Minudie wharf) 1004; (Parker's Cove pier) 1006 (i); (Porter's lake outlet) 4622 (ii); (Port Latour, breakwater) 990 (i), 4624 (ii); (Port Mouton breakwater) 990 (i); (Round Bay beach) 4624; (Windsor dams) 4624 (ii); Ont. (Port Arthur) 599; P.E.I. (creosoted timbers, &c.) 1015 (i); Que. (Batiscan dredging) 4629; (charges *re* wharfs) 4636; (Cross Point) 4630; (Magdalen Island breakwater) 4631; (Maria wharf) 4630 (ii); (Montreal harbour) 608 (i); (Point St. Pierre breakwater) 4621; (Rivière aux Renards pier) 4632; (St. Francois wharf) 4632; (St. Irenée wharf) 4634; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 4634; (St. Laurent wharf) 4634 (ii); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 594 (i); Miscellaneous (engineers, &c., salaries) 4219; (surveys and inspections) 4780; Roads and Bridges—Yukon (wagon roads) 4147; Slides and Booms (repairs) 4142; (St. Maurice district) 4218; Telegraph Lines (Anticosti to Bryon) 4769; (B. C., Quesnel Forks) 4779;

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con. (cable service) 4144, 4773; (Govt. system) 4771; (Mabou to Hawkesbury) 4770; (Quesnelle to Atlin) 4150; (St. Peter's to Sydney) 4770; (Str. *Tyrian*) 4219; Yukon (pole contract) 4156, 4162; (supplies) 4157 (ii).

Quarantine (Porter, A. E., claim) conc., 5033; (public health, salaries, &c.) conc., 5033; (slaughter compensation) 4968; (small-pox) 4967; (Stewart, Capt. D. C.) 2909 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (additional sidings) 4793; (Canso ferry service) 4295; (Drummond Co., rentals, &c.) 3538, 3547; (Halifax accommodation) 4791; (Mulgrave improvements) 4297; (Ouelle River spur line) 4796; (procedure, &c.) conc., 5035; (Sydney bridge) 4795; P.E.I. (expenditure, &c.) 3583; (Murray Harbour branch) conc., 5040; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4861, 4889 (ii).

Weights and Measures (inspection binder twine) 4963; (metric system) 4961 (ii).

Yukon (Treadgold concessions) 4949 (ii).

Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 735 (i).

Treadgold Concessions, O.C's, Plans, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2472 (i).

——— *See* 'Yukon.'

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 953 (i).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) on Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii).

Yukon—Irregularities and Interview with Judge Craig (remarks) 973 (i).

——— Council Amt. B. 119 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 3126; in Com., 3832, 4485, 4530 (ii).

——— Police Magistrates Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3776 (ii).

——— Representation Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3774, 4466; on Sen. Amts., 4971 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2069 (i).

——— Treadgold Concession, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4977 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2456 (i).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*

Address, on The (amt.) Ry. Policy 65, 68; wthdn., 119 (i).

Alaska Boundary, Declaration of Sir Louis Davies (remarks) 785 (i).

B. C. Legislation, Disallowance of Acts, &c. (M. for cor.) 137 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1837, 1862 (i).

Canadian Cattle Embargo by G. B. (M. for cor.) 138 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 3980 (ii).

——— notice of amt., 3858 (ii).

Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and Alaskan Boundary (M. for cor.) 143 (i).

———Letter from Sir Louis Davies (personal explanation) 811 (i).

——— *See* 'Alaska.'

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Commissions to Can. Officers in British Army, Cor., &c. (M. for copies, &c.) 419 (i).
Coronation of His Majesty, Appnmt. of Can. Delegates (M. for cor.*) 153 (i).
Income Tax, G. B. and Can. Agents (Ques.) 5054.
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 3°, 4441 (ii).
S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3327 (ii).
——— Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).
——— Cor. between His Excellency, Can. Govt. and G. B. *re* Recruiting Troops, &c. (Ques.) (M. for cor.) 137 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 2999, 3016.
Public Works: Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 3288 (ii).

Boyd, Mr. N., *Macdonald.*
C.P.R. Lands, Taxation Test Case (remarks) 5072 (ii).
Canned Beef for S. Africa, Quantity, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 746 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 3933 (ii).
Coal Oil Inspection, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to adjn., 5078 (ii).
Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Duty, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1206 (i).
Lisgar, Man., Revising Officer, Date of Appnmt., (Ques.) 3152 (ii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for 1°, 4245; in Com., 4486 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3623 (ii).
Man. School Lands Fund, Reduction of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 2941 (ii).
——— Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3035 (ii).
Maple Creek P.O., Change of Location, &c. (Ques.) 2853 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Parmelee*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3231 (ii).
S. A. War, Canadian Beef Exclusion from Imp. Contracts (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3840; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 98) 3857 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3410 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3379; (census, Lisgar, &c.) 4113 (ii).
Customs (coal oil, Port Arthur) 2931 (i); (coal oil inspection) 3300 (ii).
Dom. Lands (Man. school lands) 4252; (salaries, &c.) 4117 (ii).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1148 (i); (grain standards) 4258 (ii); (inspectors' salaries) 1148, 1155 (i).
Interior: N.W.T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3084, 3114 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries–Kingston (binder twine) 3599, 3606 (ii).

Boyd, Mr. N.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works: Dredging (Lake Manitoba) 3286; Harbours and Rivers (western transportation) 4554; Telegraphs—Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4150; (operators pay) 4154, 4172; (pole contract) 4156 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Halifax accomodation) 4790 (ii).
Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1198 (i).
Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren*) to Com. of Sup., 4392 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 908, 960 (i).

Brock, Mr. W. R., *Toronto Centre.*
Auditor General's Rep., Publication in Parts, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 775 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1559 (i).
C.P.R. Lands, Taxation, Test Case (remarks) 5073 (ii).
Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Gov., Cor., &c., on M. for Com., of Sup., 4731 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2477 (i).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2779 (ii).
Samples sent by 'Sample Post,' Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 617 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2833; (*Year Book*) 2815 (ii).
Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (salaries) 183 (i).
Miscellaneous (conference of Colonial Ministers) 4334 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 509 (i).
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (immigrant, furniture, &c.) 974; (quarantine stations) 983; Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 692; (St. Hyacinthe drill hall) 714 (i); Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 3288 (ii).
Railways: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4924 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 942 (i).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2184, 2201 (i).
Census, Amount expended on Livery Hire (Ques.) 2069 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2467 (i).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3256 (ii).
Mineral, Agricultural Products imported from U.S. for Home Consumption, Value, &c. (Ques.) 782 (i).
Mulloy, Trooper, Pension to (remarks) 3315 (ii).
N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 3315 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3201 (ii).

Broder, Mr. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3391 (ii).
U.S. Imports for Home Consumption, 1901, Total Value, &c. (Ques.) 782 (i).
Brunet, Mr. Jos., *Montreal, St. James.*
Ry. Act. (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 463 (i).
Bureau, Mr. J., *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*
St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 39) 1°*, 961 (i).
Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*
Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 20) 1°*, 611 (i).
Huron and Erie Canal Co. incorp. (B. 80) 1°*, 1902 (i).
Knapp Tubular Steamship Co.'s incorp. (B. 75) 1°*, 1673 (i).
Niagara St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 1204 (i).
Prorogation (remarks) 5082 (ii).
Securities Bank of Can. incorp. (B. 166) 1°*, 4464.
Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) on Sen. Amts.. 2675 (ii).
Calvin, Mr. H. A., *Frontenac.*
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (light buoys) 524.
Campbell, Mr. A., *West York.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 7 (i).
Australia, Can. and New Zealand, Cor. *re* Trade Transportation (M. for copies*) 154 (i).
Canadian Manufacturers' Association (B. 47) 1°*, 1204 (i).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to present Rep. of Com., 4693 (ii).
Committees of the House, Accommodation, &c. (remarks) 2298 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4500 (ii).
Market Gardeners, Protection against Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3657.
Nepigon Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1985 (i).
——— (B. 101) 1°*, 2146 (i).
Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 961 (i).
Patent Relief (B. 49) 1°*, 1204 (i).
Sovereign Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 29) 1°*, 781 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2831.
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1169 (i).
Public Works: Buildings, Que. (St. Hyacinthe) 711 (i).
Railways: I. C. R. (general vote) 3496 (ii).
Toronto and Niagara Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 100) 1°*, 2146 (i); in Com., 3625 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 150) 1°*, 4035 (ii).
Westren, John, Paten Relief (B. 49) 1°*, 1204 (i).

Carroll, Hon. H. G., (Solicitor General) *Kamouraska.*
Binder Twine, Circulars issued for Prices, &c (Ans.) 885 (i).
Colonial Appeals to Imp. Privy Council, on M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor., 3673 (ii).
Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1100 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Vet. Surgeon, &c. (Ans.) 3831 (ii).

Carscallen, Mr. A. W., *North Hastings.*
Ricketts, T., Postmaster at Gilmour, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2224 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G. (Minister of Trade and Commerce) *South Oxford.*
Anglo-German Treaty, Date, &c. (Ans.) 617 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 801 (i).
Boards of Trade Act Amt. (B. 132) 1°*, 3304; in Com., 4136 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1342 (i).
——— Personal Explanation *re* Figures quoted 1763 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1920 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., &c., 768 (i).
Business of the House (M.) to postpone Notice of Motions, 3158 (ii).
Butter and Cheese Weighing Commission, Rep., &c. (Ans.) 1684 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 156) prop. Res., 3623; in Com. on Res., 3933; 1°*, 4127.
Commodities, Packing and Sales (B. 141) 1° m., 3622; in Com., 4246, 4354 (ii).
Easter Adjournment (M.) 1569 (i).
German Tariff applicable to Nations, &c. (Ans.) 617 (i).
——— *See* "Anglo."
Grain Inspection in Man., Changes *re* Standard (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
Grain Inspection at Montreal, Certificates, &c. (Ans.) 450 (i).
Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. (B. 142) 1° m., 3623 (ii).
Jamaica Tax on Commercial Travellers from Can. (Ans.) 622 (i).
Joint Stock Co.'s B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5061 (ii).
Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4358 (ii).
Magdalen Islands, Trips, Tonnage, &c. of Str. *Amelia* (Ans.) 1680 (i).
Mail Steamers between Can. and G. B., Rate of Speed (Ans.) 130 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 4245; 2° m., 4354; in Com. (amt.) 4355, 4487; 3° m., 4578.
——— *See* "Grain."
Paspebiac and Gaspé as Ocean Ports, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5014 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
Personal Explanation *re* Census Returns used in Budget Speech, 1763 (i).
S. S. Subsidies, Contracts, Ret. laid on Table, 4466 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (*Year Book*) 339.
Civil Govt.: Trade and Commerce (clerical assistance) 532; (salaries) 530 (i).
Public Works: Buildings (policy of govt.) 661; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1220 (i).
Trade and Commerce (grain inspectors) 532 (i).
Trade and Commerce Rep. (presented) 122 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase, *Montmorency.*
Bouillon, Dr. Alfred, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2854.
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 4569; on M. for Com. (amt.) 4647 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4680 (ii).
I. C. R., Fire Insurance on Locomotives, &c. (Ques.) 2854 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 1°, 319 (i).
Isle of Orleans Mail Service (Ques.) 246 (i).
Joliette Postmasters, Dismissal, &c., Charges against (Ques.) 2856 (ii).
——— Dismissal of J. J. Sheppard (Ques.) 2068.
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3940 (ii).
Maranda, Alfred, Emplymt. of (Ques.) 246 (i).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4520 (ii).
Petition of Right Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3937 (ii).
Ste. Anne River Works, Timber used, Price, &c. (Ques.) 2858 (ii).
Sheppard, J. J., Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 2068 (i), 2855 (ii).
Strong, Chief Justice Sir Henry, Amount paid *re* Judicial Committee (Ques.) 1986 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice: Supreme Court (*ad hoc* judges) 4264 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (*Patent Record*) 331 (i).
Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (salaries) 187 (i).
Railways and Canals: Canals—Trent (construction) conc., 5048; Railways—Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4863, 4913 (ii).

Champagne, Mr. L. N., *Wright.*
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. (presented) 1489; conc., 1673 (i).
——— Translators, 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 4121, 4241 (ii).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 125) 1°*, 3509 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. John, *North Norfolk.*
Aliens Restriction Act Amt. (B. 34) 1°*, 882 (i).
Amnesty to Boers: *See* 'S. A. War.'
Auditor General's Rep., Publication in Parts (prop. Res.) 773; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 96) 777 (i).

Charlton, Mr. John—*Con.*
Bills on Order Paper, Procedure, &c. (remarks) 2481 (i).
British Supremacy: *See* 'S. A. War.'
Brown, Jas., Relief (B. 118) on M. for 3°, 4121 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1523 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on M. for Com. of Sup., 828 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 769 (i).
Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 7 (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com., 1279 (i).
Coasting Trade of Can. B. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4607; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 4612 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 1204 (i).
Divorce Court (remarks) 4121, 4692 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*), in Com., 4672 (ii).
Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuations, Remarks, &c. on M. for Com. of Sup., 1207 (i).
Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4735 (ii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4500 (ii).
Nickel Exportation, on M. for Com of Sup. (remarks) 3030 (ii).
North Pole, Capt. Bernier's Expedition, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3951 (ii).
Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4604 (ii).
Reciprocity in Trade (prop. Res.) 248 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co's. B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3207 (ii).
Sabbath Observance *re* Militia Parades (remarks) 4646 (ii).
S. A. War, British Supremacy, and Terms of Peace (prop. Res.) 3239; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3316 (ii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 882 (i).

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2339.
Dom. Elections Act (1900) Amt. (B. 27) 1°*, 734; 2° m., 1132 (i).
Indian Treaty, No. 3, Amount claimed by Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 1681 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (advances to dairies) 2657 (ii); (aids to societies) 343; (archives) 321; (bulletins, printing, &c.) 345 (i); (cheese stations) 2634 (ii); (classifying patents) 349; (cold storage, &c.) 368 (i), 2571, 2592 (ii); (criminal statistics) 335; (experimental farms) 344 (i), 2877; (fruit inspection) 2592, 2625 (ii); (fumigating stations) 353; Glasgow and Pan American expositions) 357; (general statistics) 339 (i), 2827 (ii); (Imperial institute, Can. Exhibit) 364; (*Patent Record*) 334 (i); (poultry shipments) 2643 (ii); (*Year Book*) 336 (i), 2814 (ii).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Customs (appraisers) 2927; (Dresden port) 2925; (salaries, &c.,) 2921 (ii).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1173; (distillery duties) 1184; (Gow, Mr., superannuation, &c..) 1155; (inspectors' salaries, &c.) 1154; (Windsor, inspector) 1154 (i).
Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.,) 550 (i).
Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 636; N.W.T. (contract or day labour) 839; Ont. (Bothwell, Dresden, &c.) 658; Que. (L'Assomption) 658; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1219; (Goderich harbour) 1234; (St. Joseph's wharf) 1254; (Sarnia, dredging) 1224; (Sydenham, dredging) 1226 (i).
Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 2920 (ii); (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 372; (Public Works Health Act) 403; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 403.
Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1184; (inspectors' salaries, &c.) 1184.

Clare, Mr. Geo. A., *South Waterloo.*
Census Commissioner, South Waterloo, Name and Amount paid to (Ques.) 1861 (i).
——— Enumerators, S. Waterloo, Names, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1066 (i).
Free List, Articles placed on since 1897 (Ques.) 244 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3373 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3615 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 2543; (properties) 2553.

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *West Toronto.*
Abraham, Plains of, Rights reserved for Militia, &c. (Ques.) 3409 (ii).
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 95 (i).
Brown, James, Relief (B. 118) 1°*, 3509; 3° m., 4121 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1604, 1624 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co's. B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2612 (i).
C.P.R. Act (tolls) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3934 (ii).
Census, Dom., Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 129, 612.
——— Mr. Coté's Circular, Replies received (Ques.) 133 (i).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for Com., 4693; in Com., 4694 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 3933 (ii).
Civil Service Act (retirement) Amt. B. 124 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 3237 (ii).
Collegiate Institute, Cadet Corps (Ques.) 240.
Coronation Day, Public Holiday, &c. (Ques.) 747 (i).
Debates, Official, 4th Rep. of Com., French Translators, on M. to conc. 4243 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4130 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co's. B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4419 (ii).
Immigration during 1892 (Ques.) 244 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Immigrants, Italian, Destitute, &c., Par in *Herald*, 3744 (ii).
——— Article (read) 3756 (ii).
——— Italian Immigration, &c. (remarks) on B. 112, 3927 (ii).
Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112. (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3742; on M. for 3°, 3927.
I.C.R., Locomotives and Ry. Cars, purchased from 1896 to 1902 (M. for ret.) 2681 (ii).
——— *See* 'Locomotives.'
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3939, 3944 (ii).
Kingston Locomotive Works, Strike, &c., Par. in *Montreal Gazette*, 4702 (ii).
Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4129.
Locomotives, bought, rented, &c., by Govt. Rys. (Ques.) 1108 (i).
Mail Steamers between Can. and G.B., Rate of Speed, &c. (Ques.) 130 (i).
Montgomery, General, Permission to erect Monument, &c. (Ques.) 129 (i).
——— M. for Cor., 2681 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 2488 (ii).
Passes issued on Govt. Rys., List of Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 810 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4403 (ii).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2497 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2482; in Com., 4038, 4058 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3173 (ii).
Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3729 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies paid since 1901, (Ques.) 448 (i).
Representation in House of Commons by Provs. *re* Census, &c. (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
Return, Passes, I.C.R., Inquiry for, 4403 (ii).
Soulanges Canal Water Powers, Applications, &c. Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 631 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) 534 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (bulletins, printing, &c.), 345, 347 (i); (census irregularities, 1891) 4080. 4430 (ii); (Imperial Institute, Can. exhibit) 366; (Pan-American exposition) 360 (i).
Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4277 (ii).
Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (engraving contract, &c.) 4317 (ii).
Civil Govt.: Post Office (Knauf, H., promotion) 4313 (ii); Trade and Commerce (clerical assistance) 532 (i).
Fisheries (Steamboat Inspection Act Amt.) 534 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (printing, &c.) 4329 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses, &c.) 521 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 2544; (properties) 2555; (salaries, &c.) 2549 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates, examination) 513 (i).

Post Office (drop letter rates) 3915; (letter carriers) 3867; (mail service) 4314; (Matheson, Mr., superannuation) 3909; (postage rates) 3915; (superannuations) 3910 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (immigration sheds, repairs, &c.) 975; Man. (renewals, &c.) 834; (Winnipeg immigration shed) 834; N.B. (Marysville P.O.) 636; (Richibucto) 641; (St. John's immigrant shed) 641; N.W.T. (Carnduff court house) 836; (contract or day labour) 836; N.S. (Halifax customs house) 635; Ont. (Clinton) 721; (Cobourg armoury) 722; Ottawa (additional rooms, H. of C.) 563 (i); (leases, &c.) 4140 (ii); (rentals, &c.) 966; (telephones) 989; (Victoria memorial museum) 564; (Toronto, drill shed) 868 (i); (Toronto P.O., branch office) 4182; (Toronto P.O., locomobiles) 4186 (ii); Que. (Grosse Isle station) 645, 650 (i); (Lévis cattle quarantine) 667; (Montreal examining warehouse) 671; (Quebec military building) 710 (i); (Roberval building) 4180 (ii); (Valleyfield) 719 (i); Yukon (judges' residences, &c.) 4147 (ii); (rents, maintenance, &c.) 969; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (foremen, &c.) 1006; Ont. (Port Arthur) 599; (St. Mary's river) 600; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 570, 579; P.E.I. (tax legislation) 1012 (i); Roads and Bridges, Yukon (wagon roads) 4148; Telegraphs (cable service, &c.) 4143; Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4151; (pole contract) 4156; (rates, &c.) 4175; (supplies) 4158 (ii).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 379, 384 (i).

Railways: P.E.I. (Murray branch) 3863 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (grain inspectors) 532 (i).

Telephone Companies B. 2 (Mr. *Maclean)* on M. for 2°, 789 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick)* on M. for 1°, 736 (i).

Toronto Govt. Buildings, Appnmt. of Mechanical Engineer (Ques.) 884 (i).

Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp, B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell)* in Com., 3623; (amt.) 3624, 3636; Neg. (Y. 18, N. 74) 3636 (ii).

Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren)* to Com. of Sup., 4395 (ii).

Welsh Immigration from Patagonia (Ques.) 242.

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, on M. (Mr. *Douglas)* for Cor., 905, 940 (i).

Yukon (British) Ry., Tolls and Charges, &c. (Ques.) 3638 (ii).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland, Ont.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis)* in Com., 2613 (ii).

Coal Oil Inspection, on M. (Mr. *Oliver)* to adjn., 5080 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fisher)* in Com., 4134 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick)* in Com., 3942 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Léonard)* for Ret, 492 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick)* in Com., 2497 (ii).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock)* in Com., 4043 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3377; (cheese stations) 2647; (fruit inspection) 2586-7 (ii); (general statistics) 342 (i); (poultry shipments) 2642 (ii).

Canals: Lachine (waste weir) 4307; Trent (construction) conc., 5049; Welland (Port Colborne) 4307 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Public Works (salaries) 178 (i).

Justice: Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 3605 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (printing, &c.) 4327 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (quarantine stations) 981; Ont. (Cobourg armoury) 721; Ottawa (royal mint) 563; Que. (Grosse Isle station) 646; Yukon (rents, maintenance, &c.) 972; Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 592 (i); Telegraphs—Yukon (Rochester's contract) 4155 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 12) 1°*, 529 (i).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver)* in Com., 4673 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick)* in Com., 2497 (ii).

Procedure *re* Bills (remarks) 611 (i).

Railway Lines in N.B., Tracings, &c. (M. for plans*) 961 (i).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *South Essex.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B 130) 1°*, 3304 (ii).

Boundary Line through Detroit River (Ques.) 242 (i).

Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 530 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (B. 58) 1°*, 1438 (i).

Dom. Ry. and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 97) 1°*, 2146 (i).

Drainage across Railway Property (B. 4) 1°* 121, 2° m., 626 (i).

Essex Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 1323 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 3304 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy)* in Com., 4522 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 86) M. to ref. back to Com., 3202; agreed to (Y. 87; N. 53) 3234 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, 1891) 4081 (ii).

Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4275 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 687 (i).

Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell)* in Com., 3629 (ii).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 632 (i).

Davis, Mr. T. O., *Saskatchewan.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1759, 1766 (i).
Canadian Northern Express Co. incorp. (B. 83) 1°*, 1985 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1278 (i).
Canadian Northern Tel. Co. incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1985 (i).
Canals, Dom., Expenditure, Revenue, since Confederation (Ques.) 784 (i).
Census, Classifying Half-breeds as Indians (remarks) 1902 (i).
Govt. Business, Private Bills, &c. (remarks) 3925.
Greek Catholic Church, Pet. *re* Incorporation, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com., 2718 (ii).
Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1214 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4506 (ii).
Man. and North-western Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. *Douglas*) in Com., 2667 (ii).
Metis, Description of in Census Bulletin (remarks) 1675 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2054 (i).
N. W. Mounted Police Pensions B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 808 (i).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 883 (i).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2452 (i).
SUPPLY:
Justice: Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 3603, 3606 (ii).
Transportation on St. Lawrence, Amount spent (M. for ret.) 3674 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 900 (i).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St. John and Iberville.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2126 (i).
Chambly Canal, Wharf, &c., Maintenance by G. T.R., &c. (Ques.) 2068 (i).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4577 (ii).
Coasting Trade of Can. B. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4610 (ii).
Colonial Appeals to Imp. Privy Council, on M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor., 3672 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4674 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1126 (i); in Com., 4441; (amt. 6 m.h.) 4450; neg. (Y. 16; N. 76) 4463 (ii).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 2146 (i).
Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1106 (i).

Demers, Mr. L. P.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 455, 479 (i); in Com., 3170 (ii).
——— (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (Roy vs. C.P.R.) 4585 (ii).
Railway Fires Indemnification (B. 56) 1°*, 1323.
Ste. Thérèse Island Dam, Pets. against (M. for copies*) 3724 (ii).
S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3363 (ii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 41) 1° m., 1063 (i).

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia.*
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4503 (ii).
Man. Grain Inspection, Changes in Standard (Ques.) 2857 (ii).
Man. and North-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 1°*, 530 (i).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1569 (i).
SUPPLY:
Interior: N. W. T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3074, 3085 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and N.W.T., (M. for cor., &c.) 888 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algoma.*
Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 23) 1°*, 632 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Blind River wharf) 1223; (Midland harbour) 1239 (i).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*
B. C. Fisheries, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3308 (ii).
Labour Disputes B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).
Seine Licenses issued in B. C., Number, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2680 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) B.C., 4434 (ii).
Fisheries (hatchery, B.C.) 4225 (ii).
Indians: B.C. (medical attendance) 3058 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (B.C. coast navigation) 5024; (hydrographic survey) 5028 (ii).
Miscellaneous (assay office, Vancouver) 4117; (Banff park) 4118 (ii).
Post Office (Dawson and Victoria mails) 4314.
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (engineers' salaries) 4186; Dredging—B. C. (Victoria harbour) 3286; Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Anderson Lake outlets) 4642; (Hardy Bay wharf) 4643; Ont. (Pelee Island wharf) 4217; Miscellaneous (National Art Gallery) 3292; (surveys, &c.) 4781; Roads and Bridges—Yukon (wagon roads, &c.) 4149; Telegraphs—B. C. (Ashcroft to Dawson) 3293, 4151, 4782; (Port Simpson-Hazleton) 4779; (Quesnel Forks) 4779; (Skeena, &c.) 3292; Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4151; (Bennett to Dawson) 4153; (Kelly, Douglas & Co.'s tenders) 4157; (Yukon lines, revenue) 4771; (supplies) 4157 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Halifax accommodation) 4790 (ii).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1545 (i).
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1673 (i).
Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c., (remarks) 2864 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3965 (ii).
Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 272 (i).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 912, 920 (i).

Emmerson, Mr. H. R., *Westmoreland.*
Bathurst, P. O., Charges against Henry Bishop (Ques.) 4700 (ii).
Canada Temperance Act, Res. from Mar. Baptists, &c. (Ques.) 1109 (i).
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3707 (ii).
I. C. R., Shims purchased in 1901, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 1438 (i).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 1°*, 961 ; in Com., 1675 (i).
SUPPLY :
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1177 (i).
Fisheries (hatcheries) 552 ; (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 538 (i).
Railways : I. C. R. (expenditure, &c.) 3517 ; (general vote) 3474 ; (mechanical supt.) 3816 ; (rolling stock) 3816 (ii).

Erb, Mr. D. K., *South Perth.*
Canadian Railways, Casualties, &c., Employes, Cattle, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2472 (i).
I. C. R., Accidents through Cattle on Tracks (Ques.) 883 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 472 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 2871 ; (general statistics) 2837 (ii).

Farquharson, Mr. D., *West Queen's, P.E.I.*
Fishery Regulation (1893) Modification by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3307 (ii).
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3713 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (hatcheries, P.E.I.) 4960 (ii).
Immigration (printing, advertising, &c.) 4250.
Post Office (Charlottetown P. O.) 3870 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Canoe Cove) 1013 ; (memorial *re* daily communication with mainland) 1020 ; (tax legislation) 1011 (i).
Railways : P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4286 ; conc., 5044 (ii).
Tidal Waters, Dom. and Provincial Rights, &c. (Ques.) 1861 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne & Queen's, N.S.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 119 (i).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 122 (i).
——— Publication in Parts, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 773 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Ashcroft to Dawson, &c., Tel. Lines, Length, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1986 (i).
Budget, The, Financial Statement, 1279 (i).
——— (remarks) 962 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) *re* Letter of Sir Louis Davies, 762 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2612 (ii).
C. P. R. Lands, Taxation, Test Case (remarks) 5071 (ii).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2201 (i).
Cattle Embargo by G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3983 (ii).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4571 ; in Com., 4694 (ii).
Chartered Banks, List of Shareholders (presented) 3128 (ii).
Civil Service Act (retirement) Amt. B. 124, 1° m., 3236 ; in Com., 3775 (ii).
Coasting Trade of Can. B. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4609 (ii).
Committees of the House, Accommodation, &c., (remarks) 2298 (i).
Crown Bank of Canada incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *McCreary*) on M. for 2°, 2022 (i) ; in Com , 2607.
Customs Tariff (1897) Amt. (B. 169) 1° m., 4977 ; 3° m., 4977 (ii).
Devlin, Mr. C. R., Interview in Montreal *Witness* (Ans.) 622 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 635 (i).
Dom. Bank Notes, Circulation from 1892 to 1901 (Ans.) 616 (i).
——— Number of Sheets issued since 1892 (Ans.) 619 (i).
Dom. Securities Company, Par. in N. Y. newspaper (remarks) 4428 (ii).
Dyment Banking Co.'s incorp. B. 151 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4123 (ii).
Eastern Extension Ry., Refund of Amounts paid by Counties (Ans.) 781 (i).
Estimates, The (presented) 120 (i).
——— (1902) Suppl. (presented) 785 (i) ; 3918, 5030 (ii).
——— (1903) Suppl. (presented) 4353 (ii).
——— (Remarks) 4342 (ii).
Financial Situation, Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Lorden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4817, 4822.
German Duties on Can. Imports (Ans.) 156 (i).
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3722 ; (M.) to adjn. Deb., 3723 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4674 (ii).
Indian Treaty No. 3, Amount claimed by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 1681 (i).
I. C. R., Truro Round-house, Rebuilding, &c. (Ans.) 4352 (ii).
——— Truro Station, Rebuilding, &c. (Ans.) 4353.

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Knapp Tubular SS. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2607 (ii).

Loan (B. 157) prop. Res., 3926; in Com. on Res., 4127; 1°*, 4129; in Com. on B., 4357 (ii).

Marconi System of Wireless Telegraphy, Agreement, &c., *re* P. E. I. (Ans.) 1684 (i).

Market Gardeners, Protection *re* Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) M. to adjn. Deb., 3665 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 483, 498 (i).

Newspapers, Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 158, 615 (i).

Nickel Exportations, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).

Ottawa City Improvement (B. 164) 1° m., 4344; in Com., 4604 (ii).

Paper Combine, Rep. of Commission (presented) 3128 (ii).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2749 (ii).

Private Bills and Govt. Business (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4567 (ii).

Printing of Parlt., 4th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4644 (ii).

Prorogation (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4968 (ii).

Public Accounts (presented) 121 (i).

Public Accts. Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3922 (ii).

——— 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1407 (i).

Ry. Construction, N.S., on M. for Ways and Means, 5067 (ii).

Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 315 (i).

Redhead, N.S., Boat Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4994 (ii).

Ross Rifles, Manufacture of, Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 4974 (ii).

S. A. War, Can. Contingent, Par. in *La Patrie* (remarks) 1762 (i).

——— Canned Beef from Can. condemned by Imp. Govt. (remarks) 3410 (ii).

Supply (B. 168) Res. prop., 5071; 1° m., 5073 (ii).

——— (remarks) 127 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (archives) 323 (i); (census) 3386; (general statistics) 2844; (*Year Book*) 2821 (ii).

Charges of Management (printing Dom. Notes) 171 (i), 4533; conc., 4342 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Agriculture (clerical assistance) 207; Aud. General (clerical assistance) 204 (i) 4535 (ii); (salaries) 175; Finance (cleaning deptl. buildings) 214 (i); (contingencies) 3303 (ii); (salaries) 175; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 172; High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 209; (salaries) 180; Inland Revenue (clerical assistance) 207; Interior Dept. (clerical assistance) 202 (i); (salaries) 3063 (ii); Labour Dept. (salaries) 183; Marine and Fisheries (clerical assistance) 204; N. W. M. Police (clerical assistance) 212; Printing and Stationery (clerical assistance) 199; (salaries) 174; Privy Council (salaries) 173 (i); Public Works (Desrochers, Mr., increase, &c.) 4535 (ii); (salaries) 179 (i); Railways and Canals (Dixon, F. A., promotion) 4782, 4534 (ii); Sec. of State (clerical assistance) 199; (salaries) 173 (i); Trade and Commerce (clerical assistance) 4534 (ii); Treasury Board (clerical assistance) 204 (i).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1158 (i).

Finance (Wallace, Mr., superannuation) 3303.

Fisheries (inspectors, overseers, &c.) 533 (i).

Insurance (expenses) 4117 (ii).

Justice (Leeds & Grenville, jun. judge) 4966; Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3605; Yukon (legal adviser) 3592 (ii).

Legislation (general printing, &c.) 237 (i); conc., 4343; H. of C. (ballot gratuities) 4330 (ii); (printing laws, &c.) 237; Library (salaries) 236; (voters' lists) 237 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour) 4226 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and France) 4332; (Victoria and Skagway) 4964.

Miscellaneous (Bank of Commerce, Yukon) 4339; (Coronation, expenses of Ministers) 4332; Labour Dept. (salaries) 4119; (Dom. and Provl. arbitration) 4120; (Eastern Extension arbitration) 4340; (Marconi telegraph construction) 4338; (printing bureau plant) 4119, 4956; (St. Vincent, &c., relief *re* volcanic eruption) 5031; (unprovided items) 4341 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 507 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Halifax custom house) 635 (i); Ont., Ottawa (additional rooms, H. of C.) 562; (rentals) 976 (i); (Toronto P.O., alterations) 4566; Yukon (judges' residences) 4208; (official residences) 4536; Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (La Have river) 4214; N. S. (Amagandus wharf) 4618; (Bear river obstructions) 4621; (Charlesville breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Clark's harbour) 991 (i); (Glace Bay) 4622 (ii); (Lockeport harbour) 991 (i); (Petit Rivière breakwater) 4211; (Porter's lake outlet) 4623; (Port La Tour) 4624; (Round Bay beach) 4624; (Windsor dams) 4624 (ii); P. E. I. (tax legislation) 1012 (i); Que. (charges *re* wharfs) 4636; Roads and Bridges, Ottawa (Maria St. bridge) 3290; Telegraphs (Marconi system) 4775; (Yukon supplies) 4158 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (Clergue's contract, *re* steel rails) 3793; (Drummond Co., rentals, &c.) 3550; (expenditure, &c.) 3583; (explanation) 3410; (general vote) 3459, 3476; (Halifax accommodation) 4790; (locomotives) 3824; (North Sydney pier) 4796; (sidings, &c.) conc., 5037; P. E. I. (expenditure, &c.) 3583; (Murray Harbour branch) conc., 5040; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4914 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 527 (i).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 4964; (iron and steel bounties) 4331 (ii).

Weights and Measures (binder twine inspection) 4963 (ii).

Timber Limits, Sale by Govt., Names of Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 885 (i).

Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 120, 1279 (i), 5064 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Ways and Means—The Budget, 1279 (i).
——— The Tariff (M.) for Com., 4972; in Com., 4972 (ii).
——— (beet root sugar machinery) in Com. on Res., 4973 (ii).
Welsh Immigrants from Patagonia, Remarks of Mr. Chamberlain *re* Climate of Canada (Ans.) 1441 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*
Agricultural and Manufacturing Products of Can., Aggregate Amount, &c. (Ans.) 747 (i).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 237 (i).
Bouillon, Dr. Alfred, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2854.
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2147 (i).
Bull, Charles A., Produce Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4808 (ii).
Can. Cattle Embargo by G.B, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 138 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3990 (ii).
Canned Beef for South Africa, Quantity, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 746 (i).
——— *See* "S. A. War."
Census, Amount expended on Livery Hire (Ans.) 2069 (i).
——— Classifying Half-breeds as Indians (remarks) 1902 (i).
——— Commissioners, Atlin District, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 3155 (ii).
——— Commissioner at South Waterloo, Name and Amount paid to (Ans.) 1861 (i).
——— Coté, Mr., Circular, Replies received (Ans.) 133 (i).
——— Dom., Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 130, 612.
——— East and North Simcoe, Cost in 1891-1901 (Ans.) 2224 (i).
——— Enumeration, 1891 and 1901, Cost, &c. 1064 (i).
——— 1881, 1891, 1901, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2222 (i).
——— Enumerators for South Waterloo, Names, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 1066 (i).
Chickens purchased by Dept. of Agriculture (Ans.) 3408 (ii).
Colchester Regiment, Pets. *re* Medals, &c. (Ans.) 4699 (ii).
Cooling Plant on Steamships, Names, Number, &c. (Ans.) 882 (i).
Devlin, Mr. C. R., &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 635.
Fans for Cooling Steamships *re* Products, &c. (Ans.) 616 (i).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. (B. 136) 1° m., 3307; in Com., 4130; on Sen. Amts., 4702 (ii).
Grapes purchased by Dept. of Agriculture, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 3151 (ii).
Hay purchased for War Office in Quebec (Ans.) 2223 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4744 (ii).
Japan Exposition, Can. Representation, &c. (Ans.) 2225 (i).
Medical Council in Can., Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1131 (i).
Mutton Shipments in Cold Storage, Indemnity to Mr. Wheatley (Ans.) 4695 (ii).
P.E.I., Chicken-fattening Stations, Location, &c. (Ans.) 1065 (i).
'Rothesay Blues,' Pets. *re* Medals (Ans.) 4699.
S. A. War—Can. Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3843 (ii).
——— *See* "Canned."
——— Horses purchased in N. W. Can. (Ans.) 1989 (i).
Stock Breeders' (Mar.) Association incorp. (B. 159) 1°*, 4344; in Com., 4612 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Acadian historical data) 357 (i); (advances to creameries) 2657 (ii); (aids to societies) 343; (Archives) 321 (i); (bonuses, &c.) 2653 (ii); (bulletins, printing, &c.) 345 (i); (census) 3365, 4076; (census cheques *re* Lisgar, &c.) 4429; (census investigation *re* 1891) 3394; (cheese stations) 2634 (ii); (classifying patents) 349; (commissioner's branch, cold storage, &c.) 368 (i), 2568 (ii); (criminal statistics) 335; (experimental farms) 345 (i), 2867, 2892, 4966; (fruit inspection) 2585, 2622 (ii); (fumigating stations) 353; (general statistics) 339 (i), 2827 (ii); (Glasgow exposition, &c.) 358; (Imperial Institute) 365 (i); (Japan exposition) 4966; (St. Louis exposition) 4966; (Pan-American exposition) 4967; (Paris exposition) 4967 (ii); (*Patent Record*) 329 (i); (poultry shipments) 2640 (ii); (*Year Book*) 336 (i), 2814.
Civil Government: Agriculture (Chittick, F. C., promotion) 4965 (ii); (clerical assistance) 205; (salaries) 177 (i).
Militia (supplies, remounts, &c.) 2560 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—B.C. (William's Head quarantine) 4614 (ii); Generally (experimental farms, renewals) 875; Que. (Grosse Isle station) 645; (Lévis, cattle quarantine) 668 (i).
Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 2919; (*Monitor* SS.) 2900 (ii); (Public Works Health Act) 403 (i); (public health) 4967 (ii); (salaries, organized districts, &c.) 371 (i); (slaughter compensation) 4968; (small-pox) 4967; (Stewart, Capt. D. C.) 2909 (ii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 403 (i); (unorganized districts) 2903 (ii).
Telephone Co.'s in Can., Total Mileage, &c. (Ans.) 3151 (ii).
Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4376 (ii).
Tubercular Test, Res. by Shorthorn Breeders Association (Ans.) 130 (i).
Wellington Mutch, Payments to by Dept. of Agriculture (Ans.) 3152 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles, (Minister of Justice) *Quebec County.*
Beauchamp, Oscar, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 158 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Bills of Exchange Act (1890) Amt. (B. 105) 1°, m., 2455 (i).
Binder Twine, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 410, 618, 1439 (i).
Can. Evidence Act Amt. (B. 115) 1° m., 2852; in Com., 3513 (ii).
C.P.R. *vs.* Roy, Privy Council Judgment, on M. for Copy (Mr. *Lemieux*) 504 (i).
C.P.R. Act (tolls) Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 2933; in Com., 3934 (ii).
Civil Service List (presented) 129 (i).
Coasting Trade of Can. Act Amt. (B. 165) prop. Res., 4126; in Com., 4607 (ii).
Commutations for Arson, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 419 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (1900) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 1133 (i).
Drainage across Ry. Property B. 4 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).
Eilbeck, Sheriff, Leave of Absence from Yukon (Ans.) 745 (i).
Exchequer Court Act (appeal) Amt. (B. 114) 1° m., 2851; in Com., 3511 (ii).
——— (B. 139) prop. Res., 3239; in Com. on Res., 3311; 1°*, 3510 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4682 (ii).
Halifax Industrial School Act Amt. (B. 152) 1° m., 4036; in Com., 4701 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 14 (Mr. *Beland*) on Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii).
Joint Stock Companies incorp. B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4804 (ii).
Judges of County Courts, Age Limit, &c. (remarks) 418 (i).
——— Legislation *re* Retirement (Ans.) 131 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 138) prop. Res., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°* of B., 3510; in Com., 3939 (ii).
Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 121 (i).
Knapp Tubular SS. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2607 (ii).
Larose, Jos., Indemnity, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 624 (i).
Leeds and Grenville, Jr. Judge, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4701 (ii).
Manitoba Liquor Act, Constitutionality of Referendum, Letters, &c. from Man. Govt. (Ans.) 1682 (i).
Marconi's Wireless Tel. Co.'s B., on Order for 1°, 530 (i).
Medical Council in Canada Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2474 (i); on M. for 3°, 4457 (ii).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4522 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 491 (i).
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3134 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2491 (ii).
O'Keefe, Magistrate, Pet. *re* French Language in Courts (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
Penalties Remission (B. 151) 1°*, 4036; in Com., 4579 (ii).
Petition of Right Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 3306; in Com., 3936 (ii).
Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 76) 1° m., 1673 (i); in Com., 2495 (ii).
P. E. I. Tax on Commercial Travellers, &c. (Ans.) 782 (i).
Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1096 (i).
Queen's and King's Counsel, Appnmt. since 1896 (Ans.) 3155 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3171 (ii).
Referendum Act, Pet. from Man. Prohibition Alliance *re* (Ans.) 785, 1682 (i).
Regina Law Library (B. 19) 1°*, 530; 2° m., 1205.
Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2674 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, Appnmt. of Physician (Ans.) 159 (i).
——— Coal Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 159 (i).
——— Letter *re* Misconduct of Employees (Ans.) 1445 (i).
——— Relations between Warden and Dep. Warden (Ans.) 1445 (i).
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 451 (i).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 1675, 2192 (i).
Strong, Sir Henry, Amount paid *re* Judicial Committee (Ans.) 1986 (i).
Superior Court, Que., Writs issued, &c. (Ans.) 442 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (judges' salaries) 214 (i); (Man. judges) 4266 (ii); N.B. (Divorce Court) 217; Ont. (Exchequer Court) 230; (Supreme Court) 218, 223; (*ad hoc* judges) 4265; Yukon (clerk of court) 3587; (judges' living allowance) 3584 (ii); (judge) 233 (i) 3583; (law books, &c.) 3590; (legal advisers, &c.) 3590; (maintenance of prisoners) 3589; (sheriff Eilbeck) 3586; (surgeon's salary) 3588; (transport of prisoners) 3589; (witness fees) 3590 (ii).
Dominion Police (salaries) 234 (i).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1167 (i).
Fisheries (Dom. and Provincial) 548; (overseer, &c.) 548 (i); (Noble Bros., award, &c.) 4239 (ii).
Justice (consolidation of statutes) 3622; (contingencies) 4264; (legal agents) 3620; Miscellaneous (Farewell, J. C., payment to) 4269; (law books) 4267; (litigation expenses) 4266; (witness fees) 4267; Penitentiaries—B.C. (new wing) 3619; Dorchester (salaries, &c.) 3618; (general vote) 3593; (inspector Dawson) 4267; Kingston (binder twine) 3593; Man. (land purchase) 3618; (Prince Albert jail) 3620; St. Vincent de Paul (Lussier arbitration) 4269; (purchase of land) 3617 (ii).
Legislation (printing laws, &c.) 237 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon, Charles—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings—Yukon (rents, maintenance, &c.) 972 (i), 4191 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (tax legislation) 1010; Que. (Grande Vallée, title, &c.) 1043; (Isle au Coudre) 1047; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 586 (i).

Supreme Court Act, Amt. *re* Man. (Ans.) 411 (i)*

——— Assistant Judges (B. 77) 1° m., 1673 (i)*

Supreme Court Judges, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 2225 (i).

Telephone Companies B. 2 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 788 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s (B. 28) 1° m., 734; 2°*, and M. to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 1206 (i).

Tidal Waters, Dom. and Provincial Rights, &c. (Ans.) 1861 (i).

Wales, Prince of, Visit, Cost of Illuminations, &c. (Ans.) 615 (i).

Yukon—Territorial (court of appeal) Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 2851; in Com., 3776 (ii).

——— (magistrates) Amt. (B. 137) prop. Res., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°*, 3509; in Com., 3939 (ii).

——— M. to introduce (remarks) 2850 (ii).

——— Irregularities and Interview with Judge Craig (remarks) 973 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 60) 1°*, 1490.

Canada Temperance Act, Names of Counties, &c. under Operation (Ques.) 1682 (i).

Chipman, Samuel Nelson, Relief (B. 163) 1°*, 4344; in Com., 4692 (ii).

Cosmos Cotton Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 1569 (i); in Com., 2670, 2887 (ii).

Debates, Official, 4th Rep. of Com., French Translators, on M. to conc., 4243 (ii).

Greek Catholic Church, Pet. *re* Incorporation, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com., 2717, 3123 (ii).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Expenditure, Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3274 (ii).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (M.) to suspend Rules, 1569 (i).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 3°, 4452 (ii).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3963 (ii).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2783 (ii).

Printing Committee, 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 4644 (ii).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 780 (i), 4464 (ii).

Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1083 (i).

Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1418 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2830; (*Year Book*) 2824 (ii).

Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *McCrcary*) on Sen. Amts., 4570 (ii).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's, N.B.*

Representation Unit by Census 1901 (Ques.) 2854.

Restigouche Indians, Investigation *re* Complaint, Rep. of Inspector, &c. (M. for copy*) 2473 (i).

Round Hill to Armstrong's Corners, Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1987 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (bonuses, &c.) 2653; (census) 3367; (cheese stations) 2636; (poultry shipments) 2643 (ii).

Justice: Yukon (clerk of court) 3588; (legal adviser) 3591; (maintenance of prisoners) 3589; (surgeon's salary) 3588 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 2532; (pay and allowance) 2529; (properties) 2549 (ii).

Post Office (Round Hill service) 3916 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (clerks of works, &c.) 878; N.B. (armoury, Sussex) 866; (Alma pier) 1031 (i); (Andrews Hollow) 4626 (ii); (Bay du Vin wharf) 1022 (i); (Campbellton wharf) 4626; (Campobello breakwater) 4626 (ii); (Caraquet wharf) 1023; (Chance Harbour) 1024; (Grand Anse breakwater) 1025; (lumber, price, &c.) 1027; (Marysville) 640; (Negro Point) 1031 (i); (Oromocto wharf) 4628; (Partridge Island pier) 4628 (ii); (Point Wolfe breakwater) 1025; (Richibucto pier) 1026; (St. John's immigrant shed) 641 (i); (Salmon River breakwater) 4628; (tidal water wharfs) 4629; Que. (Batiscan dredging) 4629; (Crane Island wharf) 4630; (Cross Point) 4630 (ii); (Grande Vallée) 1033 (i); (Maria wharf) 4630; (Point Fortune wharf) 4631; (Point St. Pierre breakwater) 4631; (St. Irenée wharf) 4634; (St. Laurent wharf) 4635 (ii); (title for property, &c.) 1042 (i).

Railways: I.C.R. (additional sidings) 3811; (expenditure, &c.) 3556; (Moncton engine shops) 3829; (Sussex engine house) 3829 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1884.

Canada Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 123) M. *re* Pet., 2846; 1°*, 3202 (ii).

Canso Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2197 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4422 (ii).

Greek Catholic Church, Pet. *re* Incorporation, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com., 2716, 3125 (ii).

Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2862 (ii).

I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3244, 3260 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 1°, 317 (i).

Market Gardeners, Protection *re* Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3650 (ii).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2474 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Con.*

Precedence in Can. at Official Functions, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 436 (i).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2798 (ii).

Presbyterian College Board incorp. (B. 22) 1°*, 632 (i).

Public Accts. Com. (M.) to ref. Pub. Accts. to Sel. Com., 198 (i).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 440 (i).

——— 1st and 2nd Reps. (presented) 810 (i).

——— 3rd Rep. (presented) 1108 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3172, 3192 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) in Com., 2194 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3387; (fruit inspection) 2604; (*Year Book*) 2820 (ii).

Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 538 (i).

Indian Affairs (schools) 3045 (ii).

Justice: Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3599 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (light buoys) 524.

Public Works: Buildings—N. S. (armouries) 871; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Larry's River breakwater) 1004; (New Harbour breakwater) 1005 (i); (Windsor dams) 4625 (ii); Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 576 (i).

Railways: I. C. R. (Drummond Co., rentals, &c.) 3542 (ii).

Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3631 (ii).

Gallery, Mr. D., *Montreal, St. Anne's.*

Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3706, 3712 (ii).

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Yale and Cariboo.*

Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2199 (i).

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) M. to present Rep. of Sel. Com., 4693, 4694 (ii).

Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2469 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (armouries) 872 (i).

United Gold Fields Co.'s (B. 9) 1°*, 408 (i).

Velvet (Rossland) Mine Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 18) 1°*, 530 (i).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2425 (i).

Clergue Steel Rail Contract, &c., Quantity delivered, &c. (Ques.) 746, 781, 1439 (i).

I. C. R., St. John Elevator, Amount of Grain handled, &c. (Ques.) 883 (i).

North Head, N. B. Breakwaters, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1441 (i).

Richibucto Pier, Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 1439 (i).

St. John and Halifax Govt. Elevators (Ques.) 612.

Scotia Str., Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 1440 (i).

Steel Rails Contract, Quantity delivered by F. H. Clergue, &c. (Ques.) 746, 781 (i).

Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3367; (census, manufacturers, &c.) 4111; (experimental farms) 2889 (ii); (general statistics) 343 (i).

Fisheries (bounty cheques) 554; (cold storage, deep sea) 557; (hatcheries) 551; (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 539, 546 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers, salaries, &c.) 519 (i).

Ocean and River Service (biological station) 517.

Public Works: Buildings—Generally (armouries) 861; N. W. T. (Carnduff court-house) 844; (Wilson's Beach work) 844, 847 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bay du Vin wharf) 1022; (Caraquet wharf) 1023; (Dipper Harbour breakwater) 1025; Ont. (St. Joseph's wharf) 1269; Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1031 (i); Telegraph Lines (Charlotte Co.) 3291 (ii).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

I. C. R. and Temiscouata Ry., Traffic between Rivière du Loup and Wharf (Ques.) 1860 (i).

——— Ditching along Farm Lands, Temiscouata, Damages, &c. (Ques.) 2677 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivière aux Renards) 4632 (ii).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2062 (i).

Quebec Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 87) 1°*, 1986 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 85) 1°*, 1985 (i).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Criminal Code Act Amt. (B. 33) 1°*, 882 (i).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3974 (ii).

Ontario and Niagara Power Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 1438 (i).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2776 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4272; Welland (Port Colborne) 4799 (ii).

Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (redemption) 4325 (ii).

Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) 4316 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 4327.

Post Office (pets. of right *re* cancelled contracts) 3918 (ii).

Public Works: Dredging, Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie) 4765; Harbours and Rivers (Port Colborne) 4558 (ii).

Yukon Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr *Sifton*) in Com., 4477 (ii).

Gibson, Mr. A., Jr., *York, N.B.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 636 (i).

Gilmour, Mr. J., *East Middlesex.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2613 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4132 (ii).

Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1209 (i).

Gilmour, Mr. J.—*Con,*
Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 496 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3186 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (advances to creameries) 2658; (cheese stations) 2638, 2647; (experimental farms) 2872; (fruit inspection) 2588.
Public Works: Buildings—N.W.T. (Edmonton jail) 855; (Red Deer immigration shed) 853.

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3144 (ii).

Gourley, Mr. S. E., *Colchester.*
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Cor., 150 (i).
Colchester Regiment, Pets. *re* Medals, &c., (Ques.) 4699 (ii).
I. C. R., Truro Station, &c., Rebuilding, &c. (Ques.) 4352 (ii).
Newfoundland, Negotiations *re* Confederation with Can. (Ques.) 4698 (ii).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2786 (ii).
'Rothesay Blues,' Pet. *re* Medals, &c. (Ques.) 4698 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.: Aud. Gen.'s Office (clerical assistance) 4535; Rys. and Canals (F. A. Dixon, promotion) 4534 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 2999 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Yukon (official residences) 4543 (ii).
Truro Round-house, I. C. R., Rebuilding, &c. (Ques.) 4352 (ii).
Yukon Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4475 (ii).

Guthrie, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1673 (i); in Com., 3129 (ii).
Crown Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 79) 1°*, 1860.
Ry. Act (limitation) Amt. (B. 25) 1° m., 632 (i).
Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 110) 1° m., 2847 (ii).

Hackett, Mr. E., *West Prince, P.E.I.*
Alberton Ry. Station, Location, &c. (Ques.) 1441
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1823 (i).
Cascumpec Harbour, Range Lights, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 1064 (i).
Customs Forfeited Goods, Sale of at Sydney, N.S. (Ques.) 783 (i).
Fishing Gear, P.E.I., Confiscation, &c. (Ques.) 1440 (i).
Fishing Licenses, Prince Co., P.E.I., Number issued, &c. (Ques.) 1065 (i).
Kemp, Mr. Ernest, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 135 (i).
Magdalen Islands, Steam Communication, Trips, Tonnage, &c. Str. *Amelia* (Ques.) 1680 (i).
Mutton Shipments in Cold Storage, Indemnity Mr. Wheatley (Ques.) 4695 (ii).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Oyster Fishing (P.E.I.) Protection Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 135 (i).
P.E.I. Chicken-fattening Stations, Location, &c. (Ques.) 1065 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Southport to Murray Harbour, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 4695 (ii).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Pets., O. C's., &c., on M. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) for Ret., 163 (i).
Sandhills, P.E.I., Range Lights, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 1064 (i).
SUPPLY :
Administration of Justice (Supreme Court) 220.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Acadian historical data) 356 (i); (apple grafting) 2653; (census) 3371, 4093; (census enumerators) 4097; (cheese stations) 2656; (cold storage) 2632; (poultry shipments) 2644 (ii).
Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (Burland litigation) 4322 (ii).
Customs (Charlottetown port) 2932; (salaries, &c., Mr. Curry) 2924 (ii).
Fisheries (cold storage, deep sea) 557 (i); (salmon and lobster hatchery) 4222 (ii); (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 540; (oyster culture) 555 (i).
Indians: P.E.I. (medical attendance) 3053 (ii).
Miscellaneous (national park, Banff) 4118 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (biological station) 516; (Govt. steamers, maintenance, &c.) 510; (winter mail service) 516 (i).
Post Office (Kehoe, Mr., mail contractor) 4932; (P.E.I. mail service) 4939 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine, repairs) 1023 (i), 4627 (ii); P.E.I. (Brae breakwater) 4625 (ii); (Canoe Cove) 1012; (Cape Traverse, &c.) 1021; (Carleton Point) 1021; (Cascumpec Harbour) 1013 (i); (Chapel Point) 4625; (New London breakwater) 4212 (ii); (tax legislation) 1011 (i); (Tignish breakwater) 4212, 4626; (West Point pier) 4211; Miscellaneous (Percival River survey) 3292; (surveys, &c.) 3292; Telegragh Lines (P.E.I. and Mainland) 3293.
Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 377 (i); (Stewart, Capt. D. C.) 2918; (unorganized districts) 2902 (ii).
Railways: P.E.I. (Hillsboro bridge) 3863; (Murray Harbour, &c.) 3997, 4288, 4293, 4922 (ii).
Webb and Sunday Travelling over P.E.I. Ry., &c. (Ques.) 4700 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 104 (i).
Alexander Gibson Ry. and Mfg. Co.'s Pet., on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to ref. to Com., 2846 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2661 (ii).
C. P. Ry. Act (tolls) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2935 (ii).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2219 (i).
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Edwards*) in Com., 2888 (ii).
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Cor., 152 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 824 (i).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Letters read by Mr. Bourassa, 812 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Coasting Trade of Can. B. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4608 (ii).

Cosmos Cotton Co. incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 2670; on M. for Com., 2888 (ii).

Crossen Mfg. Co.: *See* 'I.C.R., Trucks, &c.'

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc. (objection) 1204 (i).

Drainage across Ry. Property B. 4 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 629 (i).

Dyment Banking Co.'s incorp. B. 151 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4124 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3512 (ii).

——— B. 139 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3311 (ii).

Financial Situation, Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4832 (ii).

Galops Rapids, Improvements, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5023 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 4569 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1° m., 2714; in Com., 4416 (ii).

Grand Valley Traction Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. *Heyd*) in Com., 1620 (i).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4671 (ii).

Intercolonial Con. with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4741 (ii).

I. C. R., Horne, Mr. R. T., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2068 (i).

——— and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditure, &c., Inquiry by Pub. Accounts Com., (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3235, 3240; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 3281.

——— Notice of Motion, 3126 (ii).

——— Trucks, &c., purchased (Ques.) 2852 (ii).

Joughin's Truck: *See* 'I.C.R., Trucks, &c.'

Judges of County Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3310 (ii).

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4128.

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4599 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4520 (ii).

North Shore Power, Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69, in Com., 3136, 3150 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2484 (ii).

Petition of Right Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 3306; in Com., 3938 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2496 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2483 (ii).

Preferential Trade with Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2809 (ii).

P. E. I. Ry., Southport to Murray Harbour, Tenders, &c. (remarks) 4697 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1089 (i).

Public Accounts Com., 1st and 2nd Reps., on M. to conc. (objection) 810 (i).

——— 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1404 (i).

Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Malouin*) in Com., 1622 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 459 (i).

——— Commission and Consolidation Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2442, 2447 (i).

——— (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4580, 4590 (ii).

——— Subsidies (remarks) 4972 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3218 (ii).

Regina Law Library B. 19 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 1205 (i).

Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2671 (ii).

——— Manufacture, &c., Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 4974 (ii).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 1677, 2021 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 229; (judges' salaries) 214; (miscellaneous expenditure) 214; (Supreme Court) 217 (i).

Canals: Carillon (guide pier) 4280; Cornwall (repairs, &c.) 4294, 4310; Culbute (damages, &c.) 4281, 4309; Farran's Point (enlargement) 4300; Galops (deepening, &c.) 4024, 4301; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4024; Generally (extra service) 4294, 4312; Georgian Bay (surveys) 4298; Lachine (electric plant) 4300; (lock repairs) 4035; (Mill St. paving) 4307; (waste weir) 4307; North Channel (dam) 4035; (enlargement) 4300; Quebec (boundaries) 4281; Rapide Plat (enlargement) 4304; Rideau (Poonamalie causeway) 4270, 4917; Sault Ste. Marie (entrances) 4002, 4298; Soulanges (construction, &c.) 4019, 4304; Trent (construction) conc., 5047; (Corry & Laverdure claim) 4007; (dredging) 4269; (Lindsay and Fenelon road) 4270; (Peterborough dam) 4918; Welland (lock walls) 4306; (Montrose bridge) 4800; (Port Colborne entrance) 4020, 4307, 4798; (Port Dalhousie) 4306 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Agriculture (salaries) 177; (clerical assistance) 206; Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 175; Customs (clerical assistance) 208; Finance (salaries) 175; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 173; High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 209; Inland Revenue (salaries) 175; (clerical assistance) 207; Interior (clerical assistance) 202; Labour (clerical assistance) 213; N. W. M. Police (clerical assistance) 213; Printing and Stationery (salaries) 174; (clerical assistance) 201; Privy Council (salaries) 173 (i); Railways and Canals (Dixon, F. A., promotion) 4783 (ii); Sec. of State (salaries) 174; (clerical assistance) 199; Treasury Board (clerical assistance) 204 (i).

Justice: Miscellaneous (Farewell, J. C. (accounts) 4269; (litigation expenses) 4266; Penitentiaries (inspector Dawson) 4268; (Lussier arbitration) 4268 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Legislation: House of Commons (salaries) 234.

Militia (pay and allowance) 2517 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings,—N.W.T. (Carnduff court-house) 840; (day labour and contracts) 840; Ottawa (heating, engineers, &c.) 4138 (ii); Que. (Grosse Isle station) 648 (i); Yukon (judges' residences, &c.) 4146, 4209; Harbours and Rivers-N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 4617 (ii); (Boularderie wharf) 998; (Burlington wharf) 1000; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1000; (Drumhead breakwater) 1001; (Barrie wharf) 1217; (Blind River wharf) 1222; (Collingwood harbour) 1227; (Depot Harbour) 1231; (Goderich dredging) 1232; (Kingsville pier) 1236; (Petewawa narrows) 1239; (St. Joseph wharf) 1247; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1242; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 566 (i); Roads and Bridges—Yukon (wagon roads, &c.) 4148; Telegraphs—Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4150.

Railways and Canals (remarks) 2866; Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 4792; conc., 5037; (bridges, strengthening) 4792; (Canso ferry service) 4294; (Chaudière Junction, engine house) 4786; (Drummond Co., rentals, &c.) 3533; (general vote) 3418, 3452; (Halifax accommodation) 4790; (Miramichi bridge) 4794; (Moncton accommodation) 4797; (Nicolet station) 4796; (operation, maintenance) 4310; (Ouelle River spur line) 4796; (Pictou accommodation) 4795; (Rockingham improvements) 4798; (rolling stock) 4783; (St. John accommodation) 4786; (Stellarton, increased accommodation) 4788; (Sydney accommodation) 4789; (Sydney bridge) 4795; P. E. I. (Murray Harbour branch) 3862, 3996, 4282, 4919; conc., 5039; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4868 (ii).

Supreme Court (assistant judges) B. 77 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 1673 (i).

Town Sites, N.W.T., Land Grants, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4406 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff (beet root sugar machinery) in Com. on Res., 4973 (ii).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1620; on Sen. Amts, 2676 (ii).

Yukon Territory, Magistrate's B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. to introduce (remarks) 2850 (i).

——— Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 3306 (ii).

Halliday, Mr. J., *North Bruce.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Presqu'Isle) 1239; (Tobermory harbour) 1246.

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 2367 (i).

Bronte Harbour Improvements, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 133 (i).

——— Lighthouse (Ques.) 134 (i).

Canadian Cattle Embargo by G. B., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 141 (i).

Crown Bank of Canada incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *McCreary*) on M. for 2°, 2023 (i).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4131 (ii).

German Duties on Can. Imports (Ques.) 156 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Milton Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 133 (i).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2063 (i).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4425, 4568 (ii).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier, 3969 (ii).

North Shore Power, Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3129 (i).

Oakville Harbour, Construction of Docks, &c. (Ques.) 135 (i).

Ontario Provincial Subsidy, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 2473 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3174 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3220 (ii).

St. Lawrence Canal Employees, Amounts paid, collected, &c., 1896-1901 (Ques.) 2222 (i).

S. A. War, Socks, Contract for Third Contingent (Ques.) 3638 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 232 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives) 326 (i); (cold storage) 2579; (fruit inspection) 2596 (ii); (Pan-American exposition) 363 (i); (*Year-Book*) 2817 (ii).

Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4276 (ii).

Charges of Management (printing Dom. notes) 171 (i).

Customs (collectors and inspectors) 3295 (ii).

Immigration (agents, salaries. &c.) 2993 (ii).

Interior: N. W. T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3118 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 235 (i).

Post Office (outside service) 3894; (securities, &c.) 3876 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—N.W.T. (immigration shed, Red Deer) 853; Ont. (Clinton) 719 (i); Ottawa (ventilation H. of C.) 4141 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 731; (Toronto Junction) 733); Yukon (official residences) 4548 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (New Harbour, breakwater) 1004 (i); (Windsor dams) 4625; Ont. (Bronte harbour) 1226 (i); (Burlington channel) 4637 (ii); (Collingwood harbour) 1228 (i).

Tobacco Duty, Amount collected for 1901, &c. (Ques.) 134 (i).

Heyd, Mr. C. B., *South Brant.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 1447 (i).

Grand Valley Traction Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 611 (i).

Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1213 (i).

Port Dover, Brantford, Berlin and Goderich Ry. Co.'s Change of Name (B. 21) 1°*, 611 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4039, 4051 (ii).

Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 297 (i).

Heyd, Mr. C. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 2897; (fruit inspection) 2591, 2602 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Joseph's wharf) 1263 (i).
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (steel rails) 3785.

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 910, 914 (i).

Holmes, Mr. R., *West Huron.*

Auditor General's Rep., Publication in Parts, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 776 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1974 (i).

Cattle Exports to U. S. from 1890, Value, &c., (Ques.) 3153 (ii).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 440 (i).

Horses imported into Man. and N. W. T., Customs Valuation, &c., Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1211 (i).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3969 (ii).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 467 (i).

Riordon Paper Co. and Welland Canal Water Privileges (Ques.) 745 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Year Book) 339 (i).
Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (engraving contract) 4321 (ii).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1173 (i).
Justice: Penitentiaries — Kingston (binder twine) 3601 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1218; (Goderich harbour) 1233; (St. Joseph's wharf) 1270 (i).

Welland Canal, Water Privileges, &c., (Ques. 409, 745 (i).

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's, P.E.I.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1647 (i).

Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3705 (ii).

P. E. I., Telegraphic Communication with Mainland, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2721 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Customs (collectors and inspectors) 3296 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—P.E.I. (armouries) 874 (i).
Railways: P. E. I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4923 (ii).
Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 378 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S., *North Victoria, Ont.*

Ashcroft to Dawson, &c., Tel. Lines, Total Length, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1986 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2666 (ii).

Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2219 (i)

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Commissions on Disbursements for Imp. Authorities (Ques.) 1065 (i).

Coronation Contingent, Employmt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2462, 2465 (i).

Cosmos Cotton Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 2670 (ii).

Consular Agencies, Flags, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).

Courts-Martial in Militia Force, Number, Offences, &c. (Ques.) 740 (i).

Fenian Raid Medals, Issue, &c. (Ques.) 1109 (i).

G. O. C., Increase of Salary, &c. (Ques.) 614 (i).

——— Right to rep. to Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Grain Inspection at Montreal, Certificates, &c. (Ques.) 450 (i).

Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Waterways, Commission, &c. (prop. Res.) 886 (i).

Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2864 (ii).

Hutton-Hughes, Ret. ordered by Hse., &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2969 (ii).

King's Birthday, Official Observance (Ques.) 2226.

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1131; in Com., 2478 (i).

Middleton, Gen., Rep. of, &c., *re* Rebellion of 1885 (Ques.) 239 (i).

Militia Officers, Training, &c. (prop. Res.) 2682.

North Shore Power, Ry. and Nav. incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3131 (ii).

Ontario Legislature, Extension of Duration, Disallowance by Govt. (Ques.) 131 (i).

Permanent Corps, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 409 (i).

——— Total Strength (Ques.) 740 (i).

Peters Target at London Camp, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 446 (i).

Precedence in Can. for Official Functions, (prop. Res.) 429 (i).

Preferential Trade within the Empire, on Ques. of Order, 2946 (ii).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 460, 464 (i).

Rifle Practice for young Canadians (prop. Res.) 3155 (ii).

Royal Military College, Rep. of Commissioners (Ques.) 443 (i).

S. A. School Teachers, Information *re* (remarks) 962 (i).

S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Sup., 3347.

——— Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3856 (ii).

——— Conduct of Canadian Soldiers: Par. in *Daily News* (remarks) 2069, 2088 (i).

——— Small-pox Outbreak among Troops, &c. (Ques.) 1446 (i).

Staff Course at Kingston (Ques.) 239 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (experimental farms, beet root experiments) 345 (i); (experimental farms) 2868; (general statistics) 2828 (ii); (Imp. Institute) 364 (i); (*Year-Book*) 2815, 2824 (ii).
Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4271 (ii).
Customs (appraisers) 2927; (salaries, &c.) 2923.
Fisheries (Noble Bros., award, &c.) 4235 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 3020 (ii).
Militia (pay and allowance) 1133; (permanent force) 1135; (promotions, &c.) 1134 (i).
Post Office (branch offices) 3898; (control of cables, &c.) 3908; (parcel service) 3913 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—B.C. (armouries) 872; Generally (armouries, &c.) 861; (experimental farms, renewals) 875; (telephones) 986; N.S. (Baddeck armoury) 861; Ont. (Wentworth armoury) 863; Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Maurice, dredging) 1053; (Sorel wharf) 1060 (i).
Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 2919 (ii); (organized district, salaries, &c.) 376 (i); (Stewart, Capt. D. C.) 2917 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (steel rails, &c.) 3781 (ii).

Fassie, Major, Retirement of (Ques.) 241 (i).

Transportation, Distances, &c. (Ques.) 135 (i).

Welsh Immigrants from Patagonia, Mr. Chamberlain's Remarks *re* Climate of Canada (Ques.) 1441 (i).

Yukon—Telegraph Lines, Construction, &c. (remarks) 2859 (ii).

Hyman, Mr. C. S., *London.*

Buffalo and International Ry. Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 1623 (i).

Grand Valley Traction Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. *Heyd*) in Com., 1620 (i).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4690 (ii).

I.C.R. and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditures, Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3280 (ii).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2057 (i).

Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Matouin*) in Com., 1622 (i).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3209 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) in Com., 2193 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2836.
Railways: I.C.R. (expenditure, &c.) 3558 (ii).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1620 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*

Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 7) 1°*, 316; in Com., 1270 (i).

Labour Disputes B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).

Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4344 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back for Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1431 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 472, 477 (i); in Com., 3190 (ii).

——— Commission and Consolidation Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2443, 2451 (i).

——— Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3729 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3226 (ii).

Rifle Practice for Young Canadians, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 3155 (ii).

St. Clair Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 530 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives) 324; (bulletins, printing, &c.) 345 (i); (census) 3371; (census enumerators) 4433; (census investigations, &c.) 4435; (fruit inspection) 2595, 2622 (ii); (general statistics) 339 (i), 2828 (ii); (Imperial Institute) 367; (Pan-American exposition) 358; (*Patent Record*) 329; (St. Louis exposition) 360; (*Year Book*) 336 (i), 2814 (ii).
Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (salaries) 181; Privy Council (salaries) 173 (i).
Customs (St. Thomas collector) 2930; (St. Thomas port) 3205 (ii).
Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 542 (i).
Indians: B.C. (industrial schools) 3059; (inspectors, &c.) 3060; (medical attendance) 3059; N.B. (medical attendance) 3051, 3052; N.S. (seed grain) 3050; Ont., &c. (liquor traffic suppression) 3050; (medical attendance) 3043; (printing, &c.) 3060 (ii).
Interior: N.W.T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3079, 3087 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 2534; (Dom. arsenal) 2565 (ii); (pay and allowance) 1134 (i); (properties) 2550; (rifle ranges) 2567 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, engineers, &c.) 987; (immigration sheds, &c.) 976; N.B. (Marysville) 639; Ont. (architect's fees) 729; (London drill hall) 729; (renewals, &c.) 728; Ottawa (rentals, &c.) 967; Que. (contract or day labour) 705; (Montreal examining warehouse) 705; (plans, specifications, &c.) 666; Dredging (plant) 3283; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (foremen, &c.) 1006; (Parker's Cove pier) 1006; Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1217; (Collingwood harbour) 1230; (Depot Harbour) 1231; (Goderich harbour) 1233; (Kingsville pier) 1236; (Lime Kiln crossing) 603; (Presqué Isle harbour) 1240; (St. Joseph's wharf) 1254, 1270; (St. Mary's river) 603; (Grand Vallée) 1040, 1043; (St. Lawrence transportation) 597; (Sorel elevator) 1062 (i); Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (Maria St. bridge) 3289; Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft to Dawson) 3293 (ii).
Quarantine (Public Works Health Act) 404; (organized districts, salaries) 389 (i).
Railways: I.C.R. (air brakes) 3812; (expenditure, &c.) 3565; (general vote) 3416; (mechanical supt.) 3813; (new machinery) 3812; (objection) 3411; (original construction) 3809; (rolling stock) 3813; (Sydney accommodation) 3807; (tie inspection) 3565; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 3862 (ii).

Union Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 158) 1°*, 4241.

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1622 (i).
Yukon Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4467 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. A., *Cape Breton.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1724 (i).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2196 (i).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4572 (ii).
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3709, 3717 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Post Office (country postmasters) 3901 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 687 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.S (Amagandus wharf) 4617; Telegraphs (Scatari Island) 4774 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (general vote) 3467; (North Sydney) 4796 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. R., *Cardwell.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1651 (i).
Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1216 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 476 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census enumerators) 3396 (ii); (cold storage) 370 (i); (experimental farms) 2873 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Joseph's wharf) 1269 (i).
Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1190 (i).

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *West Lambton.*
SUPPLY:
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1203 (i).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Halifax and South-western Ry., Construction, on M. for Ways and Means, 5064 (ii).
Jeanie Myrtle, Schr., Small-pox, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5015 (ii).
Shipping (Atlantic) Combine, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cheese stations) 2651; (experimental farms) 2874, 2896 (ii).
Fisheries (herring slaughter) 4223 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (La Have River) 4213 (ii); N.S. (Boularderie wharf) 998; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1000; (Herring Cove breakwater) 1002; (Lunenburg breakwater) 1007 (i); (Lunenburg, dredging) 4622 (ii); (Mill Cove breakwater) 1008 (i); (Petit Rivière breakwater) 4210 (ii); (Port George breakwater) 1007; Ont. (dredges, &c.) 1236 (i).
Quarantine (*Monitor*, SS.) 2899 (ii).

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *East Toronto.*
Anglo-German Commercial Treaties, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Copies, 802 (i).
——— Date, &c. (Ques.) 617 (i).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Boards of Trade Res., Inquiry for Ret., 4404 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1788.
Can. Transatlantic Mails, via U.S. (Ques.) 447.
Commercial Travellers, Tax by Jamaica (Ques.) 622 (i).
——— Tax by P.E.I., &c. (Ques.) 781 (i).
Freight Rates, Report of Mr. McLean, Inquiry for 1205 (i).
——— *See* 'Ry. Freight.'
German Tariff *re* 'Most Favoured Nation Clause' (Ques.) 617 (i).
I.C.R., Freight Rates per Ton on Pig Iron, &c. 782 (i).
Jamaica Tax on Commercial Travellers from Can. (Ques.) 622 (i).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
——— Res. from Boards of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 3153 (ii).
P.E.I., Tax on Commercial Travellers, &c. (Ques.) 781 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3922 (ii).
——— (M.) to print Evidence *re* Gaudry, 4343 (ii).
Ry. Commission and Consolidation B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2449 (i).
Ry. Freight Rates, Rep. of Prof. McLean (Ques.) 448 (i).
S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3359 (ii).
——— Contingents, Expense of Equipment, &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4270 (ii).
Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (redemption) 4325 (ii).
Interior: Miscellaneous (boundary surveys) 4954 (ii).
Post Office (district offices) 3885; (mail service) 3911; (outside service) 3874 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (quarantine stations) 980 (i); Ont. (Toronto P.O., branch office) 4182; (Toronto P.O., locomobiles) 4187 (ii); (Toronto, renewals, &c.) 732 (i); Que. (Lake St. John district) 4179 (ii); Yukon (rents, maintenance, &c.) 971 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Depot harbour) 1232; (Goderich harbour) 1234; (Toronto harbour) 1275; P.E.I. (Canoe Cove breakwater) 1010; (tax legislation) 1010; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 570, 574; (Sorel wharf) 1055 (i); Telegraphs—Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4151; (pole contract) 4154; (Rochester's contract) 4152; (supplies) 4160.
Trade and Commerce (treaty negotiations) 4964.
Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4395 (ii).

Kendall, Mr. A. S., *Cape Breton.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1930 (i).
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3709 (ii).
I.C.R., Coal purchased in Can. (Ques.) 883 (i).

Kendall, Mr. A. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (cold storage, deep sea) 556 (i).

Indians: N. B. (medical attendance) 3053; N.S. (medical attendance) 3051 (ii).

Post Office (Magdalen islands) 3906 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Cow Bay breakwater) 1001; P. E. I. (creosoted timber) 1017 (i).

Sydney Land and Loan Co.'s incorp. B. (30) 1°*, 781 (i).

Kendrey, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2200 (i).

SUPPLY :

Post Office (Peterborough postmaster) 4943 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4571.

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take Precedence on Wednesdays, 2720 (ii).

North Shore Power, Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3137 (ii).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4057 (ii).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 68; 2° m., 451, 457 (i); M. for Com., 3158; in Com., 3171 (ii).

——— M. to proceed (remarks) 2480 (i).

Rifle Practice for Young Canadians (M.) to adjn. deb., 3158 (ii).

St. Catharines Water Supply, &c. (Ques.) 883, 1860 (i).

——— *See* 'Welland.'

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (aids to societies) 344 (i); (fruit inspection) 2603 (ii).

Indians: B.C. (medical attendance) 3058; N.S. (medical attendance) 3051; Ont., &c. (Leduc, Mr. J. D.) 3049 (ii).

Justice (legal agents) 3620; Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 3599; Yukon (legal adviser) 3593 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (St. Catharines drill hall) 715 (i), 4567; Yukon (official residences) 4547 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Colborne) 609; Que. (Montreal harbour) 608; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 593.

Welland Canal Water Supply, O.C. granting St. Catharines Power, &c. (Ques.) 1683, 1860 (i).

——— *See* 'St. Catharines.'

Yukon Representation in H. of C., B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4468, 4532; (amt.) 4578 (ii).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2136.

Census, Description of Metis (remarks) 1674 (i).

Debates, Official, 4th Rep. of Com., French Translators, on M. to conc., 4242 (ii).

Dyment Banking Co.'s incorp. B. 151 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4123 (ii).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to receive Rep. of Sel. Com., 2715, 3121, 3304; on Order for 2°, 3866; on M. for 2°, 4076; in Com., 4667; on M. for 3° (amt.) 6 m. h., 4690; neg. (Y. 34; N. 71) 4691.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Con.*

Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation; remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1211 (i).

Interior Dept. Officials, Date of Appnmt., Salaries, &c., 1896, 1901 (M. for ret.*) 961 (i).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 3131 (ii).

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4357 (ii).

Man. School Lands, Sales, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 154 (i)

Metis, Description in Census Bulletin (remarks) 1674 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4043 (ii).

Printing of Parlt., 4th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4644 (ii).

Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 3305 (ii).

Roseau River Indian Reserve (Ques.) 247 (i).

St. Andrew's Rapids, Expenditure *re* Improvements (Ques.) 247 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 440 (i).

School Lands, Man., Sale, &c. (M. for cor.*) 154 (i).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (divorce court, N.B.) 217; (judges' salaries) 216 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives) 324 (i); (*Year Book*) 2816 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (salaries) 183; Post Office (salaries) 179 (i).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 403; (Winnipeg hospitals) 407 (i).

Supreme Court Act, Amt. *re* Man. (Ques.) 410 (i).

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 932 (i).

Winnipeg Post office Officials, Date of Appnmt., 1896-1901 (M. for ret.*) 961 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister) *East Quebec.*

Abraham, Plains of, Rights reserved for Militia (Ans.) 3409 (ii).

Address, on The, 35 (i).

———Consdn. (M.) 6 (i).

Anglo-German Commercial Treaties, Cor., &c., on M. for Copies (Mr. *Monk*) 794 (i).

Auger, I. A., Contract *re* Spruce Planks, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 2483, 2677 (ii).

Ballot Papers for Laval, Printing, &c. (Ans.) 157 (i).

——— St. James Division, Montreal, Printing, &c. (Ans.) 157 (i).

Banking and Commerce Com. (M.) to add Name, 2482 (ii).

Bills on Order Paper, Procedure, &c. (remarks) 612, 2481 (i).

——— wthdn. (remarks) 4970 (ii).

———*See* 'Private'.

Boer Immigration, Par. in *Mail and Empire* (Ans.) 3408 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
B. C. Chief Justiceship (remarks) 611 (i).
B. C. Legislation, Disallowance of Acts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Cor., 138 (i).
Bronte Harbour Lighthouse, Erection, &c. (Ans.) 134 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 756 (i).
Business of the Hse., Ascension Day Adjnmnt. (M.) 4353 (ii).
——— Private Bills, &c. (remarks) 3920 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Cabinet Changes (explanation) 412 (i).
C. P. R., Increase in Capital Stock, Papers respecting laid on Table, 129 (i).
Can. Temperance Act, Memorial from Baptists in Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 1110 (i).
——— Names of Counties, &c., under Operation (Ans.) 1682 (i).
Census, Description of Metis (remarks) 1674 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) prop. Res., 3832 (ii).
Chinese Immigration, Rep. of Com., First Part (presented) 451 (i).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4575 (ii).
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 143, 147 (i).
——— Letter from Sir Louis Davies (read) 821 (i).
———*See* 'Bulwer,' &c.
Clergue's Contract *re* Steel Rails, &c. (Ans.) 781 (i).
Coal Oil Inspection, 5055 (ii).
Collegiate Institute Cadet Corps (Ans.) 240 (i).
Colonial Troops in Defence of Empire, Par. in *Ottawa Citizen* (remarks) 786 (i).
Commissions to Can. Officers in British Army, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 425 (i).
Commissions on Disbursements for Imperial Authorities (Ans.) 1066 (i).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 6 (i).
———Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 7 (i).
———Lists (presented) 122 (i).
———(M.) to add Name, 1063 (i), 2568 (ii).
Consular Agencies, Flags, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).
Coronation Day, Public Holiday, &c. (Ans.) 747 (i).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 7 (i).
——— 4th Rep. of Com., French Translators, on M. to conc., 4244 (ii)
——— (remarks) 4121 (ii).
Dom. Securities Co., Par. in New York Paper (remarks) 4428 (ii).
Employees of H. of C., Transportation to Homes (remarks) 5056 (ii).
Fishery Awards, Distribution to Provs., &c. (remarks) 3861 (ii).
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com. 4570 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order, 4656 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
G. O. C., &c., Right to rep. to Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 240 (i).
Govt. Business, Morning Sittings (M.) 3920 (ii).
——— Precedence on Mondays (M.) 961 (i).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 1278 (i), 2720 (ii).
——— *See* 'Business,' &c.
Govt. Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).
——— Interference in Federal Elections, &c. (Ans.) 619 (i).
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3718 (ii).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. (remarks) 3623 (ii).
Greek Catholic Church, Pet. *re* Incorporation, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com., 2718 (ii).
Ile-aux-Coudre Wharf, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3410.
Immigration, on Inquiry (Mr. *Wilson*) for Ret., 1205 (i).
Income Tax, G.B. and Can. Agents (Ans.) 5054.
Industrial Properties Preservation Treaty, &c., Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 2146 (i).
Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4724 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4427 (ii).
I.C.R. Officials, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).
——— P.E.I. Rys., Expenditures, Ques. of Order, 3235 (ii).
Internal Economy Com. (presented) 154 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 1°, 318 (i).
Japanese Immigration, Rep. of Commissioners (remarks) 1323 (i).
——— Rep. of Royal Commission laid on Table, 2658 (ii).
Joint Stock Companies incorp. (B. 161) 1°*, 4245; in Com., 4803 (ii).
King's Birthday, Official Observance (Ans.) 2226 (i).
Library of Parlt., Joint Com. (M.) 128 (i).
Lisgar, Man., Revising Officer, Date of Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 3153 (ii).
Man. School Lands Fund, &c. (Ans.) 2942 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1129; in Com., 2476 (i); on M. for 3°, 4454; on Sen. Amts., 4803 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3925, 4246 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 154 (i).
Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 155 (i).
Montgomery, General, Erection of Monument, &c., (Ans.) 129 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) for Ret., 2681 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Board, Appnmt. of Mr. Doran (Ans.) 3920 (ii).
Mulloy, Trooper, Pension *re* (remarks) 3315 (ii).
Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 154) 1°*, 4121; in Com., 4484 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Newfoundland, Negotiations *re* Confederation with Can. (Ans.) 4698 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3977 (ii).
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3142 (ii).
N.W.M. Police Act (asst. commissioner) Amt. (B. 147) prop. Res., 3308; in Com. on Res., 3510; 1°* of B., 3734 (ii).
——— Police Pensions (B. 40) prop. Res., 779; in Com. on Res., 806; 1°* of B., 962; in Com., 2484, 3311 (ii).
——— Police Report (presented) 1063 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°* *pro formâ*, 4 (i).
Ontario Legislature, Extension of Duration, &c. (Ans.) 131 (i).
Oriental Commission, Rep. of Commission (Ans.) 444 (i).
——— Rep. laid on Table, 2658 (ii).
Precedence in Can. at Official Functions, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 433 (i).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2739 (ii).
——— Res. from Boards of Trade, &c. (Ans.) 3154 (ii).
Private Bills, on M. to extend Time, 781 (i).
——— and Govt. Business (remarks) 4568 (ii).
Procedure *re* Bills (remarks) 612, 2481 (i).
Provincial Subsidies and B.N.A. Act. Amt. (Ans.) 442 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 440 (i).
——— 1st and 2nd Reps., on M. to conc., 810 (i).
——— 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1413 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3197 (ii).
——— on M. to proceed (remarks) 2481 (i).
——— Commission B. (remarks) 4970 (ii).
——— (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4601 (ii).
Railway Com. (M.) to add Name, 1278 (i).
Railway Expenditures, &c. (remarks) 3126 (ii).
Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3733 (ii).
Railway Subsidies (remarks) 4972 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3229 (ii).
Representation in House of Commons, Provinces *re* Census, &c. (Ans.) 2677, 2854 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 3862 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. *Bell*) 4036 (ii).
Sabbath Observance *re* Militia Parades (remarks) 4646 (ii).
Sessional Clerks employed in Civil Service (Ans.) 619 (i).
Shipping (Atlantic) Combine, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
S.A. War—British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3333 (ii).
——— Commissions on Outlay, &c. (Ans.) 1064.
——— Constabulary, Selection of Officers (Ans.) 244 (i).
——— Contingents, Expense of Equipment, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).
——— School Teachers, Information *re* (remarks) 962 (i).
——— Volunteers, Land Grants to, Memorial from N.W. Ter. (Ans.) 3831 (ii).
Speech from the Throne (M.) 6 (i).
Staff Course at Kingston (Ans.) 239 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Trent (construction) conc., 5049 (ii).
Civil Govt.: N.W.M. Police (clerical assistance) 212; (salaries) 174; Privy Council (salaries) 173 (i).
Dom. Lands (Man. school lands) 4252 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 4329 (ii); (salaries) 234; Library (books) 237 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and France) 4332 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Chinese commission) 4340 (conference of Col. ministers) 4332; (coronation, expenses of ministers) 4332; (eastern extension arbitration) 4340; (Nipissing election, payments to stenographer) 4339 (ii).
N.W.M. Police (service, &c.) 4247 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (St. Joseph's wharf) 1271; Que. (Sorel wharf) 1058 (i); Telegraph Lines (Anticosti to Bryon) 4769 (ii).
Quarantine (Porter, A. E., claim) 5034 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Drummond Co., rental, &c.) 3539; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4864 (ii).
Tassie, Major, Retirement of (Ans.) 241 (i).
Telephone Companies B. 2 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 786 (i).
——— (remarks) 526 (i).
Trackmen's Wages: *See* 'Govt. Rys.'
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 956 (i).
Windmill, Battle of, Pensions (Ans.) 238 (i).
Yukon, Employment of Japanese (Ans.) 242 (i).

Lavell, Mr. J. R., *Leeds and Grenville.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2030 (i).
SUPPLY:
Customs (laboratory) 2927; (salaries, &c.) 2922; (sugar testing) 2927 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
King Bros., Claim against Govt., Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 3307 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *East Prince, P.E.I.*
Canoe Cove (P.E.I.) Breakwater, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 3831 (ii).
P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication with Mainland, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2728 (ii).
——— Winter Communication, Pets., &c. (M. for copies) 160, 170 (i).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (hatcheries, P.E.I.) 4960 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers, salaries) 520 ; (*Stanley*, Str.) 520 (i).

Public Works: Dredging (Cape Tormentine) 3284 (ii) ; Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Cape Tormentine, memorial *re*) 1018 ; (Cape Traverse memorial *re*) 1018 ; (Summerside breakwater) 1017 (i) ; Telegraphs (Marconi system) 4772 (ii).

Railways and Canals: P.E.I. (Kinkora, Res., &c.) 3863 ; (Murray Harbour branch) 3863 (ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinongé.*

Dominion Cotton Co.'s (B. 71) 1°*, 1673 (i).

I.C.R., Ste. Monique Station, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 744 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3949 (ii).

Tay Canal, Amount expended, 1896 to 1901, &c. (Ques.) 2067 (i).

Lemieux, Mr. R., *Gaspé.*

B.N.A. Act *re* Provincial Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 441 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2398 (i).

Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Edwards*) in Com., 2888 (ii).

Colonial Appeals to Imp. Privy Council (M.) for Cor., 3668 (ii).

Gaspé Basin as an Ocean Port, on M. for Com. for Sup., 5011 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) on M. for Com., 4661 (ii).

Greek Catholic Church B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. for 2°, 3866 ; in Com., 4680 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 1°, 318 (i).

Japan Exposition, Can. Representation, &c. (Ques.) 2225 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3944 (ii).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1129 (i) ; in Com., 4438 (ii).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2055 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 496 (i).

Northern Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 66) 1°*, 1569.

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3967 (ii).

Provincial Subsidies and B. N. A. Act Amt. (Ques.) 441 (i).

Queen's and King's Counsel, Appnmt. by Govt. since 1896 (Ques.) 3154 (ii).

Roy *vs.* C. P. R., Privy Council Judgment (M. for copy) 499 (i).

Superior Court, Quebec, Writs issued, &c. (Ques.) 442 (i).

Lemieux, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Militia (properties) 2557 (ii).

Post Office (Magdalen Islands) 3903 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (telephones) 986 ; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Gaspé, dredging, &c.) 1049 ; (Grande Vallée) 1039 ; (Murray Bay wharf) 1052 (i) ; Telegraph Lines (Magdalen Islands) 4144 (ii).

Railways: Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4916 (ii).

Lennox, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*

Allandale Station, Mail Transfer (Ques.) 884 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2207, 2226 (i).

Coronation Contingent, Representation, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3839 (ii).

Drainage across Ry. Property B. 4 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Fruit Transportation, &c., Excessive Charges, Res. of Georgian Bay Fruit Growers' Association (Ques.) 1109 (i).

House of Commons, Addition to Central Block, &c., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1442 (i).

Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4756 (ii).

I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditure, Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3974 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back for Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1422 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 468 (i) ; in Com., 3177 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) Ques. of Order, 3224 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3367, 3376 ; (experimental farms) 2883 (ii).

Canals: Trent (construction) conc., 5053 (ii).

Indians: B.C. (industrial schools) 3060 ; (inspectors) 3060 (ii).

Justice: Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3610 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 638 ; Que. (Levis cattle quarantine) 668 (i) ; Miscellaneous (surveys and inspections) 4781.

Railways: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) conc., 5045 ; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4911 (ii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Beauchamp, Oscar, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 158 (i).

Descary, C. A., Surgeon at St. Vincent de Paul (Ques.) 3831 (ii).

Govt. Employees and Interference in Elections, &c. (Ques.) 618 (i).

I. C. R., Classifying of Employees, Salaries, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 2472 (i).

Market Gardeners, Protection against Foreign Competition (prop. Res.) 3639 ; Neg. (Y. 33 ; N. 71) 3666 (ii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E.—*Con.*
Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, &c. (M. for ret.) 481 (i).
Rifle Associations' Regulations, Pamphlet, French Translation, &c. (Ques.) 2223 (i).
St. Eugène de Grantham Mail Service, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4350 (ii).
St. Jerome Postmaster, Interference in Political Meetings (Ques.) 159 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Pen., Appnmt. of Physician (Ques.) 159 (i).
——— Coal Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 159 (i).
——— Employees organizing Political Meetings, &c. (Ques.) 158 (i).
——— Indemnity to Trefflé Nantel (M. for ret.*) 2471 (i).
——— Leave of Absence of Warden (M. for cor., &c.*) 2472 (i).
——— Letter *re* Misconduct of Officials (Ques.) 1445 (i).
——— Relations between Warden and Dep. Warden (Ques.) 1445 (i).
——— Surgeon, &c. (Ques.) 3831 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works : Buildings, Yukon (matron, court-house, &c.) 4193, 4197 ; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (St. Genevieve) 4215 ; (Valleyfield channel) 4216 (ii).
Vadnais, Francois, Contractor for Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 4350 (ii).
Vegetables imported into U.S., Quantity, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 171 (i).
——— Readjustment of Duties (M. for pets.*) 171 (i).

Logan, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c. (prop. Res.) 3702, 3719 ; Amt. to adjn. Deb. agreed to (N. 23 ; Y. 54) 3724 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3233 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Lower Cove breakwater) 1004 (i).

Loy, Mr. G. M., *Beauharnois.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Valleyfield channel) 4216 (ii).

Mackinnon, Mr. D. A., *East Queen's, P.E.I.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1480 (i).
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3708 (ii).
Marconi System of Wireless Telegraphy, Agreement *re* P.E.I., &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).

Maclaren, Mr. W. S., *Huntingdon.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2045 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2054 (i).
SUPPLY :
Militia (pay and allowance) 2519 (ii).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *North Perth.*
Transportation Problem (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4361 ; Neg. (Y. 43 ; N. 93) 4402 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York, Ont.*
Address, on The, 51 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 114 (i).
Anglo-German Commercial Treaties, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Copies, 797 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 771 (i).
C. P. Ry. Act (tolls) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2936 (ii).
Crown Bank of Canada incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *McCreary*) 2° m., 2021 (i).
Debates, Official Reporting (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 964 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take Precedence on Wednesdays, 2720 (ii).
Greek Catholic Church, Pet. *re* Incorporation, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com., 2718 (ii).
Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3736 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 1°, 317 (i).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2733, 2942 (ii).
Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1103 (i).
Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1436 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3729 (ii).
Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 304 (i).
SUPPLY :
Administration of Justice (Divorce Court, N.B.) 217 ; (judges' salaries) 215 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (*Year Book*) 339 (i).
Civil Govt. : Agriculture (clerical assistance) 206 ; Inland Revenue (clerical assistance) 207 ; Labour Dept. (clerical assistance) 213 ; Marine and Fisheries (clerical assistance) 204 ; Printing and Stationery (clerical assistance) 199 (i).
Public Works : Buildings—Dom. (quarantine stations) 980 ; Ottawa (rentals) 964 ; (telephones) 986, 988 ; Yukon (rentals, repairs, &c.) 969 ; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Cow Bay wharf) 1001 ; Que. (Sorel wharf) 1057 (i).
Railways : I.C.R. (Clergue's contract, steel rails) 3789 ; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4877, 4896 (ii).
Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 736 (i).
Telephones and Telephone Co.'s (B. 2) 1° m., 66 ; 2° m., 625, 786 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *North Simcoe.*
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2852 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (B. 61) 1°*, 1490 (i).
Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief (B. 127) 1°*, 3725.
Dyment Banking Loan and Savings Co.'s incorp. (B. 51) 1°*, 1204 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G.—*Con.*
General Inspection Act (leather) Amt. (B. 111) 1° m., 2849 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3948 (ii).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. (B. 98) 1°*, 2146 (i); in Com., 4424, 4521 (ii).
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 1673 (i); in Com., 3131 (ii).
N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 3315 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 475 (i); in Com., 3187 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) in Com., 2194 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2835.
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1175 (i).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 1108 (i).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 2064 (i).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, Ont.*
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1985 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Cobourg armoury) 725; Que. (day labour or contract system) 682; (Montreal examining warehouse) 682 (i).

McCormick, Mr. G., *Muskoka and Parry Sound.*
Ontario James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 1490 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burke's Falls wharf) 4637; (Georgian Bay, dredging) 4640; (Huntsville wharf) 4631; (Orillia wharf) 4641 (ii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F., *Selkirk.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2606, 2608, 2659 (ii).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4575 (ii).
Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3735 (ii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4507 (ii).
Man. and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 96) 1°*, 2146 (i).
Man. Liquor Act, Constitutionality of Referendum, Letters, &c. from Man. Govt. (Ques.) 1682 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 495 (i).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier, 3971 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Supreme Court) 221.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 4088 (ii).
Customs (coal oil inspection) 3302 (ii).
Interior: N. W. T. Govt. (prov. autonomy) 3076 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries — Kingston (binder twine) 3613; Man. (land purchase) 3618 (ii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Post Office (electric ry. mail service) 3874; (newspaper postage) 3916; (parcel service) 3913; (Winnipeg P.O.) 3868 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (immigration sheds, &c.) 976; (renewals, &c.) 833; Que. (contract or day labour) 699 (i); Dredging—Man. (*Sir Hector*) 3284; (snag boat) 4768 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews Rapids) 605 (i).
Quarantine (Winnipeg hospitals) 406 (i).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 903, 915, 960 (i).
Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 65) 1°*, 1569; on Sen. Amts., 4570 (ii).

McEwen, Mr. G., *South Huron.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings—Yukon (official residences) 4545; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1219 (i).
Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1189 (i).

McGowan, Mr. J., *Centre Wellington.*
Census Commissioners, Atlin District, Amounts paid to, &c. (Ques.) 3155 (ii).
Drainage across Ry. Property B. 4 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).
Flax Seed, Importation from U.S., Amount, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1682 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3376; (experimental farms) 2873; (fruit inspection) 2624.
Customs (linseed oil) 2932, 3299 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries — Kingston (binder twine) 3612 (ii).
Militia (properties) 2556; (supplies, remounts, &c.) 2559 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 2919; unorganized districts) 2906 (ii).
Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1197 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
Public Accounts Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3922 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 4619 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*
Canso Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 46) 1°*, 1204 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indian Affairs: Ont. and Que. (schools) 3047.
Lighthouse and Coast Service (light buoys) 526.
Post Office (Inverness mail service) 4939; (country postmasters) 3897 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Friar's Head harbour) 1002 (i).

Madore, Mr. J. A. C., *Hochelaga.*
Cottons, Bleached and Unbleached, Duty *re* (Ques.) 614 (i).
Montreal and St. Lawrence Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 48) 1°*, 1204 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2059 (i).
Sugar, Refined and Raw, imported into Can. during 1900 and 1901 (M. for ret.*) 809 (i).

Malouin, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*
Quebec and Huron Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1°*, 734 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Canal and Lake Champlain Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 2146 (i).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 1763 (i).

Marcil, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) on M. for Com., 4656 (ii).
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3710 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4683 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 14 (Mr. *Beland*) on Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 4438; on M. for 3°, 4461 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3972 (ii).
O'Keefe, Magistrate, Pet. from St. Jean Baptiste Society (Ques.) 2857 (ii).
Paspebiac as an Ocean Port, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5000 (ii).
Printing of Parlt., 4th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc. (amt.) 4644 (ii).
Restigouche River, I.C.R. Bridge, on M. for Ways and Means, 5070 (ii).
Royal Marine Insurance Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 4568.
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 3011 (ii).
Post Office (Magdalen islands) 3907; (outside offices) 3902 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Lévis local service) 4297 (ii).

Matheson, Mr. J., *Richmond, N.S.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3387 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, maintenance) 512 (i).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Grand River channel) 4622 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (general vote) 3469 (ii).

Maxwell, Mr. G. R., *Burrard.*
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4057 (ii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 1108 (i).
Yukon Coast Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1569 (i).

Monet, Mr. D., *Laprairie and Napierville.*
Colonial Troops and Defence of Empire, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 785 (i).
S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3343 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Address, on The, 43 (i).
Alaskan Boundary. *See* 'Bulwer-Clayton.'
Anglo-German Commercial Treaties, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 790; Negatived (Y. 56; N. 107) 804 (i).
Auger, I. A., Contract *re* Spruce Planks, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 2483, 2676 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Ballots for St. James Electoral Division, Montreal, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 157 (i).
——— Laval, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 157 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2399, 2411 (i).
Bull, Charles A., Produce Co., Letter from High Commissioner's Office, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4805 (ii).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.) 747 (i).
——— Order, Question of, Letter of Sir Louis Davies, laid on Table, 761 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Cor., 149 (i).
Cacouna and Ry. Station, Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 2225 (i).
Civil Service Act (retirement) Amt. B. 124 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3775 (ii).
Commissions to Can. Officers in British Army, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 426 (i).
Commutations for Arson, &c., Number (M. for ret.) 419 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) (amt.) 2469 (i).
Cote St. Luc Rifle Range, Indemnity to J. Larose (M. for cor.) 622 (i).
Customs Tariff (1897) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 3°, 4977 (ii).
Dom. Bank Notes, Number of Sheets issued in 1892 (Ques.) 619 (i).
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3711 (ii).
Hay purchased for War Office in Quebec (Ques.) 2223 (i).
Herald, Globe, &c., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 615 (i).
——— *Halifax Chronicle*, &c., (M. for ret.*) 809.
Illumination for Royal Visit, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 615 (i).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Expenditure, Inquiry by Pub. Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3250 (ii).
——— St. Octave Station, Tenderer, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2222 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 8) 1°m., 316 (i).
——— (remarks) 1110 (i).
Joint Stock Companies B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5064 (ii).
Judges of County Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3310 (ii).
Laprairie Post Office, Dismissal of A. Thomas &c. (M. for cor.*) 2473 (i).
——— (Ques.) 2221 (i).
Larose, Jos., Indemnity to, &c. (M. for cor.) 622.
Longueuil Govt. Farm, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 2455 (i
Market Gardeners, Protection against Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3645.
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1129; in Com., 2479 (i).

Monk. Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2055 (i).

Montreal Harbour Board, Appmnt. of Mr. Doran (Ques.) 3920 (ii).

Montreal Rifle Ranges, Amount expended, Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 2223 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*) 484 (i).

Newspapers, Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 158, 615 (i).

North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3122, 3146 (ii).

N.W.M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 3314 (ii).

Petition of Right Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 3306 (ii).

Public Works Employees, Delay in Payment (remarks) 3778 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2457 (i).

Pullman Car Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2459 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3170, 3200 (ii).

Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 3305; in Com., 3774 (ii).

Ross Rifles, Manufacture of, Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 4974 (ii).

Royal Visit. *See* 'Wales.'

S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3338 (ii).

——— Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).

——— Constabulary, Applications, Selections, &c. (M. for ret.*) 528 (i).

——— (Ques.) 243 (i).

Sorel and Montreal Wharf Contracts, Specifications, Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 2473 (i).

Supreme Court Judges, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 2224 (i).

Supply (remarks) 128 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Acadian historical data) 357; (bulletins, printing, &c.) 348 (i); (census) 3392; (census investigation *re* 1891) 3393 (ii); (cold storage) 368; (Imperial Institute, Can. exhibits) 367 (i).

Civil Govt.: Post Office (salaries) 4925; Railways and Canals (salaries) 3780 (ii).

Electric Light (inspection) 1202 (i).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1150, 1202; (inspectors' salaries) 1148 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers, &c.) 522 (i).

Militia (Larose, Jos., indemnity) 4947 (ii).

Post Office (Montreal, P.O.) 3869 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Que. (contract or day labour) 701; (Cote St. Paul, Verdun, &c.) 656; (Drummondville) 643; (Granby) 644; (L'Assomption) 656; (Levis, building) 669; (Levis, cattle quarantine) 668; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 670; (renewals, &c.) 642; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 710; (Thetford Mines) 716; Valleyfield) 717;

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Dredging—Man. (vessels, repairs, &c.) 4763; Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie) 4763; (plant) 3283; (Jacques Cartier Co.) 3285; Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Gaspé, removal of rock) 1048; (Grande Vallée) 1036: (Hudson wharf) 1046; (Lake Temiscamingue) 1047; (Murray Bay wharf) 1051; (St. Alexis Bay) 1053; (St. Maurice, dredging) 1053; (Sorel wharf) 1060; (title for lands) 1042; (Valleyfield, dredging) 1061 (i); (Yukon) 3283; Miscellaneous (surveys and inspections) 4781; (timber creosoting plant) 4779; Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft to Dawson) 3293; (cable system) 4775; (Magdalen Islands extension) 4769 (ii).

Quarantine (organized district, salaries, &c.) 371; (Public Works Health Act) 404 (i).

Railways: I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3810; (Clergue's contract, steel rails) 3783; (general vote) 3410, 3429; (Levis accommodation) 3811; (locomotives) 3816; (Miramichi bridge spans) 3812; (Moncton engine house) 3830; (Moncton shops) 3828; (Pintsch gas equipment) 3812; (Point Tupper) 3828; (rolling stock) 3816; P.E.I. (bridges) 3828; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4862 (ii).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1195 (i).

Telegraph Lines in B.C. and Ters., Amount expended (Ques.) 157 (i).

Thomas, Alphonse, Postmaster at Laprairie, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2221 (i).

Three Rivers, Inspector Gravel, Amounts paid, collected, &c. (Ques.) 2457 (i).

Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3630 (ii).

Trackman's Wages. *See* "Govt. Rys."

Transportation *re* St. Lawrence, Amount, &c. (Ques. of Order), 3683 (ii).

Wales, Prince of, Visit, &c., Cost of Illumination, &c. (Ques.) 615 (i).

Yukon Timber Licenses or Leases issued since 1899, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2472 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3509 (ii).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*

Coté, Jos., Mail Carrier at Ste. Hénédine, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).

Doyon, Thos., Postmaster at St. Odilon, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4350 (ii).

Employees of H. of C., Transportation to Homes (remarks) 5056 (ii).

Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3712 (ii).

Ste. Hénédine Mail Carrier, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).

St. Odilon, Dorchester Co., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 4350 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census expenses) 4435.

Legislation: H. of C. (French debates, &c.) 4330 (ii).

Post Office (charges *re* postmasters) 4934; (mail contracts) 3881 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.W.T. (Edmonton Jail) 851; Que. (Thetford Mines) 717 (i); Yukon (official residences) 4545 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Isle aux Coudres wharf) 1046; (Isle aux Grues wharf) 1047; (Murray

Morin, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Bay wharf) 1051 (i); (Quebec harbour) 4553; (St. François wharf) 4633 (ii); (Sorel wharf) 1057 (i); Roads and Bridges, Ottawa (Maria St. bridge) 3290; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 3287; (sorting logs) 4218; Telegraph Lines (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 3291 (ii).

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster.*

Bennett Lake Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 17) 1°*, 530.

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1504 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Rep. of Commission (remarks) 1323 (i).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1569 (i).

Oriental Immigration, Rep. of Commission (Ques.) 444 (i).

Pacific Northern and Omineca Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) 1°*, 1673 (i).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Chinese Commission) 4340 (ii).

Telephone Cos. in Can., Total Mileage, &c. (Ques.) 3150 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. Wm. (Postmaster General) *North York, Ont.*

Allandale Station, Transfer of Mails (Ans.) 884.

Anten Mills and Hendrie Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 1681 (i).

Bathurst, N.B., Charges against Postmaster H. Bishop (Ans.) 4700 (ii).

Cacouna and Ry. Station Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 2225 (i).

Can. Transatlantic Mails via U.S. (Ans.) 447 (i).

Clinton, David, Postmaster at Wellington, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 613 (i).

Crathie, Postmistress, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 2678 (ii).

Doyon, Thos., Postmaster at St. Odilon, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4350 (ii).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4684 (ii).

Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2860 (ii).

Holstein, Dismissal of Postmaster (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4927 (ii).

Isle of Orleans Mail Service (Ans.) 246 (i).

Joliette P. O., Dismissal of J. J. Sheppard (Ans.) 2068 (i), 2855 (i).

Kaulbach, Postmaster at Musquodoboit, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).

Kingston Locomotive Works, Strike, &c. (remarks) 4704 (ii).

Labour Dept. Rep. (presented) 121 (i).

Labour Disputes B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).

Laprairie P. O., Dismissal of Alph. Thomas (Ans.) 2221 (i).

McDonald's Corner, N.B., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 2676 (ii).

Magazines, &c., imported from G.B. and U.S., Quantities, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2679 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Maple Creek P. O., Change of Location, &c. (Ans.) 2854 (ii).

Maranda, Alfred, Emplymt. of (Ans.) 246 (i).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 4440 (ii).

Milton Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ans.) 133.

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4521 (ii).

Morton P.O., Abstraction from registered Letters (Ans.) 1987 (i).

Newcastle, Ont., Resignation of Postmaster (Ans.) 4697 (ii).

Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 121 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. (B. 106) 1° m., 2482; in Com., 4036 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes, Settlement (B. 147) 1° m., 3725 (ii).

——— *See* Labour.

Ricketts, T., Postmaster at Gilmour, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2224 (i).

Round Hill to Armstrong's Corners, Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1988 (i).

St. Eugène de Grantham and I.C.R. Station, Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 4350, 4351 (ii).

Ste. Hénédine Mail Carrier, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 447 (i).

St. Jerome Postmaster, Interference in political meetings (Ans.) 159 (i).

Samples sent by 'Sample Post,' Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 617 (i).

Seeley's Bay P. O., Abstraction from registered Letters (Ans.) 1987 (i).

Sheppard, J. J., Postmaster at Joliette, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2068 (i), 2855 (ii).

Springbank Post Office, Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 2678 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (Burland litigation) 4317; (engraving, &c.) 4317; (redemption) 4324 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (clerical assistance) 211, 213; (salaries) 181 (i); Marine and Fisheries (Tyrwhitt, Mr., salary) 4958 (ii); Post Office Dept. (clerical assistance) 211; (Knauf, promotion) 4313; (salaries) 179 (i), 4313, 4925.

High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 4326.

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 4327; (Library, printing) 4327; (stationery) 4326 (ii).

Post Office: (automobiles) 3872; (Bain, Mr., P.O. inspector) 3871; (Barrie mail service) 3910; (Bates, Mr. E. B., salary) 4940; (Belleville P.O.) 4945; (B.C. mail service) 4314; (charges against postmasters) 4930; (Kehoe, Mr., mail contractor) 4932; (LeSueur, Mr., superannuation) 3904; (letter carriers) 3867, 4940; (mail service) 3911; (outside service, salaries) 3867; (parcel service) 3911; (Peterborough postmaster) 4943; (petitions *re* contracts) 4931; (ry. mail clerks) 4313; (railway mail service) 4940; (salary increases) 4941; (service payments) 4314 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (P.O., rent of boxes) 988 (i).

Williamstown Postmaster, Charges against *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 4353 (ii).

Murray, Mr. T., *Pontiac.*

SUPPLY :

Railways : P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4290 (ii).

Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren*, Perth) to Com. of Sup., 4393 (ii).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2268 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 238 (i).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2755 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back for instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1415 (i).

Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 311 (i).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3213 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Post Office (Belleville P. O.) 4945 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1658 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2615, 2662 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com. (amt.) 3128 (ii).

——— Lands patented up to March, 1902, Acreage, &c. (Ques.) 1988 (i).

——— Land Taxes, Exemption, &c. (Ques.) 1988.

——— Taxation, Test Case (remarks) 5055, 5073 (ii).

Coal Oil Inspection, 5054, 5074 (ii).

——— M. to adjn., 5077 (ii).

Coronation Contingent and Western Contingents (remarks) 4647 (ii).

Greek Catholic Church (B. 140) Pet. *re* Incorporation (M.) to refer back to Com., 2715, 3121, 3303 ; 1°*, 3622 ; M. for 2°, 3866 ; 2° m., 4076 ; in Com., 4676 (ii).

Horses imported into Man. and N. W. T., Customs Valuation, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1212 (i).

Hudson's Bay and North-west Ry. Co.'s (B. 93) 1°*, 2145 (i).

Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3738 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2485 (ii).

Pensions granted in British Army *re* wounded (Ques.) 2679 (ii).

Railway Act (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4592 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3203 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation, 3224, 3227 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*

S. A. War—British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3355 (ii).

——— Horses purchased in N. W. Can. (Ques.) 1989 (i), 2679 (ii).

——— Pensions to Canadians, &c. (Ques.) 2459.

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3391 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1152, 1157 (i).

Interior : N. W. T. Govt. (prov. autonomy) 3071 (ii).

Militia (properties) 2551 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings—N.W.T. (Edmonton Jail) 854 ; (Red Deer immigration shed) 853.

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 946, 960 (i).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1385 (i).

Buffalo Ry. and International Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 811 (i).

Cements, Canadian and Foreign, Tests by Govt. (Ques.) 1442, 1444 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4415 (ii).

Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3721 (ii).

Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1210 (i).

Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3760 (ii).

Molsons Bank Pension Fund incorp. (B. 109) 1°*, 3304 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4424 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 497 (i).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3974 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2486, 3314 (ii).

Penny Bank incorp. (B. 95) 1°*, 2146 (i).

Railway Commission and Consolidation B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2445 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3368 (ii).

Charges of Management (printing Dom. Notes) 172 (i).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1159, 1179 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse service) 519 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 507 (i).

Public Works : Buildings—Dom. (policy of Govt.) 666 ; Que. (L'Assomption) 666 ; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1217 ; (Collingwood harbour) 1230 ; (St. Joseph's wharf) 1258 ; (Toronto harbour) 1274 (i).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 390 (i).

Railways : I. C. R. (Clergue's contract) 3781 ; (general vote) 3478 ; (Lévis accommodation) 3810 ; (steel rails, &c.) 3781 ; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4863, 4887 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3628 (ii).
Town Sites, N.W.T., Land Grants, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4408, 4412 (ii).
Trackman's Wages : *See* " Govt."
Transportation *re* St. Lawrence, Amount spent, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3698 (ii).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2478 (i).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s (B. 10) 1°*, 408 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 86) 1°*, 1985 (i).

Paterson, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Customs) *North Wentworth and Brant.*
American Tugs in Can. Waters, &c. (Ans.) 441.
Bathurst Collector of Customs, P. J. Venoit, Absence from Office, &c. (Ans.) 4125 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2299 (i).
Cattle Exports to U.S. since 1890, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3153 (ii).
Coal Oil Inspection, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to adjn., 5079 (ii).
Coasting Trade Act Amt. (B. 165) in Com. on Res., 4246, 1°*, 4361 (ii).
Cottons, Bleached and Unbleached, Duty *re* (Ans.) 614 (i).
Customs Forfeited Goods, Sale of at Sydney, N. S. (Ans.) 783 (i).
Flax Seed imported from U.S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1682 (i).
Free List, Articles placed on since 1897 (Ans.) 244 (i).
Grain Importations through Western Ports in 1900, Quantity (Ans.) 782 (i).
—— from Ont. Ports in 1901 (Ans.) 246 (i).
McCormick Binder, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 441 (i).
Magazines and Newspapers imported from G.B. and U.S., Value, &c. (Ans.) 2679 (ii).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2802 (ii).
Pullman Car Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 2459 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c.: Census (remarks) 4342
Civil Govt.: Customs (clerical assistance) 208 (i) ; (contingencies) 4264 (ii).
Customs (American tugs, &c.) 3298 ; (appraisers) 2927 ; (coal oil inspection) 3301 ; (inspector's salaries) 3295 ; (laboratory) 2927 ; (linseed oil importations) 2932, 3300 ; (printing, &c.) 3296 ; (salaries, &c.) 2921 ; (St. Thomas collector) 3295 ; (sugar testing) 2927 (ii).
Railways : I.C.R. (locomotives) 3825 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Amount collected during 1901 (Ans.) 134 (i).
Trade and Navigation Rep. (presented) 122 (i).
U.S. Imports for Home Consumption in 1901, Value, &c. (Ans.) 782 (i).

Paterson, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Facilities, on M. for Cor. (Mr. *Douglas*) 895, 899 (i).
Yarn admitted Duty Free, Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 4125 (ii).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2414.
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Japan exposition) 4966 ; (Paris exposition) 4967 (ii).
Geological Survey (maps, engraving, &c.) 4948.
Post Office (Keith P.O., change of location) 4937 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings—Dom. (immigration sheds, &c.) 975 ; (quarantine stations) 985 (i).
Railways : Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann, award) 4861 (ii).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*
Belleville Harbour Commissioners, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 449 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1903 (i).
Cadets, R.M.C., Application *re* Coronation Contingent (Ques.) 3637 (ii).
Coronation Contingent Representatives, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3835 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Inspector Hurley) 543 (i).

Prefontaine, Mr. R., *Maisonneuve, Terrebonne.*
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 4569 (ii).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4517 (ii).

Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1989 (i).
McPherson, Wm., Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 4353 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3191 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s (B. 153) 1°*, 4121 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Administration of Justice (Exchequer court) 231
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, 1891) 4111 (ii).
Canals : Cornwall (repairs, &c.) 4311 (ii).
Dominion Police (salaries) 233 (i).
Public Works : Buildings—Generally (Cornwall armoury) 863 (i) ; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Aultsville wharf) 4217 (ii).
Quarantine (small-pox in N.Y. state) 376 (i).
Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3627 (ii).
Williamstown Postmaster, Dismissal of Wm. McPherson, &c. (Ques.) 4353 (ii).

Puttee, Mr. A. W., *Winnipeg.*
Alien Labour Law, Cor. between Govt. and C.P.R., &c. (M. for ret*.) 529 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2621 (ii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. (B. 32) 1° m., 881 (i).
'Current Wages' Clause and Govt. Contracts (M. for ret*.) 631 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*
Employees killed, &c. on Canadian Rys. (Ques.) 410 (i).
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3706 (ii).
Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2863 (ii).
Moncton and Charlottetown, Govt. Ry. Shops, Number of Employes, &c. (Ques.) 614 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2062 (i).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4037 (ii).
Prohibition. *See* 'Referendum.'
Ry. Contracts and Current Wages Clause, Number, &c. (M. for ret*.) 631 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3728 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3208 (ii).
Referendum Act of 1902, Pet. from Man. Prohibition Alliance (Ques.) 785 (i).
Shoe Workers' Union, Quebec, Pet. to Govt. &c. (M. for copy*) 2473 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3382 (ii).
Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (salaries) 193 (i).
Customs (coal oil inspection) 3301 (ii).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1157 (i).
Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 2989 (ii).
Post Office (branch offices) 3884 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (contract or day labour) 689, 707; Man. (renewals, &c.) 831; Ottawa (royal mint) 560; Harbours and Rivers, Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 604 (i).
Railways: I.C.R. (Sydney accommodation) 3807.
Trackmen's Wages: *See* 'Govt.'
Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. *re* Ry. Management, &c. (Ques.) 2942 (ii).
Yukon, Employment of Japanese (Ques.) 242 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census expenses) 4434.
Canals: Galops (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4021; North Channel (dam) 4034; Rapide Plat (Gilbert Bros.) 4021 (ii).
Fisheries (Noble Bros., award, &c.) 4238 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 2995 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses, repairs) 4222 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4221; (Str. *Rothesay*) 4221 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria reformatory) 4184; (Brockville drill hall) 4182; Ottawa (electric lighting) 4189; (Major's Hill Park) 4181; (Rideau Hall, improvements) 4188; Yukon (employees, &c.) 4198; (rents, &c., judges residences) 4190; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Ecum Secum wharf) 4210; (Ingonish breakwater) 4211; Que. (Valleyfield channel) 4216; Roads and Bridges, N.W.T. (Belly River bridge) 4218; Slides and Booms (Shawinigan boom) 4218; (working expenses) 4220; Telegraphs—Yukon (pole contract) 4169; (supplies) 4159; (Str. *Tyrian*) 4220 (ii).
Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4400 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Windmill, Battle of, Pensions (Ques.) 238 (i).
——— (M. for pet.*) 3724 (ii).

Richardson, Mr. M. K., *South Grey.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1876 (i).
Holstein, Dismissal of Postmaster, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4927, 4933 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier, 3966 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3383 (ii).
Post Office (Holstein, postmaster, dismissal) 3875 (ii).

Riley, Mr. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
British Columbia and Yukon Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 36) 1°*, 961 (i).

Robinson, Mr. J., *West Elgin.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 107 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1554 (i).
Butter and Cheese Weighing Commission, Rep., &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).
Drainage across Ry. Lands (B. 6) 1°m., 2°8; 2°m., 789 (i).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4058 (ii).
Prorogation (remarks) 5082 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 467 (i); in Com., 3176 (ii).
Railway Commission and Consolidation B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2451 (i).
——— Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 131 (i).
S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3362 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3389; (experimental farms) 2893; (fruit inspection) 2588, (ii); (Pan-American exposition) 361; (*Patent Record*) 334 (i).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 3009 (ii).
Indian Affairs: Ont. and Que. (grants to Munceys) 3048 (ii).
Post Office (outside service) 3893 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Que. (contract or day labour) 696; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland harbour) 1238; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 572 (i).
Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4382 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W., *Halifax.*
Financial Situation, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4855 (ii).
S. A. War—Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3856 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Militia (pay and allowance) 2510 (ii).
Public Works: Roads and Bridges (hearing, difficulty, &c.) 4149 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*
Agricultural Implements exported in 1901, Rebate, &c. (M. for ret.*) 440 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2107 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2620 (ii).
Gilbert Blasting & Dredging Co., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3155 (ii).
Govt. Business, Private Bills (remarks) 3925 (ii).
Interior, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ques.) 4351 (ii).
McCormick Binder, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 441 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4495 (ii).
Man. and N.W.T. Timber Limits, Sale by Govt., Names of Purchasers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1133.
——— (Ques.) 885 (i).
Medical Council in Can. B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1122 (i).
S. A. War—Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3850 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census cheques) 4101.
Dom. Lands (Man. school lands) 4252 (ii).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1149, 1156 (i); (grain standards) 4258 (ii).
Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 547 (i).
Interior: N.W.T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3093 (ii).
Justice: Miscellaneous (travelling allowance, Man. Judges) 4265 (ii).
Miscellaneous (miners' relief, &c.) 4257 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Man. (Mossey river) 1276 (i).
Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1199 (i).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 916 (i).

Roddick, Mr. T. G., *Montreal, St. Antoine's.*
Medical Council in Can. Establishment (B. 11) 1°m., 408; 2°m., 1110; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1131; in Com., 2474 (i); (amt.) 4438; 3°m., 4441; on Sen. Amts., 4803 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4245 (ii).

Rosamond, Mr. B., *North Lanark.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1964 (i).
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3131 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census expenses) 4434; (experimental farms) 2869 (ii).
Canals: Lachine (waste weir) 4308 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 2543 (ii).
Railways: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4290 (ii).
Yarn admitted Duty Free, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 4125 (ii).

Ross, Hon. Wm., *Victoria, N.S.*
Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 882 (i).

Ross, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to present Rep. of Com., 4693 (ii).
Divorce Court and Senate Proceedings (remarks) 4122 (ii).
Govt. Rys. Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3714 (ii).
Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2863 (ii).
Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1216 (i).
Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4753 (ii).
Market Gardeners, Protection *re* Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3661 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddock*) on M. for 2°, 1132 (i).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Captain Bernier, 3968 (ii).
Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3729 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3385; (fruit inspection) 2597; (poultry stations) 2650 (ii); (*Year-Book*) 338 (i), 2820 (ii).
Customs (coal oil inspection) 3301 (ii).
Indians: N.S. (medical attendance) 3052 (i).
Justice: Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3600 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour) 4227 (ii).
Miscellaneous (conference of Colonial Ministers) 4333 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, maintenance, &c.) 510 (i).
Post Office (branch offices) 3888 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (immigration sheds, repairs, &c.) 978; N.S. (Iona Wharf) 1002 (i); Yukon (official residences) 4546 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Boularderie wharf) 998 (i); (Cow Bay breakwater) 1001; P.E.I. (creosoted timber) 1017; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 566 (ii); Telegraphs, Yukon (rates, &c.) 4177 (ii).
Quarantine (Stewart, Capt. D. C.) 2917 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (general vote) 3465 (ii).
Trackmen's Wages: *See* Govt.
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 916, 941 (i).
Yukon Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4468 (ii).

Ross, Mr. W., *South Ontario.*
Immigration to Can., Jan. 1 to May 1, 1902 (Ques.) 4697 (ii).
Judge of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3943 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3977 (ii).
N.W.M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2494 (ii).

Ross, Mr. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 2875; (general statistics) 2838; (*Year Book*) 2816 (ii).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1169, 1180 (i).
Quarantine (organized districts) 388 (i).
Railways: I.C.R. (general vote) 3440 (ii).
Yukon Representation in H. of C., B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4469 (ii).

Russell, Mr. B., *Hants.*
B.N.A. Act. *See* 'Property and Civil Rights.'
Criminal Code (1902) Act Amt. (B. 108) 1° m., 2567 (ii).
Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2859 (ii).
Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c. (prop. Res.) 1067 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*, on M. to ref. back to Com., 3212 (ii).
Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2672 (ii).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*
Fraudulent Sale Act, Inspection *re* Commercial Commodities (Ques.) 744 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3185, 3194 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (poultry shipments) 2645.
Public Works: Buildings—Que. (contract or day labour) 691; (Montreal examining warehouse) 691 (i).

Scott, Mr. W., *West Assiniboia.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2089 (ii).
C.P.Ry. Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 3129 (ii).
C.P.R. Lands, Taxation, on M. for Ways and Means, 5070 (ii).
——— Test Case (remarks) 5072 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Lands.'
Can. Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89) 1°*, 2054.
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 1322 (i).
Govt. Business, Private Bills (remarks) 3923 (ii).
Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, &c., Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1208 (i).
Library of Parlt., 2nd Rep. of Com., Conc. (M). 4644 (ii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4504 (ii).
Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 88) 1°*, 1986 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 42) 1°*, 1063 (i).
——— (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (amt. *re* fire guards) 4581, 4594 (ii).
Ry. Lands, N.W.T., Acreage patented, &c. (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
——— *See* 'Town.'
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to refer back to Com., 3216 (ii).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*
S. A. Contingents, Land Grants to, &c. (Ques.) 1446 (i), 3831 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1160 (i).
Interior: N.W.T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, expenditure, &c.) 3064, 3089, 3116, 4949 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries — Kingston (binder twine) 3603, 3615 (ii).
Post Office (N.W.T. postal facilities) 4942 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (western transportation) 4555 (ii).
Railways: Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4905 (ii).
Town Sites, N W. Ter., Land Grants and Govt. Policy (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4404.
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 919 (i).

Sherritt, Mr. J., *North Middlesex.*
Crathie, Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 2678 (ii).
Crediton P.O., Decease of Postmaster, Notice, &c. (Ques.) 3308 (ii).
London Drill Shed, Allotment of Armouries, &c. (Ques.) 1446 (i).
Springbank Postoffice, Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 2678 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 2896 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1222; (St. Joseph wharf) 1247, 1256 (i).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford (Minister of the Interior) *Brandon.*
Boundary Line through Detroit River (Ans.) 242.
C.P.Ry. Act (tolls) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2938 (ii).
C. P. Ry. Lands patented, Acreage, &c. up to 1902 (Ans.) 1988 (i).
——— Taxes, Exemption, &c. (Ans.) 1988 (i).
——— (remarks) 5055, 5072 (ii).
——— *See* 'Town.'
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 120) 1° m., 3127; in Com., 3769, 3832 (ii).
Eilbeck, R. J., Appnmt. as Sheriff (Ans.) 411.
Game Preservation Act (unorganized Ters.) Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 2941; in Com., 3769 (ii).
Geological Survey Rep. (presented) 2659 (ii).
Govt. Business, Private Bills (remarks) 3924 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. Pet. to Sel. Com., 2717, 3123; in Com., 4684 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 112) 1° m., 2850; in Com., 3734, 3748; 3° m., 3927, 3929; on Sen. Amts., 4801 (ii).
Immigration during 1892 (Ans.) 244 (i).
——— to Can., Jan. 1 to May 1, 1902 (Ans.) 4698 (ii).
——— General Statement, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2966

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Interior, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ans.) 4352 (ii).

—— Rep. (presented) 160 (i).

Joint Stock Co.'s B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5056 (ii).

Labour needed in Man. *re* Crops, Cable *re* (Ans.) 247 (i).

Land Titles Act (registration) Amt. (B. 149) 1° m., 3919; in Com., 4357 (ii).

Longueuil Govt. Farm, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 2456 (ii).

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4496 (ii).

Man. School Lands Fund, &c. (Ans.) 2942 (ii).

——— Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3035 (ii).

Miller Creek Concessions (remarks) 4427, 4465 (ii).

North-west Ter. Act Amt. (B. 121) 1° m., 3127; in Com., 3773 (ii).

Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4346 (ii).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2768 (ii).

Ry. Act (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4583, 4588 (ii).

Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. (B. 133) 1° m., 3305; in Com., 3774 (ii).

Roseau River Indian Reserve (Ans.) 247 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 180 (i); Indian Affairs (clerical assistance) 3037; (salaries) 3035; Interior (clerical assistance) 3062; (salaries) 3061 (ii).

Dom. Lands (L. E. Fontaine, allowance, &c.) 4256; (Man. school lands) 4252; (salaries, &c.) 4117; (surveys) 4953 (ii).

Geological Survey (director, &c.) 4116; (international boundary survey) 4250; (map engraving) 4948 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 2988; (contingencies, printing, &c.) 3029, 4248 (ii).

Indians: B.C. (industrial schools) 3059; (medical attendance) 3058, 4247; Generally (half-breed commission) 4954; (inspectors) 3060; (legal expenses *re* liquor traffic) 3061; (printing, &c.) 3060; Man., &c. (agricultural implements) 3054; (destitute, &c.) 3056; (grist and saw mills) 3057; (seeds, &c.) 3056; (Sioux) 3056; (treaty expenses) 3057; N.B. (medical attendance) 3052; N.S. (seed grain) 3050; Ont., &c. (grants to agricultural societies) 3048; (liquor traffic suppression) 3049; (medical attendance) 3038; (Munceys, grant, &c.) 3048; (St. Regis) 3038; (schools) 3043; P.E.I. (medical attendance) 3053 (ii).

Interior: Miscellaneous (Banff museum) 4953; (boundary surveys) 4953; (maps, &c.) 4954; N.W.T. Govt. (provincial autonomy, &c.) 3084, 3097, 4251, 4948; (registrars) 4251 (ii).

Miscellaneous (assay office, Vancouver) 4117; (Banff park) 4118; (gratuity to Mrs. White) 4256; (litigation expenses, Interior) 4119; (miners, Dease and Liard, relief, &c.) 4257; (Saskatchewan settlers, relief) 4257 (ii).

Quarantine (Porter, A. E., claim) conc., 5034.

Railways: Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4877 (ii).

Yukon (Treadgold concessions) 4950 (ii).

Town Sites, N.W.T., Land Grants, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4410 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Welsh Immigration from Patagonia (Ans.) 241, 243 (i).

Yukon Territory Act Amt. (B. 119) 1° m., 3126; in Com., 3832, 4484, 4529 (ii).

——— Representation in House of Commons (B. 134) 1° m., 3306; in Com., 3774, 4466, 4579; on Sen. Amts., 4971 (ii).

——— Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2069 (i).

——— Treadgold Concession, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4986 (ii).

——— (Ans.) 241 (i).

——— interpretation of O. Cs., &c. (Ans.) 2456.

Smith, Mr. E. D., *South Wentworth.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1459.

Cooling Fans for Steamships, &c. (Ques.) 616, 882 (i).

Hamilton and Guelph Mail Contract, Tenders, &c. (M. for copy*) 3724 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Buildings—N.W.T. (day labour or contract system) 846; Ont. (Dundas, armoury) 716; (Dundas, P.O.) 720; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte harbour) 1226; (Burlington, channel) 846; (Burlington, pier) 1226; (Goderich harbour) 1233; (Port Colborne) 610; (St. Mary's river) 603; Que. (Montreal harbour) 608; (St. Lawrence transportation) 598 (i).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1200 (i).

Transatlantic, Transpacific or W. Indian Trade, Contracts with Govt. *re* Subsidies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 632 (i).

VanWagner, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re* Removal (Ques.) 616 (i).

Smith, Mr. R., *Vancouver.*

Alien Restriction Act Amt. (B. 122) 1° m., 3127.

B. C. Legislation, Disallowance of Acts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for copies of Cor., 138 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1569 (i).

Ry. Act (safety of employees) Amt. (B. 92) 1°*, 2064 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3731 (ii).

Rossland Miners' Union and Alien Labour Act, Letters, &c. *re* (M. for copies*) 2471 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Buildings—Que. (contract or day labour) 690 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. L. P. Brodeur) *Rouville.*

Addington Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 2 (i).

Adjournments of Hse. (remarks) 157 (i).

Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 882 (i).

Beauce Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 2 (i).

Beauharnois Electoral District, Judge's Certificate (presented) 610 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) *re* Letter of Sir Louis Davies (ruling) 761, 762 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Haggart*) *re* Letters being read (ruling) 812, 825, 827 (i).
——— ref. to past Debate (ruling) 753, 756 (i).
Budget, The, Order, Ques. of (ruling) 1919 (i).
Cabinet Changes (remarks) 414 (i).
Chicoutimi Electoral District, Dismissal of Petition, 2219 (i).
Coal Oil Inspection, Remarks checked, 5077 (ii).
Elections, Controverted, Beauharnois, Burrard, Victoria, B.C., Two Mountains, Terrebonne, Judges Certificates (presented) 2 (i).
——— Durham, York and Lisgar, Judges Certificates (presented) 1 (i).
——— Ottawa City, Cornwall, Charlotte, Ontario, Bruce, Judges Certificates (presented) 2 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc. (ruling) 1204 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1489 (i).
Dismissals of Govt. Employees for political Reasons (ruling) 429 (i).
Employees of H. of C., Transportation to Homes (remarks) 5056 (ii).
Financial Situation, &c., Members' Remarks checked, 4854 (ii).
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) on M. for Com. (irregularity of debate) 4656 (ii).
——— Members' Remarks checked, 4665 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church, Pet. *re* incorp., on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com. (ruling) 3125 (ii).
——— on M. for 2° (remarks) 3866 (ii).
——— (ruling) 3304 (ii).
I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup. (ruling) 3236 (ii).
Kamouraska Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Kingston, Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Laval Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Library of Parliament, Report (presented) 7 (i).
Lisgar Electoral District, Certificate (presented) 881 (i).
L'Islet Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 2 (i).
Market Gardeners, &c. (ruling) 3652 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2478 (i).
Members addressing the Chair (ruling) 113 (i).
——— Introduced, 3, 68, 121 (i).
——— Remarks checked, 3924 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 121, 154, 785 (i), 3918, 4354, 5030 (ii).
Montreal (St. James) Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 2 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4569 (ii).
Oxford Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bell*) Ques. of Order, ref. to past Deb. (ruling) 2731 (ii).
Petitions, Irregularity of (ruling) 2145, 2218 (i).
Preferential Trade, &c., Ques. of Order (ruling) 2807, 2809 (ii).
——— Ref. to previous Deb. (ruling) 2946 (ii).
Procedure *re* Bills, 611 (i).
Prorogation, Comn. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 5032 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., 1st and 2nd Rep., on M. to conc., 810 (i).
Quebec Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Queens, W. (P.E.I.) Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. B. 86, Ques. of Order (ruling) 3224 (ii).
S. A. War, British Supremacy, Members' remarks checked, 3358 (ii).
——— Canadian Soldiers, Conduct *re* Par. in *Daily News*, Ques. of Order, 2070 (i).
Speech from the Throne (read) 4 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Trent (remarks checked) 5047; (remarks) conc., 5035 (ii).
Legislation: H. of C. (debates) 4341 (ii); (salaries) 234; (sessional clerks) 235 (i); Library of Parlt. (statutes of Can.) 4966 (ii).
Two Mountains Electoral District, Certificates received, 1323 (i).
Vacancies, Notification, 2 (i).
Victoria, B.C., Certificate of Election (notification) 65 (i).
York, W. (Ont.) Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy (Mr. Peter Macdonald) *East Huron.*
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2195, 2219 (i).
Coal Oil Inspection, in Com. of Sup., Ques. o Order (ruling) 1170 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. (amts. read) 4355 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1118; in Com., 2475 (i).
——— (M.) to employ Stenographer, 1672 (i).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4569 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Belcourt*) ruling, 4523 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 470 (i); (amt. read) 3176 (ii).
——— (ruling) 3177 (ii).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co's. incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. (amt.) read, 1678.

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Public Works : (members called to order) 689 (i), 4149 ; Dredging (members' remarks checked) 4767 ; Harbours and Rivers (members' remarks checked) 4561 (ii).

Railways : I. C. R., Members' remarks checked, 3559 (ii).

Transportation on St. Lawrence, Amount spent, &c., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 3684 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 96 (i).

Auditor General's Rep., Publication in Parts, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 775 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 1737 (i).

Buffalo and International Ry. Co's. B. 31 (Mr *Osler*) in Com., 1623 (i).

Cabinet Changes (remarks) 416 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co's. B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2610 (ii).

Canada Southern Ry. Co's. B. 7 (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com., 1279 (i).

Cattle Embargo by G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3986 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 141 (i).

Canso Strait Bridge Co. incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2194 (i).

Census Enumeration, 1891 and 1901, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1064 (i).

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4572 (ii).

Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 830 (i).

Committees of the House, Accommodation, &c. (remarks) 2298 (i).

Coronation Contingent, Emplymt, of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2462 (i).

Crown Bank of Canada incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 2607 (ii).

Dom. Bank Notes, Circulation, &c. from 1892 to 1901 (Ques.) 615 (i).

Financial Situation, Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to Com. of Sup. 4847 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co's. B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4414 (ii).

Grain Importations through Western Ports in 1901, Number of Bushels, &c. (Ques.) 246, 782 (i).

Greek Catholic Church, Incorporation B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. Pet. to Com., 2718; in Com., 4672 (ii).

Holstein Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).

Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup., (remarks) 2972 (ii).

Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3762; on M. for 3°, 3930 ; on Sen. Amts., 4802 (ii).

Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor. &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4748 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.– *Con.*

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Expenditures, Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3235, 3257 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act. (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3309 ; in Com. on B., 3943 (ii).

Labour (Ry.) Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3728 (ii).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4357 (ii).

Leeds and Grenville, Jr. Judge, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4701 (ii).

Library of Parlt., 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Scott*) to conc., 4646 (ii).

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4358 (ii).

Longshoremen's Strike at Halifax (remarks) 2861 (ii).

McDougall, Capt., Award for Life Saving (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 962 (i).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2475 (i), 4438 ; on Sen. Amts., 4803 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co's. incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4424, 4522 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Act. (ass't. commissioner) Amt. B. 147 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 3511 (ii).

——— Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on prop. Res., 808 (i) ; in Com., 2484, 3314 (i).

Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4344 ; in Com., 4606 (ii).

Personal Explanation, Report of Speech (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 962 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2482 ; in Com., 4037, 4055 (ii).

Precedence in Can. at Official Functions, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) 436 (i).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2743 (ii).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (remarks) 780 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3922 (ii).

Public Works Employees, Delay in Payment (remarks) 3778 (ii).

Ry. Act (cattle-guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 457 (i).

——— Commission and Consolidation Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2438, 2446 (i).

——— (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4597 (ii).

Railway Companies incorp. B. 110 (Mr. *Guthrie*) on M. for 1°, 2848 (ii).

Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 289 (i).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co's. B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3207, 3209 (ii).

Rocky Mountain Park Act (extension) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3774 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence and Great Lakes Waterways, Issue of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 888 (i).

St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Burcau*) in Com., 2193 (i).

Sessional Clerks employed in Civil Service (Ques.) 619 (i).

S.A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3340 (ii).

——— Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3846 (ii).

——— Commissions on Outlay, &c. (Ques.) 1063 (i).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 1676 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Exchequer court) 231 (i); (Leeds and Grenville, jr. judge) 4966; Supreme Court (O'Regan, Jas., salary) 4965 (ii); (Supreme court) 218 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (bulletins, printing, &c.) 345 (i); (census) 3368, 4093, 4430; (cold storage) 2575; (experimental farms) 2867, 2891; (fruit inspection) 2587, 2603, 2624 (ii); (general statistics) 340 (i); 2828 (ii); (Japan exposition) 4966 (ii); (Pan-American exposition) 360 (i); (St. Louis exposition) 4966; (*Year-Book*) 2815, 2826 (ii).

Canals: Carillon (guide piers) 4281; (Culbute (damages, &c.) 4282; Galops (deepening, &c.) 4024, 4301; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4024; (revotes, &c.) 4281, 4282; Sault Ste. Marie (entrances, &c.) 4003; Soulanges (construction, &c.) 4019; Trent (dredging, &c.) 4271 (ii).

Charges of Management (clerical assistance) 4324 (ii); (printing Dom. Notes) 172 (i), 4533; (redemption) 4324; conc., 4342 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Agriculture (clerical assistance) 205; (salaries) 177; Aud. General (clerical assistance) 204; (salaries) 175 (i); Charges of Management (Dom. notes) 4317; (Civil Service Examiners) 4315 (ii); Customs (clerical assistance) 208; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 172; High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 180; House of Commons (additional rooms) 214 (i); Indian Affairs (clerical assistance) 3037; (salaries, &c.) 3036 (ii); Inland Revenue (clerical assistance) 207; (salaries) 176; Interior Dept. (clerical assistance) 203 (i); (salaries) 3061-2 (ii); Labour Dept. (clerical assistance) 213; (salaries) 183, 194; Marine and Fisheries (clerical assistance) 204; (salaries) 177; N.W.M. Police (clerical assistance) 212; (salaries) 174; Post Office Dept. (clerical assistance) 211; (salaries) 179; Printing and Stationery (clerical assistance) 200; (Privy Council (salaries) 173; Public Works (printing, &c.) 209; (salaries) 179; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 530 (i).

Dom. Lands (surveys) 4953 (ii).

Excise: Weights and Measures (metric system) 4962 (ii).

Fisheries (bounty cheques) 555; (hatcheries, &c.) 550 (i), 4959; (Noble Bros.' claim) 4957 (ii); (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 534; (protection service) 552 (i).

High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 4326 (ii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Lake Huron, &c.) 528.

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians: Generally (legal expenses *re* liquor traffic) 3061; Man., &c. (agricultural implements) 3054; (saw mills, &c.) 3057; Ont. and Que. (Cornwall) 3038; (liquor traffic suppression) 3049; (Manitoulin) 3041; (medical attendance) 3037; (schools) 3043; P.E.I. (medical attendance) 3054 (ii).

Interior: Miscellaneous (boundary surveys) 4953; (maps, &c.) 4954 (ii).

Justice: Miscellaneous (Farewell, J. C., payments to) 4269; (witness fees) 4267; Penitentiaries (inspector Dawson) 4267 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 4327, 4342 (ii); (general printing) 237 (i); (paper, binding, &c.) conc., 4343 (ii); (printing laws, &c.) 237; (salaries) 234; (sessional clerks) 235 (i); (stationery) 4326 (ii); (voters' lists) 237; Library (books) 237 (i); (printing) 4327 (ii); (salaries) 236 (i); (sessional messengers) 4966 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers' salaries) 517; (scientific institutions) 527 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and France) 4332 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 2533; (Coronation contingent) 4263; (Esquimalt defences) 2565; (pay and allowance) 2516, 2524; (rifle ranges) 2566; (Royal Military College) 2562; (supplies, remounts, &c.) 2559 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese commission) 4340; (Coronation expenses of Ministers) 4332; (Eastern Extension arbitration) 4340; (Imp. conference of Ministers) 4332; (law books) 4267; (Marconi construction) 4338; (Nipissing election expenses) 4339; (Printing Bureau plant) 4956 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection expenses) 517; (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 506; (life-saving rewards) 514 (i); (Str. *Newfield*) 4958 (ii); (tidal service) 515 (i).

Post Office (automobiles) 3872; Outside Service (salaries) 3867 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (William's Head station) 4614 (ii); Dom. (clerks of Works, &c.) 876; (experimental farms, renewals) 875; (quarantine stations) 980; Man. (renewals, &c.) 833; N. W. T. (Carnduff court-house) 836; (Edmonton jail) 850, 856; (Macleod court-house) 852 (i); (Red Deer, court-house) 852 (i), 4613 (ii); Red Deer, immigrant shed) 853 (i); (Saskatoon immigrant shed) 4614; (Yorkton court-house) 4613 (ii); Ont. (armouries) 868; (Clinton) 719; (Cobourg armoury) 721; (Fort William) 728; Ottawa (additional rooms, H. of C.) 561 (i); (eastern block repairs) 4565 (ii); Ont. (Royal Military College) 729; (Toronto Junction) 734 (i); (Toronto Junction P.O.) 4566; (Toronto P.O., alterations) 4566 (ii); (Toronto, renewals, &c.) 733; Que. (contract or day labour) 683; (Lévis cattle quarantine) 667; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 683 (i); (Montreal, P.O.) 4564 (ii); (Que., immigrant building, Louise Embankment) 709; (military building, Que.) 709 (i); (St. Hyacinthe) 711 (i), 4564 (ii); (Valleyfield) 718 (i), 4564 (ii); Yukon (official residences, &c.) 4539 (ii); (rents, repairs, &c.) 967 (i); (supplies, wood, &c.) 4539; Dredging—Man. (snag boat) 4768; (vessels, repairs, &c.) 4763 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river dredging) 1276; (Skeena river) 1277 (i); Man. (Lake St. Francis piers) 4642; Winnipegosis. dredging) 4642; N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 4616; (Big Pond wharf) 4621; (Charlesville breakwater) 4621; (Glace Bay) 4622 (ii);

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con. (Larry's River breakwater) 1002 (i); Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 4637; (Big Bay wharf) 4637; (Burlington channel) 4637; (Collingwood, dredging) 4638; (Goderich harbour) 4640; (Hilton wharf) 4640; (Kaministiquia dredging) 4563 (ii); (Meaford harbour) 1236 (i); (Orillia wharf) 4641; (Penetanguishene, dredging) 4641; (Port Colborne) 4557; (Port Elgin pier) 4641 (ii); (St. Joseph wharf) 1249, 1255; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1243; (Southampton harbour) 1245 (i); (South Nation river) 4642 (ii); (Wolfe Island channel) 1242 (i); Que. (Batiscan, dredging) 4629; (charges *re* wharfs) 4636; (Cross Point) 4630; (Quebec harbour) 4549; (Rivière aux Renards pier) 4632; (St. Laurent wharf) 4634 (ii); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 465 (i); Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (Maria St. bridge) 3290; Telegraphs (Marconi system) 4776 (ii).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 373; (Public Works Health Act) 404 (i); (slaughter compensation) 4968; (unorganized districts) 2904 (ii).

Railways (Drummond County) 3515; Generally (Ry. commission) 4305; I.C.R. (operation and maintenance) 4310; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4287, 4292; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4897 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 527; (meteorological service) 527 (i).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 4963; (iron and steel bounties) 4331 (ii).

Weights and Measures (binder twine inspection) 4963 (ii).

Supreme Court (assistant judges) B. 77 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 1674 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 736 (i).

Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4383 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff (beet root sugar machinery) in Com. on Res., 4973 (ii).

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 928 (i).

Windsor and Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1621 (i).

Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *McCreary*) on Sen. Amts., 4571 (ii).

Yukon (police magistrates) Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3309 (ii).

——— Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3775 (ii).

——— Ter. Act. (council) Amt. B. 119 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3832 (ii).

Stephens, Mr. G., *Kent, Ont.*

British American Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 90) 1°*, 2064 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 465 (i).

SUPPLY:

Customs (salaries, &c., Dresden Port) 2925 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1177 (i).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c. 399 (i).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1188 (i).

Stewart, Mr. D. A., *Lisgar.*

SUPPLY:

Justice: Penitentiaries — Kingston (binder twine) 3611 (ii).

Sutherland, Hon. James (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *North Oxford.*

Belleville Harbour Commissioners, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 450 (i).

B.C. Fisheries, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3308 (ii).

Bronte Harbour Lighthouse, Erection, &c. (Ans.) 134 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2612, 2664 (ii).

Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Edwards*) in Com., 2888 (ii).

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4571 (ii).

Commodities Packing and Sale B. 141 (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4246 (ii).

Crediton P. O., Decease of Postmaster, Notice, &c. (Ans.) 3308 (ii).

Dismissals of Govt. Employees for Political Reasons, on M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 428 (i).

Employees killed, &c., on Canadian Rys. (Ans.) 410 (i).

Fish Canners, B.C., and Prof. Prince's Remarks (Ans.) 449, 613 (i).

Fishing Gear, P.E.I., Confiscation, &c. (Ans.) 1440 (i).

Fishery Regulations (1893) Modification by Govt. (Ans.) 3307 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 4570 (ii).

Greek Catholic Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. for 2°, 3866; in Com., 4689 (ii).

Hurley, Mr. J. M., Charges *re* West Hastings Election (stmnt. read) 4968 (ii).

I. C. R., Locomotives, Construction, Steaming Qualities, &c. (Ans.) 445 (i).

——— Moncton, and P.E.I. Ry. Shops, Number of Employees, &c (Ans.) 615 (i).

——— Ties and Sleepers, Quantity purchased (Ans.) 445 (i).

Joint Stock Co.'s B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5062 (ii).

Kemp, Mr. Ernest, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 135 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 129, 408 (i).

North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3131 (ii).

Oyster Culture in Shediac Harbour, &c. (Ans.) 746, 1444 (i).

Oyster Fishing Protection, Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 135 (i).

Picton Public Buildings, Delay in Opening, &c. (Ans.) 1490 (i).

Port Dufferin Wharf, Wharfage collected (Ans.) 132 (i).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*
Prince County Fishing Licenses, Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 1065 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) for Ret., 167 (i).
Prince, Prof., Remarks *re* Fish Canners (Ans.) 449, 613 (i).
Private Bills, Suspension of Rules (remarks) 4465 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3920 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 457 ; agreed to (Y. 90 ; N. 50) 480 (i).
Ry. Freight Rates, Prof. McLean's Rep. (Ans.) 448 (i).
Ry. Lands, N.W.T., Acreage patented, &c. (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3215 (ii).
Red Horse Shoal Light, Keeper's Salary, &c. (Ans.) 443 (i).
Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2671 (ii).
——— Manufacture, &c., Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 4975 (ii).
St. John and Halifax Govt. Elevators (Ans.) 612.
St. Lawrence and Great Lakes Waterways, Issue of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 888 (i).
Sandhills, P.E.I., Range Lights, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 1064 (i).
Smallpox on Schr. *Jeanie Myrtle*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5019 (ii).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 2021 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. since 1901 (Ans.) 448 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. : Marine and Fisheries (clerical assistance) 205 ; (salaries) 177 (i) ; (Tyrwhitt, Mr., salary) 4958 (ii) ; Public Works (salaries) 179 (i).
Fisheries (bounty cheques) 553 ; (breeding establishments) 550 ; (Can. exhibit) 553 ; (cold storage, deep sea) 558 ; (hatcheries) 550 (i) ; (hatcheries, B.C.) 4225 ; (hatcheries, Georgian Bay) 4959 ; (herring slaughter) 4224 ; (inspectors' salaries) 4228 (ii) ; (McDougall, Capt., life-saving reward) 533 (i) ; (Noble Bros. award, &c.) 4234 (ii) ; (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 535 ; (oyster culture) 555 ; (protection service, B.C.) 552 (i) ; (salmon and lobster hatchery) 4223 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys : (Lake Huron, &c.) 528, 533 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour) 4227 (ii) ; (lighthouse repairs) 526 (i), 4222 (ii) ; (lightkeepers, salaries) 518, 521 (i) ; (St. Lawrence navigation) 5024 (ii) ; (Traverse light) 527 (i).
Ocean and River Service (biological station) 516 ; (cattle inspection, &c.) 517 (i) ; (Dom. steamers, repairs, &c.) 506 (i), 4221 ; (furnishing crew for new strs. built in Scotland) 4958 (ii) ; (life-saving rewards) 514, 515 ; (McDougall, Capt., reward) 533 ; (masters and mates, examination) 513 (i) ; (Str. *Newfield*)

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service—Con. 4958 ; (Str. *Rothesay*) 4222 (ii) ; (winter mail service) 516 (i).
Public Works : Buildings—Ont. (St. Catharines drill hall) 716 ; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Ottawa river) 1240 (i) ; Que. (wharf charges) 4636 (ii).
Quarantine (smallpox) 4968 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 527 ; (meteorological service) 527 (i).
Tiverton SS., Grounding, &c., Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 2856 (ii).
Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3626 (ii).
Trent Valley and Rice Lake Canals, Rep. of Engineer (Ans.) 411 (i).
Welland Canal, Water Privileges (Ans.) 409 (i).
Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1621 (i).
Yukon—Treadgold Concession, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4984 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. R. F., *North Essex.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1807 (i).
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. (B. 55) 1°*, 1323 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Mary's river) 603 ; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 591 (i).
Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 390 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1°*, 2146 (i).
Market Gardeners, Protection against Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3654 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2837 ; (*Year-Book*) 2821 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 3027 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (light buoys) 525.
Post Office (charges *re* postmasters) 4940 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings, Que. (Grosse Isle station) 650 ; (St. Hyacinthe drill hall) 712.
Railways : I.C.R. (locomotives) 3825 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. for Cor., 912 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. I., (Minister of Public Works) *Montreal, St. Mary's.*
Address, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 90 (i).
Alberton Ry. Station, Location, &c. (Ans.) 1441.
Bronte Harbour, Improvements, Amount expended (Ans.) 133 (i).
Canoe Cove (P.E.I.) Breakwater, Amount expended (Ans.) 3831 (ii).
Cements, Canadian and Foreign, Tests made by Govt. (Ans.) 1442, 1444 (i).
Clegg, Samuel, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4699.
Collingwood, Meaford, Owen Sound, &c., Harbours, Improvements (Ans.) 747 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*

Debates, Official Reporting (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 964 (i).

Financial Situation, Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4840 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4412 (ii).

Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3713 (ii).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4671, 4686 (ii).

Hawbold's Cove, Cost of Breakwater (Ans.) 132.

Hopewell Cape Pier, Date of Completion, &c. (Ans.) 1444 (i).

House of Commons, Central Block, Cost of additional Rooms (Ans.) 1442 (i).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Expenditure, &c. on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3270.

——— Shims purchased in 1901, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 1439 (ii).

——— Steel Rails, Quantity purchased, Clergue's Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1440 (i).

Market Gardeners, Protection from Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3642 (ii).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 3°, 4457 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4423, 4516 (ii).

North Bay Pier, N.S., Cost, Amount of Work done, &c. (Ans.) 1443 (i).

North Head Breakwater, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1441 (i).

Oakville Harbour, Construction of Docks, &c. 135 (i).

Port Dufferin Wharf, Cost of Shed, Amount collected, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).

Portland Cements, Tests by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1442, 1444 (i).

P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication with Mainland, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).

——— Winter Communication, Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) for Ret., 166 (i).

Public Works Employees, Delay in Payments, (remarks) 3777 (ii).

———(Ans.) 2457 (i).

Public Works, Rep. (presented) 121 (i).

Redhead, N.S., Boat Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5000 (ii).

Richibucto Pier, Tenderers, &c. (Ans.) 1439 (i).

St. Andrew's Rapids, Expenditure *re* Improvements (Ans.) 248 (i).

Ste. Anne River Works, Timber used, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 2858-9 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Great Lakes Waterways, Issue of Commission, prop. Res., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 887 (i).

Scotia, Str., Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 1440 (i).

Shewen, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 449 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Public Works (contingencies) 4136; (Desrochers, Mr., increase) 4535 (ii); (printing, &c.) 209; (salaries) 178 (i); (S.E. O'Brien, salary) 4525 (ii).

Customs (American tugs) 3297 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence navigation) 5029 (ii).

Post Office (Magdalen Islands) 3907 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (Kamloops) 4185 (ii); (Nelson post office) 860 (i); (New Westminster) 4185 (ii); (ren wals, &c.) 857; (Rossland) 861; (Vancouver, drill shed) 876 (i), 4186 (ii); (Vancouver, post office) 857 (i); (Williams Head quarantine) 4614 (ii); Generally (armouries, &c.) 861; (caretakers, engineers, &c.) 987; (clerks of works, &c.) 876 (i); (engineers' salaries, &c.) 4186 (ii); (experimental farms, renewals) 875; (immigrant, repairs, &c.) 975 (i), 4616; (lighting, &c.) 4189, 4615 (ii); (P.O. caretakers) 988; (quarantine stations) 980 (i); (rents) 4615; (repairs, &c.) 4182 (ii); (telephones) 986, 989 (i); (Winnipeg, furnaces, &c.) 4616 (ii); Man. (Winnipeg immigration shed) 834 (i), 4613 (ii); (renewals, &c.) 831; Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 642; N.B. (Marysville) 636; (Richibucto) 641; (St. John) 641; (St. John immigrant shed) 641 (i), 4178 (ii); N.W.T. (Carnduff court-house) 835; (Edmonton jail) 849, 854 (i); (Lethbridge immigrant shed) 4185 (ii); (Macleod court-house) 852; (Red Deer, court-house) 852 (i), 4613 (ii); (immigrant shed) 853; (repairs) 849 (i); (Saskatoon immigrant shed) 4614 (ii); (Yorkton court-house, &c.) 859 (i), 4613 (ii); N. S. (Arichat, repairs) 635; Baddeck armoury) 861; (Halifax custom-house) 635; Ont. (Alexandria reformatory) 4184 (ii); (architects' fees) 730; (Bothwell, &c.) 659; (Clinton) 719; (Cobourg armoury) 721; (Cornwall armoury) 865; (Deseronto) 728; (Dundas post office) 720; (Fort William) 728; (Hamilton warehouse) 4567 (ii); (London drill hall) 729 (i); Ottawa (additional room, H. of C.) 561 (i), 4137 (ii); (astronomical observatory) 560 (i); (eastern block wall) 4565; (electric lighting) 4189, 4616; (elevators, H. of C.) 4137, 4615; (gas, electric lighting) 4616 (ii); (grounds, &c.) 987 (i); (heating, &c.) 4138, 4189; (Major's Hill Park) 4180; (P.O.) 4565 (ii); (rentals, &c.) 964 (i), 4139; (Rideau Hall, drain) 4566; (Rideau Hall, improvements) 4188 (ii); (royal mint) 560 (i); (ventilation, H. of C.) 4140 (ii); (Victoria memorial museum) 564; Ont. (renewals, &c.) 728; (Royal Military College) 729 (i); (St. Catharines drill hall) 4567 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 732; (Toronto, drill shed) 869 (i); (Toronto P. O., alterations) 4566; (Toronto P. O., branch office) 4182, 4565 (ii); (Toronto, renewals, &c.) 733; (Toronto Junction) 733 (i); (Toronto Junction P. O.) 4566 (ii); (Wentworth armoury) 863; P. E. I. (armouries) 874 (i); Que. (cartridge factory) 4180 (ii); (contract or day labour) 693 (i); (Drummondville) 643 (i), 4180 (ii); (Granby) 644; (Grosse Isle station) 644 (i); Lake St. John District) 4179 (ii); (L'Assomption) 656; (Levis, building) 669; (Levis, cattle quarantine) 667; (military buildings—Que.) 709 (i); (Montreal, branch P. O.) 4564 (ii); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 670; (plans, specifications, &c.) 666; (renewals, &c.) 642 (i); (Roberval immigrant shed) 4180 (ii); (St. Hyacinthe drill hall) 710; (St. Laurent) 656; (Thetford Mines) 716; (Valleyfield) 717 (i), 4564; Yukon (Collinet, Mrs., memo.

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
read) 4536; (dismissal of matron, &c.) 4195; (official residences) 4536 (ii); (rentals, repairs, &c.) 967 (i); (rents, &c., judges' residences) 4144, 4190; (wood supply, &c.) 4540; Dredging—B. C. (Victoria harbour) 3286; (plant) 3283; Man. (Lake Manitoba) 3284; (snag boat) 4768; (vessels, repairs, &c.) 4763; N. S. (LaHave River) 3285; Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie) 4764 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia River dredging) 1276 (i); (Hardy Bay wharf) 4643; B.C. (Kennedy's Lake outlet) 4642 (ii); (Skeena River) 1277; Man. (Mossey River 1275; (St. Andrews Rapids) 604 (i); (St. Francis outlet pier) 4642; (Winnipegosis, dredging) 4642; Mar. Provs. (generally) 4213; (La Have) 4213; (Oromocto River) 4213; (repairs) 4142 (ii); N. B. (Alma pier) 1031 (i); (Andrews Hollow) 4626 (ii); (Black Brook wharf) 1023 (i); (Campbellton wharf) 4626; (Campobello breakwater) 4626; (Cape Tormentine, creosoted timber) 4627 (ii); (Caraquet wharf) 1023; (Chance Harbour) 1024; (Dipper Harbour breakwater) 1025; (Grand Anse breakwater) 1025; (lumber, price, &c.) 1027; (Negro Point) 1031; (Oromocto wharf) 1030 (i), 4628; (Partridge Island pier) 4628 (ii); (Point Wolfe breakwater) 1026; (Richibucto pier) 1026; (St. John River works) 1030 (i); (Salmon River) 4628; (tidal water wharfs) 4629; N.S. (Amagandus Pond wharf) 4616 (ii); (Arnold's breakwater) 990 (i); (Bailey's Brook wharf) 4620; (Big Pond wharf) 4621 (ii); (Black Point canal) 990; (Boularderie wharf) 997; (Burlington wharf) 999 (i); (Cape Cove breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Cape Tormentine, repairs) 1023 (i); (Charlesville breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Cheticamp Point wharf) 1000 (i); (Cheverie breakwater) 4621; (Church Point breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Clark's Harbour) 994 (i); (Comeau's Hill breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Cow Bay breakwater) 1001 (i); (Cribbon's Point wharf) 4621 (ii); (Drumhead breakwater) 1001 (i), 4622; (Ecum Secum wharf) 4210, 4211 (ii); (Friar's Head harbour) 1002 (i); (Glace Bay) 4622; (Grand River channel) 4622 (ii); (Herring Cove breakwater) 1002 (i); (Ingonish breakwater) 4211 (ii); (Iona wharf) 1002; (Larry's River breakwater) 1003; (Lingan Beach) 1004; (Little Bras d'Or wharf) 1004; (Livingstone's Cove wharf) 1004; (Lower Cove breakwater) 1004 (i); (Lunenburg dredging) 4622 (ii); (Mill Cove breakwater) 1008; (Minudie wharf) 1004; (Neil's Harbour) 1004; (New Harbour breakwater) 1005; (Parker's Cove pier) 1006 (i); (Petit Rivière breakwater) 4210 (ii); (Pictou Island) 1009 (i); (Porter's Lake outlet) 4623; (Windsor dams) 4624; Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 4637 (ii); (Barrie wharf) 1217; (Bayfield pier) 1217 (i); (Big Bay wharf) 4637 (ii); (Blind River wharf) 1223 (i); (Brockville drill hall) 4182 (ii); (Bronte Harbour) 1226 (i); (Burke's Falls) 4637 (ii); (Burlington Channel) 847 (i), 4637 (ii); (Burlington pier) 1226 (i); (Callendar wharf) 4638; (Cobourg, dredging) 4638 (ii); (Collingwood harbour) 1227 (i), 4638 (ii); (Depot Harbour) 1231 (i); (Georgian Bay, dredging) 4640 (ii); (Goderich harbour) 1232 (i), 4640; (Hilton wharf) 4640; Ont. (Kaministiquia) 4563 (ii); (Kingsville pier) 1236; (Meaford harbour) 1236; (Midland, harbour) 1237 (i); (Midland, wharf) 4641 (ii); (Oakville pier) 1239; (Orillia wharf) 1241 (i), 4641 (ii); (Ottawa River) 1239; (Owen Sound harbour) 1239 (i); (Pelee wharf) 4217; (Penetanguishene wharf) 4641 (ii); (Petewawa Narrows) 1239; (Port Arthur) 599; (Port Colborne) 609 (i), 4557, 4616; (Port Elgin pier) 4641 (ii); (Port Hope) 1239; (Presqu'Isle wharf) 1239; (St. Joseph wharf) 1247; (St. Mary's River) 600; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1242; (Sarnia dredging) 1224; (Southampton harbour) 1246 (i); (South Nation River) 4642 (ii); (Tobermory harbour) 1247; (Toronto harbour) 1275; (Wolfe Island channel) 1242 (i); P.E.I. (Atkins' wharf) 4626 (ii); (Bay du Vin) 1022 (i); (Brae breakwater) 4625 (ii); (Canoe Cove) 1012; (Cape Tormentine, &c., memorial *re*) 1020; (Cascumpec harbour) 1014 (i); (Chapel Point) 4625 (ii); (creosoted timber) 1015 (i); (New London breakwater) 4212 (ii); (Souris Knight's Point) 1017; (Summerside breakwater) 1017 (i); (Tignish breakwater) 4212, 4626; (West Point pier) 4211; Que. (Batiscan, dredging) 4629; (charges *re* wharfs) 4636; (Crane Island wharf) 4630; (Cross Point) 4630 (ii); (Gaspé, removal of rocks) 1048; (Grande Vallée pier) 1031; (Hudson wharf) 1046; (Isle au Coudre wharf) 1046; (Isle au Grues) 1047; (Lake Temiscamingue) 1047 (i); (Magdalen Island breakwater) 4630; (Maria wharf) 4630 (ii); (Montreal harbour) 608; (Murray Bay wharf) 1051 (i); (Peribonka) 4179; (Point Fortune wharf) 4631; (Point St. Pierre breakwater) 4631; (Quebec harbour) 4549; (Rivière aux Renards pier) 4631 (ii); (St. Alexis Bay) 1053 (i); (St. Francois wharf) 4633; (Ste. Genevieve) 4216; (St. Irenée wharf) 4634; (St. Jerome, repairs, &c.) 4180; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 4634; (St. Laurent wharf) 4634 (ii); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 565-599; (St. Maurice, dredging) 1053; (Sorel wharf) 1054; (titles for lands) 1042; (Valleyfield channel) 1061 (i), 4216; (Yukon) 3283; Miscellaneous (engineers, &c., salaries) 4219; (National Art Gallery) 3292; (Percival River survey) 3292; (surveys and inspections) 4780; (timber creosoting plant) 4779; Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (Belly River bridge) 4219; Ont. (Des Joachims bridge) 4219; Ottawa (Maria St. bridge) 3289; Yukon (wagon roads, &c.) 4147; Slides and Booms (Gatineau) 4782; (repairs) 4142; (St. Maurice) 3287, 4782; (Shawinigan wharf) 4218; (sorting logs) 4218; (working expenses) 4220; Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Ashcroft to Dawson) 3293, 4781; (Port Simpson-Hazleton) 4779; (Quesnel Forks) 4779; (Skeena, &c.) 3292; Ont. (Anticosti to Bryon Island) 4769; (cable service, Gulf of St. Lawrence) 4143; (Govt. system) 4771; (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 3291; (Mabou to Hawkesbury) 4770; (Magdalen Islands extension) 4769; (Marconi system) 3908, 4773; (St. Peter's to Sydney) 4770; (Str. *Tyrian*) 4143, 4220; Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4150; (operators' pay) 4178; (pole contract) 4155; (Port Simpson) 4178; (Yukon system) 4781; (revenue, &c.) 4771; (supplies) 4157 (ii).

Railways: I.C.R. (Ouelle River spur line) 4797 (ii).

Telegraph Lines in B.C. and Ters., Amount expended (Ans.) 158 (i).

Toronto Govt. Buildings, Appnmt. of Mechanical Engineer (Ans.) 885 (i).

Trackmen's Wages: *See* 'Govt. Rys.'

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*

Transportation Distances, &c., Cost, &c. (Ans.) 136 (i).

Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4389 (ii).

Transportation *re* St. Lawrence, Amount spent, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3687 (ii).

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 933 (i).

Yukon Telegraph Lines, Construction, &c. (remarks) 2859 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 128) 1°*, 3304 (ii).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2053, 2070 (i).

Census, 1881, 1891, 1901, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2222 (i).

Chickens purchased by Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.) 3408 (ii).

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4246 (ii).

Grapes purchased by Dept. of Agriculture, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 3151 (ii).

Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 129) 1°*, 3304 (ii).

I.C.R., Passes, Inquiry for Ret., 4120 (ii).

Jackson, Lighthouse Keeper at Gananoque, Dismissal, &c. (M. for O.Cs.*, &c.) 809 (i).

—— *See* 'Red Horse.'

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. 4359 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 494 (i).

Morton P.O., Abstraction from registered Letters

Mutch, W. (Ques.) 3152 (ii).
(Ques.) 1986 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4045 (ii).

Prorogation (remarks) 5081 (ii).

Pub. Accounts Com., Inquiry for Papers, &c., 3995 (ii).

Public Works Employees, Delay in Payment (remarks) 3777 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).

Red Horse Shoal Light, Keeper's Salary, &c. (Ques.) 442 (i).

Seeley's Bay P.O., Abstraction from registered Letters (Ques.) 1986 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: Yukon (judges' living allowance) 3584; (Sheriff Eilbeck) 3586.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Acadian historical data) 357; (archives) 325; (bulletins, printing, &c.) 345 (i); (census, 1891) 4082; (census) 3365, 3389, 4076; (census, cheques) 4099, 4429, 4431; (census, Mr. Drouin's absence) 4430 (ii); (classifying patents) 352 (i); (cold storage) 2578; (creameries) 2654; (fruit inspection) 2623 (ii); (general statistics) 341 (i), 2827 (ii); (Pan-American exposition) 364; (*Patent Record*) 329, 352 (i); (poultry shipments) 2640 (ii); (*Year-Book*) 336 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals: Generally (extra services) 4312 (ii).

Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (engraving, &c.) 4317 (ii).

Civil Govt. (civil service examiners) 4316; Post Office (salaries) 4313 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1160, 1166 (i).

Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 2994 (ii).

Indians: Man., &c. (destitute, &c.) 3056; (general, &c., treaty expenses) 3057; N.B. (medical attendance) 3052; N.S. (medical attendance) 3050; Ont. (Manitoulin) 3043; (medical attendance) 3040; (schools) 3046; P.E.I. (medical attendance) 3053 (ii).

Justice: Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 4266; Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3593 (ii).

Legislation: H. of C. (Franchise Act) 4329 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (repairs, &c.) 4222 (ii).

Militia (annual camps) 4260; (Coronation contingent) 4263; (Esquimalt defences) 4261; (Royal Military College) 2564 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese commission) 4340; (Coronation expenses) 4332; (Dom. and Provl. arbitration) 4119; (gratuity to Mrs. White) 4257; Labour Dept. (salaries) 4119; (litigation, Interior) 4119; (Nipissing election expenses) 4339; Printing Bureau (plant, &c.) 4119 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 508 (i).

Post Office (Marble Rock P.O.) 3880; (Newboro' postmaster) 3908; (parcel service) 3913; (rental allowance) 3897; (superannuations) 3906 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (immigrant sheds, repairs, &c.) 975; (quarantine stations) 983; N.W.T. (Edmonton jail) 855; Ont. (armouries) 867; (Gananoque armoury) 867; (Marysville) 640 (i); Ottawa (Major's Hill Park) 4181; Que. (St. Hyacinthe) 4564; Yukon (judges' residences) 4201; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Ecum Secum wharf) 4210 (ii); Ont. (Barrie wharf) 1217; (Presqu'Isle wharf) 1239; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 567 (i); Miscellaneous (engineers, &c., salaries) 4219; Slides and Booms (working expenses) 4220 (ii).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 381, 387 (i).

Railways: I.C.R. (expenditure, &c.) 3583; (operation, maintenance) 4310; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 3863 (ii).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1193; (metrical instruments) 1201 (i).

Wellington Mutch, Eldon, P. E. I., Purchases from by Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.) 3152 (ii).

Yukon Concessions, Leases, &c., Applications, O.Cs., &c. (M. for ret.*) 154 (i).

Thompson, Mr. A. T., *Haldimand and Monck.*

Companies Act Amt. (B. 45) 1°*, 1108 (i).

Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2466 (i).

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1673 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 461 (i); in Com., 3164 (ii).

Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1673 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia (permanent forces) 1146 (i).

Tisdale, Hon. D., *South Norfolk.*
Cabinet Changes (remarks) 417 (i).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2194 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2465 (i).
Dyment Banking Co.'s incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4124 (ii).
Judges of County Courts, Age Limit, &c. (remarks) 418 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2058 (i).
N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2492 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1427 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 465 (i).
——— Commission and Consolidation B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2444 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3214 (ii).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 1278 (i).
St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) in Com., 2193 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (pay and allowance) 1134 (i), 2498 (ii); (promotions) 1134 (i).

Tolton, Mr. E., *North Wellington.*
Collingwood, Meaford, Owen Sound, &c., Harbour Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 747 (i).

Tucker, Mr. J. J., *St. John, N.B., City and County.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence transportation) 597 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert, K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*
B.C. Chief Justiceship, Inquiry, 611 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 761, 763 (i).
Hopewell Cape Pier, Date of Completion, c&. (Ques.) 1444 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (armouries) 874; (renewals, &c.) 857; (Rossland) 861; (Vancouver drill shed) 876; (Vancouver post office) 857; Generally (armouries) 861; (clerks of works, &c.) 880; (policy of Govt.) 665; Man. (renewals, &c.) 831; N.W.T. (Carnduff court-house) 835; (Edmonton jail) 850, 854; (Macleod court-house) 852; (Nelson post office) 860; (repairs, &c.) 849; (Red Deer court-house) 852; (Yorkton court-house) 859 (i).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2009, 2024 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I.C.R. (expenditure, &c.) 3578 (ii).

Vrooman, Mr. A. E., *South Victoria, Ont.*
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2475 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3378; (poultry stations) 2649 (ii).

Wade, Mr. F. B., *Annapolis.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2246 (i).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2194; (in amt.) 2219 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2468 (i).
Cosmos Cotton Co.'s incorp B. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 2671 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4132 (ii).
I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditures, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3253 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2478 (i).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4426 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 463 (i); in Com., 3180 (ii).
——— Commission and Consolidation B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2446 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3228 (ii).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 1677 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (judges' salaries) 215.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 2632; (fruit inspection) 2586, 2632 (ii).
Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 536; oyster culture) 555 (i).
Public Works: Dredging—N.S. (LaHave River) 3285; Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (La Have River) 4215 (ii).
Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3632 (ii).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *East Durham.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2284 (i).
Clegg, Samuel, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4699.
Eilbeck, R. J., Appnmt. as Sheriff (Ques.) 411 (i).
——— Leave of Absence from Yukon (Ques.) 745.
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3941 (ii).
Newcastle, Ont., Resignation of Postmaster (Ques.) 4697 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier, 3976 (ii).
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3137 (ii).
Rickard, Mr., Resignation as Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 4697 (ii).

Ward, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4277 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Cobourg armoury) 723; Yukon (rents, maintenance, &c.) 974 (i).

Trent Valley and Rice Lake Canals, Rep. of Engineer (Ques.) 411 (i).

Yukon, Sheriff Eilbeck's Leave of Absence (Ques.) 745 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's, N.B.*

Bathurst Collector of Customs, Absence from Office (Ques.) 4124 (ii).

McDonald's Corner, N.B., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 2676 (ii).

Shewen, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 449 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine, creosoted timber) 4627 (ii); (Oromocto wharf) 1030 (i), 4213, 4628; (Partridge Island pier) 4628; (St. John immigrant shed) 4179 (ii); (St. John River works) 1030.

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Belleville Post Office, Names, Dismissals, Superannuations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 153 (i).

Boer Immigration, &c., Par. in *Mail and Empire* (Ques.) 3407 (ii).

Devlin, Mr. C. R., Interview in Montreal *Witness* (Ques.) 619 (i).

——— Cor. *re* Letters, making Statements against Members (M. for copies*) 154 (i).

——— inquiry for ret., 451, 635, 1204 (i).

——— *See* 'Immigration.'

Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Number of Employees, &c. (M. for ret.) 152 (i).

Immigrant Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3734 (ii).

Immigration, Amount spent from 1891 to 1901, Agents employed, &c. (M. for ret.*) 153 (i).

——— Devlin, Mr., Interview, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Labour needed in Man. *re* Crops, Cable *re* (Ques.) 247 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 3922 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (aids to societies) 344 (i); (census, expenses, &c.) 4434 (ii); (classifying patents) 351; (cold storage) 369; (general statistics) 341; (*Year-Book*) 338 (i).
Charges of Management (Dom. notes) 4533 (ii).
Civil Govt.: High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 181 (i).
Customs (Perry, C. B.) 2923 (ii).
Geological Survey (International boundary) 4251 (ii).
Immigration (printing, advertising, &c.) 4248.
Interior: N.W.T. Govt. (subsidy) 4252 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 3598; Yukon (judges' living allowance) 3584; (judges' salary) 3584; (Sheriff Eilbeck) 3587; (surgeon's salary) 3588; (witness fees) 3590 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 236 (i).
Militia (armouries, &c.) 4260; (R.M.C., electric lighting) 4261; (Valleyfield riots) 4261 (ii).
Miscellaneous (miners, relief, &c.) 4257; (Saskatchewan settlers relief) 4257 (ii).
N. W. M. Police (service, &c.) 4247 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, &c.) 988; (immigrant accommodation, &c.) 979; (P. O., rent of boxes) 988; Man. (Winnipeg, immigrant shed) 4613 (ii); N.S. (Halifax, custom-house) 635; Ont. (Deseronto) 728; Ottawa (rentals, &c.) 964 (i); Yukon (official residences) 4191, 4536; Dredging (plant) 3283 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine, repairs) 1023; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 571 (i); Miscellaneous (creosoting plant) 4779; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 3287; Telegraphs (Marconi system) 4775; (Yukon, revenue, &c.) 4771 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (bridges) 4792; (Halifax accommodation) 4791; (Moncton accommodation) 4797; (St. John increased accommodation) 4787; (Stellarton accommodation) 4789; P. E. I. (expenditure) 3583 (ii).

Welsh Immigration from Patagonia (Ques.) 240.

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

ABRAHAM, PLAINS OF, RIGHTS RESERVED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3409 (ii).

ACADIAN HISTORICAL DATA : in Com. of Sup., 356.

ACCIDENTS THROUGH CATTLE ON TRACK, I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Erb*) 883 (i).

Accountants : *See* 'Chartered.'

ACCOUNTS, VOUCHERS, I.C.R. AND P.E.I. RYS., &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.', &c.

ADDINGTON ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ADDITIONAL ROOMS, HOUSE OF COMMONS, COST, &C.; in Com. of Sup., 214, (i) 4137 (ii)

——— *See* 'Public Works, Ottawa,' &c.

ADDITIONAL SIDINGS, ACCOMMODATION, &C., I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 3811 ; conc., 5037 (ii).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.'

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH : moved (Mr. *Campbell*) 7 ; seconded (Mr. *Beland*) 16 (i).

Debate : (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 23 ; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 35 ; (Mr. *Monk*) 43 ; (Mr. *Maclean*) 51, 114 ; (Mr. *Bourassa*) Amt. 65, 68 ; Amt. wtdn., 119 ; (Mr. *Tarte*) 90 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 ; (Mr. *Clarke*) 95 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 96 ; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 107 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 119 (i).

AD HOC JUDGES, SUPREME COURT : in Com. of Sup., 4264 (ii).

——— *See* 'Justice,' &c.

ADJOURNMENT FOR ASCENSION DAY : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4353 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS OF HSE. : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 157 (i).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 214 (i), 3583 (ii).

——— CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 4264 (ii).

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 4 ; *pro formâ.*

AGENTS OF CAN. IN ENG., INCOME TAX : Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5054 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND MINERAL PRODUCTS OF CAN., AGGREGATE AMOUNT : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 747 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS :

ACADIAN HISTORICAL DATA : in Com. of Sup., 356 (i).

AGRICULTURE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 177, 321 (i), 2568, 2814, 2867, 3365, 4076, 4429 (ii).

——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).

AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE'S REPS., DISTRIBUTION : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).

——— IMPLEMENTS EXPORTED IN 1901, REBATE, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 440.

——— SOCIETIES, N.W.T., AID TO : in Com. of Sup., 343 (i).

APPLE GRAFTING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2653.

ARCHIVES : in Com. of Sup., 321 (i).

BEEF, CANNED, SENT TO S. AFRICA, QUANTITY, INSPECTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 746 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3410 (ii).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3840 ; Neg. (Y. 51 ; N. 98) 3857 (ii).

BONUSES TO PROMOTE DAIRYING INTERESTS : in Com. of Sup., 2657 (ii).

——— *See* 'Creameries,' &c.

BULL, CHAS. A., PRODUCE CO., LETTER FROM HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE : Read (Mr. *Monk*) 4805 (ii).

BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING COMMISSION, REP., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1684.

CANADIAN CATTLE, EMBARGO BY G.B. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 138 (i).

——— Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3980 (ii).

——— notice of amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3858 (ii).

CASSIAR, B. C., APPNMT. OF J. W. MCFARLANE *re* CENSUS : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).

CATTLE INSPECTION, EXPENSES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 517 (i).

——— QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).

CENSUS, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN LIVERY HIRE : Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2069 (i).

CENSUS, 1881, 1891, 1901, TOTAL COST, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2222 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 4342 (ii).

——— CHEQUES ISSUED, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4099, 4113, 4429-31 (ii).

——— CLASSIFYING HALF-BREEDS AS INDIANS : Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 1902 (i).

——— COMMISSIONERS, ATLIN DISTRICT : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).

——— COMMISSIONER, SOUTH WATERLOO, NAME AND AMOUNTS PAID TO : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1861.

——— MR. COTÉ'S CIRCULAR : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 133 (i).

——— COUTTS, MR., AMOUNTS PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).

——— DROUIN, MR., ABSENCE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).

——— ENUMERATION, 1891 AND 1901, COST, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1064 (i).

——— ENUMERATORS, PAYMENTS TO, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4076, 4430 (ii).

——— ENUMERATORS, S. WATERLOO, NAMES, AMOUNT PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1066 (i).

——— EXODUS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4435.

——— EXPENDITURE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

CENSUS, EXPENDITURE TO DATE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 129, 612 (i).

——— IRREGULARITIES *re* CENSUS OF 1891: in Com. of Sup., 4077, 4430, 4435 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 4080 (ii).

——— MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4111 (ii).

——— SIMCOE N. AND E., COST IN 1891-1901: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2224 (i).

——— *See* 'Census.'

CHEESE STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2634, 2647.

CHICKEN-FATTENING STATIONS, LOCATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1065 (i).

CHICKENS PURCHASED BY DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408, 3409 (ii).

CHITTICK, F. C., PROMOTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).

COLD STORAGE ON STEAMSHIPS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 368 (i), 2568 (ii).

——— DEEP SEA FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).

COOLING FANS ON STEAMSHIPS, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 616, 882 (i).

CREAMERIES, BONUSES TO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2653 (ii).

——— *See* 'Bonuses,' &c.

CRIMINAL STATISTICS, COMPILATION: in Com. of Sup., 335 (i).

DAIRYING BRANCH, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2568.

DOUGLAS, GEO. C., P.E.I., CHICKENS PURCHASED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 344 (i), 2867, 2889, 4966 (ii).

——— BULLETINS, PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 345 (i).

——— FARM, OTTAWA, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson, Lennox*) 152 (i).

FRUIT INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2585, 2622 (ii).

FUMIGATING STATIONS FOR NURSERY STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).

GLASGOW EXHIBITION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 357 (i).

GRAPES PURCHASED BY DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE, AMOUNTS RECEIVED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3151 (ii).

GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 644 (i).

HAY PURCHASED FOR WAR OFFICE IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).

HOGS AND SHEEP SLAUGHTERED, COMPENSATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4968 (ii).

JAPAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).

——— CAN. REPRESENTATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2225 (i).

MCFARLANE, W. J., APPNMT. AS CENSUS COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).

MCKINNON, MR. W. A., FRUIT INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 2587, 2622 (ii).

MEAT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).

MINERAL PRODUCTS OF CAN. AGGREGATE AMOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 747 (i).

'MONITOR,' SS., QUARANTINE, &C.; in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).

MUTCH, WELLINGTON: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3152.

MUTTON SHIPMENTS BY SS. 'HALIFAX' INDEMNITY TO MR. WHEATLEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695 (ii).

PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4967 (ii).

——— SALE OF CAN. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 358 (i).

PARIS EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4967 (ii).

'PATENT RECORD': in Com. of Sup., 329 (i).

PATENTS, CLASSIFYING CAN., AND EXCHANGE WITH U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 349 (i).

POLLY, MR., AMOUNT PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).

PORTER, DR. ANDREW, CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., conc., 5033 (ii).

POULTRY, FATTENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2640 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS HEALTH ACT: in Com. of Sup., 403 (i).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).

——— PHYSICIANS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 372.

——— PUBLIC HEALTH: in Com. of Sup., 371 (i), 4967 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 371 (i); conc., 5033 (ii).

——— UNORGANIZED DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 2902 (ii).

REPRESENTATION IN HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVS. *re* CENSUS 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2677 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2854 (ii).

ST. LOUIS AND JAPAN EXPOSITIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).

SMALL-POX ON SCHR. 'JEANIE MRTYLE': Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5015 (ii).

STATISTICS, GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 339 (i), 2827 (ii).

STEWART, CAPT. D. C., QUARANTINE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).

TUBERCULAR TEST, RES. BY SHORTHORN BREEDERS ASSN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 130 (i).

VEGETABLES IMPORTED INTO THE U.S., QUANTITY, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 171 (i).

WASHINGTON, MR., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 339 (i).

WINNIPEG HOSPITALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).

'YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 336 (i), 2814 (ii).

AID TO AGRICULTURE SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 343 (i).

AIDS TO NAVIGATION IN B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5024 (ii).

AIR BRAKES, &C., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3812 (ii).

'ALADDIN' STR., QUANTITY OF COAL CARRIED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 884 (i).

ALASKA BOUNDARY: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 785 (i).

——— *See* 'Clayton-Bulwer,' &c.

ALBERTON, P.E.I., P.O., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER KEITH: in Com. of Sup., 4938 (ii).

——— RY. STATION, LOCATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1441 (i).

ALEXANDER GIBSON RY. AND MFG. CO.: M. to ref. Pet. to Com. on Standing Orders (Mr. *Fraser*) 2846 (ii).

——— *See* 'Can. Eastern Bill.'

ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4184.

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 130 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 38.)

ALIEN LABOUR LAW, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND C.P.R., &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Puttee*) 529 (i).

Alien Restriction Act (1897) Amt. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1° m., 882 (i).

——— **B. No. 122** (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1° m., 3127 (ii).

ALLANDALE STATION, MAIL TRANSFER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 884 (i).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
AMAGANDUS POND, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4616.
'AMELIA,' STR., TONNAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1680 (i).
AMERICAN TUGS IN CAN. WATERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 441 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 3297.
AMHERSTBURG, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4637.
AMNESTY TO BOERS: *See* 'S. A. War—British Supremacy.'
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4626.
ANDERSON LAKE, OUTLET: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
ANGLO-GERMAN COMMERCIAL TREATIES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 790; Neg. (Y. 56; N. 107) 804 (i).
——— TREATY *re* TARIFF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 617.
——— *See* 'Trade and Commerce,' &c., 'German,' &c.
ANNUAL CAMPS, DRILLS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2532, 4260 (ii).
ANTEN MILLS AND HENDRIE MAIL CONTRACT, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1681 (i).
ANTICOSTI CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
APPLE GRAFTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2653 (ii).
APPRAISERS OF CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
ARCHIBALD, P. S.: *See* 'Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep.'
ARCHITECTS, FEES, PLANS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 666 (i).
ARCHIVES: in Com. of Sup., 321 (i).
ARICHAT, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
ARMOURIES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 872 (i).
——— CLOTHING, MUSKETRY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2549 (ii).
——— DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
ARMS AND AMMUNITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2532.
ARNOLD'S BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 989.
ARSENALS IN THE DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 2565 (i).
——— REPAIRS TO BATTERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4261.
ASHCROFT TO DAWSON TELEGRAPH LINES, COST, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3293, 4151, 4781 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1986 (i).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' 'Yukon,' &c.
ASSAY OFFICE, VANCOUVER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
ATKINS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
ATLANTIC COMBINE: *See* 'Shipping Combine.'
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4549 (ii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. No. 128 (Mr. *Taylor*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637 (ii).
AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 175, 204 (i); 4535 (ii).
AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP., PUBLICATION IN PARTS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 773; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 96) 777 (i).
AUGER, I. A., CONTRACT *re* SPRUCE PLANKS, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2483, 2676 (ii).
AULTSVILLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).
AUSTRALIA, CAN. AND NEW ZEALAND, COR. *re* TRADE TRANSPORTATION: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Campbell*) 154 (i).
AUTOMOBILES *re* POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3872, 4186 (ii).
BADDECK ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
BAILEY'S BROOK, BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4620 (ii).
BAIN, MR., P. O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 3872.
BALLOT, GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 4330 (ii).
——— LAVAL, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157.
——— ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION, MONTREAL, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).
BANFF NATIONAL PARK, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
——— MUSEUM BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).
BANKING AND COMMERCE COM.: M. to add Names (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2482 (ii).
BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMMISSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).
BANK NOTES, DOM.: *See* 'Dom.' &c.
BARBOUR, JOHN, DISMISSAL, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2853 (ii).
BARRIE, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3910 (ii).
——— WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1217.
BATES, MR. E. B., ASST. POSTMASTER, OTTAWA, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4940 (ii).
BATHURST, N.B., COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, ABSENCE FROM OFFICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4124 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, CHARGES *re* NEGLIGENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 4700 (ii).
BATISCAN CHANNEL, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4629 (ii).
Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 20 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 611; 2°*, 851; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 39.)
BAXTER, GEO. E., ANDOVER, N.B., CHICKENS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i).
BAYFIELD PIER, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i).
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s B. No. 84 (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 40.)
BEAR RIVER, OBSTRUCTION, PIERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
BEAUCE ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
BEAUCHAMP, OSCAR, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., &c. (Mr. *Leonard*) 158 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 610 (i).
BEDFORD RIFLE RANGE: conc., 5032 (ii).
BEEF, CANNED, SENT TO S. AFRICA, QUANTITY, INSPECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 746 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3410 (ii).

BEET ROOT SUGAR MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4972 (ii).

BELLEVILLE, HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, DISMISSALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 449 (i).

—— POST OFFICE, NAMES, SUPERANNUATIONS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 153 (i).

—— POST OFFICE, REDUCTION OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4945 (ii).

Bell Telephone Co.'s B. No. 143 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4075; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 41.)

BELLY RIVER BRIDGE, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).

Bennett Lake Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 17 (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1°*, 530; 2°*, 779 (i).

BERNIER, CAPT.: *See* 'North Pole.'

BIG BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).

BIG POND, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).

BILLS ASSENTED TO, 5083 (ii).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. No. 105 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 2455 (i); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3511 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 2.)

BILLS ON ORDER PAPER, PROCEDURE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 2481 (i).

—— WITHDRAWN: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4970 (ii).

BILLS:

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 4; *pro formâ.*

BILL (No. 2) Respecting Telephone Companies.—(Mr. *Maclean.*)
1° m., 66; On order for 2°, 625; 2° m., 786 (i).

BILL (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Lancaster.*)
1° m, 68; 2° m., 451; ref. to Sel. Com. on Rys., agreed to (Y. 90; N. 50) 481 (i); M. for Com., 3158; in Com., 3164 (ii).

BILL (No. 4) Respecting Drainage on and across the Property of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 121; 2° m., 626 (ii).

BILL (No. 5) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Northrup.*)
1° m., 238 (i).

BILL (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act with respect to Drainage.—(Mr. *Robinson, Elgin.*)
1° m., 238; 2° m., 789 (i).

BILL (No. 7) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 316; 2°*, 570; in Com., 1279; 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 47.)

BILL (No. 8) To amend the Interpretation Act.—(Mr. *Monk.*)
1° m., 316; On order for 2°, 1110 (i).

BILL (No. 9) Respecting the United Gold Fields of British Columbia, L't'd.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
1°*, 408; 2°*, 611 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 110.)

BILL (No. 10) Respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. *Parmelee.*)
1°*, 408; 2°*, 570; in Com., and 3°*, 1107 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 87.)

BILL (No. 11) To provide for the establishment of a Medical Council in Canada.—(Mr. *Roddick.*)
1° m., 408; 2° m., 1110; ref. to Sel. Com., 1131; in Com. of the Whole, 2474 (i); (remarks) 4245; in Com., 4438; 3° m., 4441; agreed to (Y. 76; N. 16) 4463; Sen. Amts., 4803 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 20.)

BILL (No. 12) Respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 529; 2°, 612; in Com., and 3°*, 1107 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 61.)

BILL (No. 13) Respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 44.)

BILL (No. 14) To incorporate the Indian River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Béland.*)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1624 (i); Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 15) Respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 95.)

BILL (No. 16) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Douglas.*)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 851 (i); in Com., 2667; 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 17) To incorporate the Lake Bennett Railway Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 779 (i).

BILL (No. 18) To incorporate the Velvet (Rossland) Mine Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 112.)

BILL (No. 19) Relating to the Regina Law Library.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 530; 2° m., 1205; in Com., and 3°*, 1205 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 30.)

BILL (No. 20) To incorporate the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 611; 2°*, 851; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 39.)

BILL (No. 21) Respecting the Port Dover, Brantford, Berlin and Goderich Railway Company and to change its name to 'The Grand Valley Traction Company.'—(Mr. *Heyd.*)
1°*, 611; 2°*, 851; in Com., 1619; 3°*, 1620 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 91.)

BILL (No. 22) To incorporate the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—(Mr. *Fraser.*)
1°*, 632; 2°*, 851; in Com., and 3°*, 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 92.)

BILL (No. 23) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*
1°*, 632; 2°*, 851 (i).

BILL (No. 24) Respecting the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 632; 2°*, 851; in Com., 1620; 3°*, 1622 (i); Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 114.)

BILL (No. 25) In further amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1° m., 632 (i).

BILL (No. 26) Respecting the Quebec and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. *Malouin.*)
1°*, 734; 2°*, 882; in Com., 1622; 3°*, 1623 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 93.)

BILL (No. 27) To further amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Clancy.*)
1°*, 734; 2° m., 1132 (i).

BILL (No. 28) Respecting Telegraph and Telephone Companies.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 734; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 1206 (i); wthdn., 4970 (ii).

BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the Sovereign Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 781; 2°*, 882; in Com., and 3°*, 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 102.)

BILL (No. 30) To incorporate the Sydney Land and Loan Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Kendall.*)
1°*, 781; 2°*, 882 (i).

BILL (No. 31) Respecting the Buffalo Railway Company and International Railway Company.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 811; 2°*, 882; in Com., 1623; 3°*, 1623 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 32) To amend the Conciliation Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Puttee.*)
1° m., 881 (i).

BILL (No. 33) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 882 (i).

BILL (No. 34) To amend the Act to restrict the Importation and Employment of Aliens, chapter 11 of the Statutes of 1897.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1° m., 882 (i).

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 961; 2°*, 1241; in Com., and 3°*, 2473 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 36) To incorporate the British Columbia and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Riley.*)
1°*, 961; 2°*, 1241 (i).

BILL (No. 37) To incorporate the Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Emmerson.*)
1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; in Com., 1675, 2021, 2192; 3°*, 2193 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 103.)

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2054; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 85) 2064 (i).

BILL (No. 39) To incorporate the St. Lawrence and Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bureau.*)
1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; in Com., 2193; 3°*, 2194 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 99.)

BILL (No. 40) Respecting Pensions to Officers of the North-west Mounted Police.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
Prop. Res., 779; in Com. on Res., 806; 1°* of B., 962 (i); 2°*, 2484; in Com., 2484, 3311; 3°*, 3410 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 41) In amendment of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville.*)
1° m., 1063 (i).

BILL (No. 42) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Scott.*)
1°*, 1063 (i).

BILL (No. 43) Respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 111.)

BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°*, 2201 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 105.)

BILL (No. 45) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 1108 (i).

BILL (No. 46) To incorporate the Strait of Canso Bridge Company.—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1438; in Com., 2194, 2219; 3°*, 2220 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 104.)

BILL (No. 47) To incorporate the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°*, 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Montreal and St. Lawrence Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Madore.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i).

BILL (No. 49) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of John Westren.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°*, 2221 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 113.)

BILL (No. 50) An Act respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3060 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 83.)

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Dyment Banking, Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., 4123; 3°*, 4124. (2 *Edward VII, c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 52) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 1278; 2°*, 1438; in Com., and 3°*, 2201 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 98.)

BILL (No. 53) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 1278; 2°*, 1438 (i); in Com., 2608, 2659; 3°*, 2667 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 50.)

BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1323; 2°*, 1624 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 62.)

BILL (No. 55) Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland, Essex.*)
1°*, 1323; 2°*, 1624 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 56) Respecting damage by fires caused by Railways.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville.*)
1°*, 1323 (i).

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 1438; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 86.)

BILL (No. 58) In amendment of the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1438 (i).

BILL (No. 59) Respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCormick.*)
1°*, 1490; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 65.)

BILL (No. 60) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°*, 1490 (i).

BILL (No. 61) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 1490 (i).

BILL (No. 62) Respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 66.)

BILL (No. 63) To incorporate the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 74.)

BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Cosmos Cotton Company.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., 2670; 3° m., 2887 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 56.)

BILL (No. 65) To incorporate the Yukon Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343; Sen. Amts., 4570 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 115.)

BILL (No. 66) Respecting the Northern Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lemieux.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 55.)

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 1680 (i).

BILL (No. 68) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Edwards.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2888; 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 53.)

BILL (No. 69) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 3128; 3°*, 3130 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 52.)

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Ross Rifle Company.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2671; 3°*, 2675 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 96.)

BILL (No. 71) Respecting the Dominion Cotton Mills Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Prefontaine.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 59.)

BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2669; 3°*, 2670 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 90.)

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the North Shore Power Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 3131; 3°*, 3150 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 85.)

BILL (No. 74) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. *Logan.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 88.)

BILL (No. 75) To incorporate the Knapp Tubular Steamship Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2607; 3°*, 2607 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 67.)

BILL (No. 76) Further to amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 1673 (i); 2°*, 2495; in Com., 2495; 3°*, 3309 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 27.)

BILL (No. 77) To provide for the appointment of Assistant Judges of the Supreme Court of Canada in certain cases.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 1673 (i); wthdn., 5064 (ii).

BILL (No. 78) Respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. *Talbot.*)
1°*, 1763; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3060 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 108.)

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1°*, 1860; 2° m, 2021 (i); in Com., 2607; 3°*, 2608 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 57.)

BILL (No. 80) To incorporate the Huron and Erie Canal Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1902 (i) 2°*, 2676 (ii).

BILL (No. 81) To incorporate the Canadian Northern Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 51.)

BILL (No. 82) To incorporate the Nepigon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 1985 (i).

BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the Canadian Northern Express Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3150 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 49.)

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. *Harty.*)
1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 40.)

BILL (No. 85) Respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion.*)
1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2473 (i); in Com., 4569; 3°*, 4569 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 101.)

BILL (No. 86) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2201 (i); M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3202; (agreed to, Y. 87; N. 53) 3234 (ii.)

BILL (No. 87) Respecting the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion.*)
1°*, 1986; 2°*, 2201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 94.)

BILL (No. 88) Respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Scott.*)
1°*, 1986; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 75.)

BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Canada Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott.*)
1°*, 2054 (i); 2°*, 2889; in Com., and 3°*, 4578 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 45.)

BILL (No. 90) To incorporate the British America Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 2064; 2°*, 2473 (i).

BILL (No. 91) Respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 2064; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 106.)

BILL (No. 92) To amend the Railway Act so as to promote the safety of Railway Employees.—(Mr. *Smith, Vancouver.*)
1°*, 2064 (i).

BILL (No. 93) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 2145; 2°*, 2474 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3150 (ii)
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 63.)

BILL (No. 94) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Barker.*)
1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2221 (i).

BILL (No. 95) To incorporate the Penny Bank.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2676 (ii).

BILL (No. 96) To incorporate the Manitoba and Keewatin Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 2146 (i) 2°*, 2676; in Com., and 3°*, 3637 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 70.)

BILL (No. 97) To incorporate the Dominion Railway and Power Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2889 (ii).

BILL (No. 98) To incorporate the Montreal Subway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*. 2146 (i); 2°*, 2676; in Com., 4423, 4515, 4568; 3°*, 4569 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 80.)

BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville.*)
1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3637 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Toronto and Niagara Power Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2889; in Com., 3623; 3° m., 3636; agreed to Y. 74; N. 18) 3637 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 107.)

BILL (No. 101) To incorporate the Nepigon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*. 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3865 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 82.)

BILL (No. 102) To incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gauvreau.*)
1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); M. for Com., 4569, 4647; in Com., 4667; 3°*, 4667 (ii).

BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion.*)
1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., 3131; 3°*, 3131 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 68.)

BILL (No. 104) To amend and consolidate the law respecting Railways.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
1° m., 2431 (i); wthdn., 4970 (ii).

BILL (No. 105) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 2455 (i); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3511 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 2.)

BILL (No. 106) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1° m., 2482; 2°*, 4036; in Com., 4036; 3°*, 4075 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 28.)

BILL (No. 107, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1° m., 2714; 2°*, 2889; in Com., 3342; recom., 4412; 3°*, 4423 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 79.)

BILL (No. 108) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892. (Mr. *Russell.*)
1° m., 2567 (ii).

BILL (No. 109, from the Senate) Incorporating the Molsons Bank Pension Fund.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3547; in Com., and 3°*, 4075 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 77.)

BILL (No. 110) Respecting the incorporation of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1° m., 2847 (ii).

BILL (No. 111) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1° m., 2849 (ii).

BILL (No. 112) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 2850; 2°*, 3734; in Com., 3734; 3° m., 3927; Sen. Amts., 4801 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 14.)

BILL (No. 113) Further to amend the Yukon Territory Act and the Acts in amendment thereof.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 2851; 2°*, 3776; in Com., 3776; 3°*, 3777 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 35.)

BILL (No. 114) To amend the Exchequer Court Act. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 2851; 2°*, 3511; in Com., 3511; 3°*, 3935 (ii).
(2 *Edward VII*, c. 8.)

BILL (No. 115) Further to amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 2852; 2°*, 3513; in Com., 3513; 3°*, 3513 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 116) To amend the provision with respect to Tolls of Chapter 1 of the Statutes of 1881 respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 2933; 2°*, 3934; in Com., 3934; 3°*, 3935 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 117) Further to amend the Unorganized Territories Game Preservation Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 2941; 2°*, 3769; in Com., 3769; 3°*, 3769 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 118, from the Senate) For the relief of James Brown.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 3509; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°, 4121 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 119) Further to amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 3126; 2°*, 3832; in Com., 3832, 4484, 4529; 3°*, 4533 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 120) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 3127; 2°*, 3769; in Com., 3769, 3832; 3°*, 3832; wthdn., 4970 (ii).

BILL (No. 121) Further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 3127; 2°*, 3773; in Com., 3773; 3°*, 3773 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 122) Further to amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Smith, Vancouver.*)
1° m., 3127 (ii).

BILL (No. 123) To incorporate the Canada Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fraser.*)
M. to receive Pet., 2846; 1°* of B., 3202; 2°*, 3343; in Com., and 3°*, 4075 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 46.)

BILL (No. 124) To amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1° m., 3236; 2°*, 3775; in Com., 3775; 3°*, 3776 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 125, from the Senate) To amend the Acts relating to the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway.—(Mr. *Champagne.*)
1°*, 3509; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4578 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 89.)

BILL (No. 126, from the Senate) To incorporate the Bishop of Moosonee.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 3407; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4124 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 81.)

BILL (No. 127, from the Senate) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George Depew.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4075; wthdn., 4692 (ii).

BILL (No. 128, from the Senate) Respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637 (ii).

BILL (No. 129, from the Senate) Respecting the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637 (ii).

BILL (No. 130, from the Senate) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 131, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 72.)

BILL (No. 132, from the Senate) To amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 4136; in Com., 4136; 3°*, 4136 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 133) To amend the Rocky Mountains Park Act, 1887.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 3305; 2°*, 3774; in Com., 3774; 3°*, 3774 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 134) Respecting the representation of the Yukon Territory in the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°* m., 3306; 2°*, 3774; in Com., 3774, 4466, 4578; 3°*, 4579; Sen. Amts., 4971 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 135) To amend the Petition of Right Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°* m., 3306; 2°*, 3935; in Com., 3936; 3°*, 3939 (ii).

BILL (No. 136) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1° m., 3307; 2°*, 4129; in Com., 4129; 3°*, 4136; Sen. Amts., 4702 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 137) To amend Chapter 41 of the Statutes of 1901 respecting the Administration of Justice in the Yukon Territory.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
M. to introduce, 2850; Res. prop., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°* of B., 3509; 2°*, 3939; in Com., 3939; 3°*, 3939 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 138) To amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
Res. prop., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°* of B., 3510; 2°*, 3939; in Com., 3939; 3°*, 3951 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 139) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
Res. prop., 3239; in Com. on Res., 3311; 1°* of B., 3510; wthdn., 4579 (ii).

BILL (No. 140) To incorporate the Bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church for North America and Aleutian Islands, and each of the parishes and missions of the said Church in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
M. to ref. rep. back to Sel. Com., 2715, 3121; M. to introduce B., 3303; 1°*, 3622; on Order for 2°, 3866; 2° m., 4076; in Com., 4667; 3° m., 4690 (ii).

BILL (No. 141) To amend the Act respecting the Packing and Sale of certain Staple Commodities.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
1° m., 3622; 2°*, 4246; in Com., 4246, 4354; 3°*, 4354 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 32.)

BILL (No. 142) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
1° m., 3623; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4246 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 11.)

BILL (No. 143, from the Senate) Respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4075; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 41.)

BILL (No. 144, from the Senate) To incorporate the Metropolitan Bank.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 76.)

BILL (No. 145, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Copp.*)
2°*, 4075 (ii).

BILL (No. 146) For the settlement of Railway Labour Disputes.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1° m., 3725; wthdn., 4970 (ii).

BILL (No. 147) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
Res. prop., 3308; in Com. on Res., 3510; 1°* of B., 3734; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4247 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.* c. 21.)

BILL (No. 148, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 3919; 2°*, 4578 (ii).

BILL (No. 149) To amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 3919; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4357 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 17.)

BILL (No. 150) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 4036 (ii).

BILL (No. 151) Respecting the remission of penalties. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 4036; 2°*, 4579; in Com., 4579; 3°*, 4579 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 26.)

BILL (No. 152) Further to amend the provisions of Chapter 183 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the Halifax Industrial School and St. Patrick's Home at Halifax.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 4036; 2°*, 4701; in Com., 4701; 3°*, 4702 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 13.)

BILL (No. 153, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. *Pringle.*)
1°*, 4121 (ii).

BILL (No. 154, from the Senate) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 4121; 2°*, 4484; in Com., 4484; 3°*, 4484 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 23.)

BILL (No. 155) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
1° m., 4126; 2°*, 4580; in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4604 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 29.)

BILL (No. 156) To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
On M. to introduce, 3623; Res. prop., 3832; in Com. on Res., 3933; 1°* of B., 4127; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4354 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 5.)

BILL (No. 157) To authorize the raising by way of loan of certain sums of money for the public service.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop., 3925; in Com., on Res., 4127; 1°* of B., 4129; 2°*, 4357; in Com., 4357; 3°*, 4361 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 18.)

BILL (No. 158, from the Senate) To incorporate the Union Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 4241; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii) (2 *Edward VII*, c. 109.)

BILL (No. 159, from the Senate) To incorporate the Maritime Stock Breeders' Association.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1°*, 4344; 2° m., 4612; in Com., 4612; 3°*, 4612 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 73.)

BILL (No. 160, from the Senate) To incorporate the Dominion Association of Chartered Accountants.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 4241; 2° m., 4571; M. for Com., 4694; in Com., 4694; 3°*, 4695 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 58.)

BILL (No. 161, from the Senate) Respecting the incorporation of Joint Stock Companies by Letters Patent.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 4245; 2°*, 4803; in Com., 4803, 5056; 3°*, 5064 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 15.)

BILL (No. 162) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
1° m., 4245; 2° m., 4354; in Com., 4355, 4486; 3 m., 4578 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 19.)

BILL (No. 163, from the Senate) For the relief of Samuel Nelson Chipman.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°*, 4344; 2°*, 4578; in Com., 4692; 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 54.)

BILL (No. 164) To amend the Act of 1899 respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1° m , 4344; 2°*, 4604; in Com., 4604; 3°*, 4607 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 25.)

BILL (No. 165) Respecting the coasting trade of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
Res. prop., 4126; in Com. on Res., 4246; 1°* of B., 4361; 2°*, and in Com., 4607; 3° m., 4612, 4701 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 7.)

BILL (No. 166, from the Senate) To incorporate the Securities Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 4464; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 100.)

BILL (No. 167, from the Senate) Respecting the Royal Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure.*)
1°*, 4568; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 97.)

BILL (No. 168) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1902, and 30th June, 1903.--(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1° m., 5073; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5074 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 169) To amend the Customs Tariff.--(Mr. *Fielding.*)
M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4972; in Com., 4972; 1° m., 4977; 2°*, and in Com., 4977; 3° m., 4977 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 33.)

BINDER TWINE, INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4963.
—— KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
—— SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 410, 618, 885, 1439 (i).

BIOLOGICAL MARINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 516.
BISHOP, HENRY, POSTMASTER AT BATHURST, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 4700 (ii).
BLACK BROOK WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
BLACK POINT CANAL, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
BLIND RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1222 (i).
BLUE BOOKS, PUBLICATION, RELIABILITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 2731 (ii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. No. 132 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 4136; in Com., 4136; 3°*, 4136 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 3.)

BOARDS OF TRADE RES.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Kemp*) 4404 (ii).
BOER IMMIGRATION TO CANADA, PAR. IN "Mail and Empire": Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 3407 (ii).
BONUSES TO PROMOTE DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 2657 (ii).
—— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
BOUILLON, DR. ALFRED, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Casgrain*) 2854 (ii).
BOULARDERIE WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 997 (i).
BOUNDARIES, CANALS, QUEBEC, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (ii).
BOUNDARY LINE THROUGH DETROIT RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 242 (i).
BOUNDARY SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).
BOUNTY CHEQUES FOR FISHERMEN: in Com. of Sup., 553 (i).
BRAE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii),
BRANCH AND DISTRICT POST OFFICES: in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).
BRIDGES, I.C.R., STRENGTHENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3809, 4792 (ii).
—— P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).

British America Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 90 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 2064; 2°*, 2473 (i).

British Columbia and Yukon Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 36 (Mr. *Riley*) 1°*, 961; 2°*, 1241 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:
ANDERSON LAKE OUTLET: in Com. of Sup., 4642.
ARMOURIES: in Com. of Sup., 872 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*
ASHCROFT TO DAWSON, &C., TEL. LINES, TOTAL LENGTH, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1986 (i).
—— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
ASSAY OFFICE, VANCOUVER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
BURRARD CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
CASSIAR, APPNMT. OF J. W. MCFARLANE *re* CENSUS: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
CENSUS COMMISSIONERS, ATLIN DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
CHIEF JUSTICESHIP, APPNMT., &C.: Inquiry (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 611 (i).
COLUMBIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i).
DEASE AND LIARD, MINERS, RELIEF TO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
DISALLOWANCE OF ACTS, B.C. LEGISLATION, &C.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 137 (i).
DREDGING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
ESQUIMALT DEFENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2565, 4261 (ii).
FISH CANNERS IN B.C., REMARKS OF PROF. PRINCE: Ques. (Mr. *Beland*) 449, 613 (i).
FISHERIES INVESTIGATION *re* REP. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 3308 (ii).
FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i), 4642 (ii).
HARDY BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4643 (ii).
INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (ii).
—— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 3059 (ii).
—— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3058, 4247 (ii).
KAMLOOPS, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
KENNEDY LAKE OUTLET: in Com. of Sup., 4642.
MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).
NAVIGATION, AIDS TO: in Com. of Sup., 5024 (ii).
NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 860 (i).
NEW WESTMINSTER, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
PENITENTIARY, LAND PURCHASED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3619 (ii).
PORT SIMPSON TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4178, 4779 (ii).
QUESNELLE TO ATLIN TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii).
QUESNELLE FORKS AND HORSE FLY TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
ROSSLAND MINERS' UNION AND ALIEN LABOUR ACT, LETTERS, &C., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 2471 (i).
ROSSLAND PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
SEINE LICENSES ISSUED IN B.C., NUMBER, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Earle*) 2680 (ii).
SKEENA RIVER, DREDGING AND IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1277 (i).
TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
—— B. C. AND TERS., AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).
VANCOUVER, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 876 (i), 4186 (ii).
—— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
VICTORIA, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
—— CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 65 (i).
—— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
VICTORIA AND VANCOUVER STEAM SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4964.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*
WILLIAM'S HEAD QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4614 (ii).
B.N.A. ACT *re* PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, &c.: (Ques.) (Mr. *Lemieux*) 441 (i).
BRITISH SUPREMACY IN S. A., TERMS OF PEACE, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3239, 3316; M. to wthdrw. Res., 3342; Neg., 3365 (ii).
BROCKVILLE, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4182 (ii).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPOVEMENTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133 (i).
—— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (i).
—— LIGHTHOUSE, ERECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 134 (i).
Brown, James Relief B. No. 118 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 3509; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°, 4121 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 42.)
BRUCE, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
BRYON ISLAND TO ANTICOSTI CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).
—— *See* "Pub. Works".
BUDGET SPEECH, IMP. PARLT.: *See* 'Preferential Trade.'
BUDGET, THE (Mr. *Fielding*) 1279 (i);
Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Amt., 1310, 1323; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1342; (Mr. *Osler*) 1385; (Mr. *Heyd*) 1447; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1459; (Mr. *Mackinnon*) 1480; (Mr. *Blain*) 1490; (Mr. *Morrison*) 1504; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1523; (Mr. *Edwards*) 1545; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1554; (Mr. *Brock*) 1559; (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1569; (Mr. *Clarke*) 1604, 1625; (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1647; (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 1651; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1658; (Mr. *Bell*) 1685; (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 1724; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1737; (Mr. *Davis*) 1759, 1766; (Mr. *Kemp*) 1788; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 1807; (Mr. *Hackett*) 1823; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1837, 1862; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1876; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1884; (Mr. *Porter*) 1903; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ques. of Order, 1919; (Mr. *Kendall*) 1930; (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1964; (Mr. *Holmes*) 1974; (Mr. *Pringle*) 1989; (Mr. *Turgeon*) 2009, 2024; (Mr. *Lavell*) 2030; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 2045; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2053, 2070; (Mr. *Scott*) 2089; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2107; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 2126; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2136; (Mr. *Fisher*) 2147; (Mr. *Broder*) 2184, 2201; (Mr. *Lennox*) 2207, 2226; (Mr. *Wade*) 2246; (Mr. *Northrup*) 2268; (Mr. *Ward*) 2284; (Mr. *Kendrey*) 2290; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2299; (Mr. *Clancy*) 2339; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2367; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2398; (Mr. *Monk*) 2399, 2411; (Mr. *Pope*) 2414; (Mr. *Ganong*) 2425; Amt. neg. (Y. 61; N. 117) 2430 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 962 (i).
—— FINANCIAL SITUATION, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Neg. (Y. 41; N. 84) 4859 (ii).
Buffalo Ry. Co. and International Ry. Co.'s B. No. 31 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 811; 2°*, 882; in Com., 1623; 3°*, 1623 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 43.)
BUILDINGS, B.C., RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
—— DOM., GENERAL REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4181, 4186 (ii).
—— RENTAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 964 (i).
—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 4613 (ii).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i), 4178 (ii).
BUILDINGS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4185, 4613 (ii).
—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 719 (i), 4182 (ii).
—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i), 4179 (ii).
—— YUKON, RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4536, 4542 (ii).
—— *See* 'Dom. Buildings,' &c.
BULL, CHAS. A., PRODUCE CO., LETTER FROM HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: Read (Mr. *Monk*) 4805.
BULLETINS, FARM, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 345 (i).
BULWER TREATY. *See* 'Clayton.'
BURKE'S FALLS, MAGANETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
BURLAND BANK NOTE CO., &c., LITIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4317 (ii).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL, PIERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 846, 1226 (i), 4637 (ii).
—— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
BURRARD, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
BUSINESS OF THE HSE. *re* PRIVATE BILLS: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 4567-8 (ii).
—— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING COMMISSION, REP., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1684 (i).
CABINET CHANGES: Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 412 (i).
CACOUNA AND RY. STATION, MAIL CONTEACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2225 (i).
CADETS, R.M.C., APPLICATION *re* CORONATION CONTINGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 3637 (ii).
—— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. *Barker*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2221 (i).
CALLENDAR, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4638.
CAMPBELLTON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4626.
—— *See* 'Wilson's Beach.'
CANADA AND FRANCE SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 2054 (i); 2°*, 2889; in Com., and 3°*, 4578 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 45.)
Canada Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 123 (Mr. *Fraser*) M. to receive Pet., 2846; 1°* of B., 3202; 2°*, 3343; in Com., and 3°*, 4075 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 46.)
Canada Evidence Act (1893) Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 2852; 2°*, 3513; in Com., 3513; 3°*, 3513 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 9.)
Canadian Manufacturers' Association incorp. B. No. 47 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°* 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 48.)
Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 44.)

Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 7 (Mr. *Ingram*) 1°*, 316; 2°*, 570; in Com., 1279; 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 47.)

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 69 (Mr. *Flint*) 1°*, 1496 (i).

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, NAMES OF COUNTIES, &c., UNDER OPERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 1682 (i).

——— RES. FROM MAR. BAPTISTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1109 (i).

CANADIAN CATTLE, EMBARGO BY G.B.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 138 (i).

——— *See* 'Cattle,' &c.

CANADIAN CATTLE COMDEMNED BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3410 (ii).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) Neg. (Y. 51; N. 98) 3857 (ii).

——— *See* 'S.A. War.'

CAN. IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com, of Sup., 364 (i).

Canadian Northern Express Co.'s incorp. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3150 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 49.)

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1278; 2°*, 1438 (i); in Com., 2608, 2659; 3°*, 2667 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 50.)

Canadian Northern Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 81 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2221; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 51.)

C. P. R., B. No. 69 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 3128; 3°*, 3130 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 52.)

——— **(tolls) Amt. B. No. 116** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 2933; 2°*, 3934; inCom., 3934; 3°*, 3935 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 4.)

C.P.R., INCREASE IN CAPITAL STOCK: Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 129 (i).

——— LANDS PATENTED TO MARCH, 1902, ACREAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1988 (i).

——— LAND TAXES, EXEMPTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1988 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 5055 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 5070 (ii),

C.P.R. *vs.* ROY, PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENT: M. for Copy (Mr. *Lemieux*) 499 (i).

CAN. RAILWAYS, CASUALTIES, &c., OF EMPLOYEES, CATTLE, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Erb*) 2472 (i).

——— EMPLOYEES KILLED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 410 (i).

CAN. TRANSATLANTIC MAILS *via* U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 447 (i).

CANALS:

CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4001, 4269, 4294, 4298.

——— DOM. EXPENDITURE, &c., SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 784 (i).

——— *See* 'Transportation,' &c.

——— EXTRA PAYMENTS FOR OVERTIME: in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4312 (ii).

——— REVOTES, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4281-2 (ii).

CARILLON, GUIDE PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (ii).

CORNWALL, REPAIRS, LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4310 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

CORRY & LAVERDURE, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).

——— *See* 'Trent,' &c.

CULBUTE, DAMAGES BY FLOODING: in Com. of Sup., 4281, 4309 (ii).

FARRAN'S POINT, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).

GALOPS, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4021, 4300 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 5020 (ii).

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4298 (ii).

GILBERT DREDGING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 4021.

——— PAYMENTS TO FROM MAY TO DEC., 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3155 (ii).

LACHINE, ELECTRIC PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4299 (ii).

——— LOCK REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4035.

——— MILL ST. PAVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4307 (ii).

——— WASTE WEIR: in Com. of Sup., 4307 (ii).

NORTH CHANNEL, DAM, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4034, 4300 (ii).

OVERTIME: in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4312 (ii).

QUEBEC CANALS, BOUNDARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (ii).

RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4304 (ii).

——— GILBERT BROS.: in Com. of Sup., 4021.

——— *See* 'Galops,' 'North Channel,' &c.

RIDEAU, POONAMALIE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4270, 4917 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE CANAL EMPLOYEES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c., 1896-1901: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2222 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE, ENTRANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4001, 4298 (ii).

SOULANGES, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4019, 4304 (ii).

——— WATER POWERS, &c., REPS. OF ENGINEERS, LEASES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bennett*) 631 (i).

SUNDAY SERVICES: *See* 'Overtime,' &c.

TAY CANAL, 1896 TO 1901. AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 2047 (i).

TRENT VALLEY, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4004 (i); conc., 5047 (ii).

——— DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4269 (ii).

——— LINDSAY AND FENELON FALLS, ROAD BUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4270 (ii).

——— PETERBOROUGH DAM: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).

——— TRENT AND RICE LAKE CANALS, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).

WELLAND: in Com. of Sup., 4306, 4798 (ii).

——— LOCKS WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).

——— PORT COLBORNE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4019, 4306 (ii).

——— PORT DALHOUSIE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).

——— ST. CATHARINES WATER SUPPLY, O. C. GRANTING POWER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 883, 1683, 1860 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 409, 745 (i).

CANNERS OF B.C. AND PROF. PRINCE'S REMARKS: Ques. (Mr. *Beland*) 613 (i).

——— *See* 'B.C.', &c.

CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3831 (ii).

CANSO FERRY SERVICE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4294 (ii).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.', &c.

CAPE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).

CAPE TORMENTINE, CREOSOTED TIMBER WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4627 (ii).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
——— MEMORIAL *re* COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1018 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
CAPE TRAVERSE, MEMORIAL *re* DAILY COMMUNICATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1018 (i).
CARAQUET WHARF, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
CAR COUPLERS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4794 (ii).
CARILLON CANAL, GUIDE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (ii).
CARLETON POINT WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1021 (i).
CARNDUFF COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 835 (i).
CARTRIDGE FACTORY, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 4180.
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1013.
——— RANGE LIGHTS, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).
CASSIAR, B.C., APPNMT. OF J. W. MCFARLANE *re* CENSUS: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
CASUALTIES OF, CANS. IN S. A.: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 2191 (i).
CATTLE EMBARGO BY G. B., AMT. TO COM. OF SUP. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3980 (ii).
——— BY G.B., PROTEST, &C.: Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3858 (ii).
——— *See* 'Can. Cattle.'
CATTLE EXPORTED TO U.S., FROM 1890, VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 3153 (ii).
CATTLE INSPECTION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 517 (i).
CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture.'
CEMENTS, CAN. AND FOREIGN, TESTS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 1442, 1444 (i).
CENSUS, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN LIVERY HIRE: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2069 (i).
——— CHEQUES ISSUED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4099, 4429 (ii).
——— CIRCULAR, MR. COTÉ'S: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 133.
——— CLASSIFYING HALF-BREEDS AS INDIANS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 1902 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1674 (i).
——— COMMISSIONERS, ATLIN DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
——— COMMISSIONER, SOUTH WATERLOO, NAME AND AMOUNTS PAID TO: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1861 (i).
——— ENUMERATION, 1881, 1891, 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2222 (i).
——— ENUMERATION, 1891 and 1901, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1064 (i).
——— ENUMERATORS, PAYMENTS TO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4076, 4430 (ii).
——— ENUMERATORS, SOUTH WATERLOO, NAMES, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1066 (i).
——— EXODUS, REMARKS: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii).
——— EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 129, 612 (i).
CENSUS, FIGURES QUOTED IN SPEECH: Personal Explanation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1763 (i).
——— INVESTIGATION, 1891: in Com. of Sup., 4077, 4435 (ii).
——— LISGAR, CHEQUES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4429.
——— MACPHERSON, D. F.: in Com. of Sup., 3398.
——— MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4111 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 4342 (ii).
——— SIMCOE, N. AND E., COST IN 1891–1901: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2224 (i),
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 68 (Mr. *Edwards*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2888; 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 53.)
CHADWICK, MR.: *See* 'Jackson, Mr.'
CHAMBLY CANAL, WHARF, MAINTENANCE BY G.T.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 2068 (i).
CHANCE HARBOUR, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1024 (i).
CHAPEL POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT, DOM. NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 171 (i), 4317, 4533; conc., 4342 (ii).
CHARLESVILLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621.
CHARLOTTE, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
CHARLOTTETOWN, CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 2932 (ii).
——— INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. No. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 4241; 2° m., 4571; M. for Com., 4694; in Com., 4694; 3°*, 4695 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 58.)
CHARTERED BANKS, LIST OF SHAREHOLDERS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3128 (ii).
CHAUDIÈRE JUNCTION, ENGINE-HOUSE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).
CHEESE STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2634, 2647 (ii).
CHETICAMP POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1000.
CHEVERIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
CHICKEN-FATTENING STATIONS, LOCATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1065 (i).
CHICKENS PURCHASED BY DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Dismissal of Pet. (Mr *Speaker*) 2219 (i).
CHIEF JUSTICESHIP, B.C., APPNMT., &C.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 611 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. No. 156 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. to introduce, 3623; Res. prop., 3832; in Com. on Res., 3933; 1°* of B., 4127; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4354 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 5.)
CHINESE IMMIGRATION COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4340 (ii).
——— REP. OF COM., FIRST PART: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 451 (i).
——— *See* 'Japanese,' 'Oriental.'

Chipman, S. Nelson. Relief B. No. 163 (Mr. *Flint*) 1°*, 4344; 2°*, 4578; in Com., 4692; 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 54.)
CHITTICK, F. C., PROMOTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).
CHURCH POINT, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
CIRCULAR ISSUED BY P. LANDRY: Ques. (Mr. *Béland*) 2458 (i).
CIRCULAR *re* PUBLIC WORKS, ISSUED BY MR. MULOCK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 843 (i).
CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 172, 199, 530 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 4315.
CIVIL SERVICE LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 129.
Civil Service Retirement Act Amt. B. No. 124 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 3236; 2°,* 3775; in Com., 3775; 3°*, 3776 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 6.)
CLARK'S HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY AND ALASKAN BOUNDARY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 143 (i).
——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Monk*) 747 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 753, 756, 812, 825 (i),
——— LETTER FROM SIR LOUIS DAVIES: Personal Explanation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 785, 811 (i).
CLEGG, SAMUEL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4699 (ii).
CLERGUE'S CONTRACT, STEEL RAILS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3781 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 746, 781 (i).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.', &c.
CLERKSHIPS, ADDITIONAL, P.O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
CLERKS OF WORKS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 876 (i), 4186 (ii).
CLINTON, DAVID, DISMISSAL FROM WELLINGTON P.O.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Alcorn*) 2680 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 613 (i).
CLINTON, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 719.
COAL CARRIED BY CHARTERED STEAMERS, QUANTITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 884 (i).
COAL PURCHASED IN CAN., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 883 (i).
COAL OIL INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1148, 1203 (i), 2931, 3300 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) Ruling, 1170 (i).
——— *re* N.W. TER. AND MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 5055 (ii).
——— Memorandum read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5074 (ii).
——— AT PORT ARTHUR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2931, 3300 (ii).
Coasting Trade of Can. B. No. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 4126; in Com. on Res., 4246; 1°* of B., 4361; 2°*, and in Com., 4607; 3° m., 4612, 4701 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 7.)
COASTING TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5015 (ii).
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 721 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
COLCHESTER REGIMENT, PETS. *re* MEDALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4699 (ii).
COLD STORAGE, DEEP SEA FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).
COLD STORAGE ON STEAMSHIPS AND RYS.: in Com. of Sup., 368 (i), 2568 (ii).
COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, CADET CORPS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 240 (i).
COLLINET, MRS., MATRON OF YUKON COURT HOUSE: Letter *re* Allowance, in Com, of Sup., 4193 (ii).
——— Memo. (Mr. *Tarte*) read, 4536 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1227 (i), 4638 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
COLONIAL APPEALS TO IMP. PRIVY COUNCIL: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor., 3668 (ii).
COLONIAL MINISTERS: *See* 'Intercolonial Conference.'
COLONIAL TROOPS IN DEFENCE OF THE EMPIRE, PAR. IN *Ottawa Citizen*: Remarks (Mr. *Monet*) 785 (i).
COLUMBIA RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1276.
COMEAUS HILL BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621.
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES, *re* TREATIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).
COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS AND TAX BY JAMAICA: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 622 (i).
——— TAX, &C. IN P.E.I., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 781 (i).
COMMISSIONS TO CAN. OFFICERS IN BRITISH ARMY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 419 (i).
COMMISSIONS ON DISBURSEMENTS FOR IMP. AUTHORITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1065 (i).
——— S.A. WAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1063 (i).
COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE, ACCOMMODATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2298 (i).
COMMITTEE, JOINT, ON PRINTING: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 128 (i).
——— SEL. STANDING: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).
——— Lists Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 122 (i).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to add Names, 1063 (i), 2482, 2568 (ii).
Commodities Packing and Sale Act Amt. B. No. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1° m., 3622; 2°*, 4246; in Com., 4246, 4354; 3°*, 4354 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 32.)
COMMUTATIONS FOR ARSON, NUMBER, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 419 (i).
Companies Act Amt. B. No. 45 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 1108 (i).
Conciliation Act Amt. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Puttee*) 1° m., 881 (i).
CONSTABULARY, S. A., APPLICATIONS, SELECTIONS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 528 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 243 (i).
——— *See* 'S.A. War,' &c.
CONSULAR AGENCIES, FLAGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 132 (i).
CONTRACT *vs.* DAY LABOUR: *See* 'Day Labour.'
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' CERTIFICATES: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— Notification of Vacancies (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— *See* 'H. of C.' &c.

COOLING FANS, STEAMERS FITTED WITH, NUMBER, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 616, 882 (i).
COPPER CROWN WORKS AND I.C.R., CONTRACTS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).
CORN LAWS, REPEAL, AND IMP. BUDGET SPEECH : *See* 'Preferential Trade.'
CORNWALL, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 863 (i).
——— CANAL, REPAIRS, LIGHTING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4310 (ii).
——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 3038 (ii).
CORONATION CONTINGENT, EMPLYMT. OF S.A. MEN, &c. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2459 ; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 2469 (i).
——— *re* MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 4262 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 4647 (ii).
——— REPRESENTATIVES, &c. : on M. for Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Porter*) 3835 (ii).
CORONATION DAY, PUBLIC HOLIDAY : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 747 (i).
CORONATION EXPENSES OF MINISTERS : in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).
CORONATION OF HIS MAJESTY, APPNMT. OF CAN. DELEGATES : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 153 (i).
——— *See* 'Intercolonial Conference.'
CORRY & LAVERDURE, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. *re* TRENT CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).
——— *See* 'Trent,' &c.
Cosmos Cotton Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) 1°*, 1569 ; 2°*, 1680 (i) ; in Com., 2670 ; 3° m., 2887 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 56.)
COTÉ, JOS., MAIL CARRIER AT STE. HENEDINE, CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 447 (i).
COTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGE, INDEMNITY TO J. LAROSE : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 622 (i).
——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
COTTON, BLEACHED AND UNBLEACHED, DUTY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Madore*) 614 (i).
COUNTY COURT JUDGES, AGE LIMIT, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Tisdale*) 418 (i).
——— COMPULSORY RETIREMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 131 (i).
——— *See* 'Judges.'
COURT HOUSE, N.W.T., POLICE ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 849 (i).
COURT HOUSE, YUKON, ALLOWANCE TO MATRON, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4193 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
COURTS-MARTIAL IN CAN. MILITIA, NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 740 (i).
COUTTS, MR., AMOUNTS PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
COW BAY BREAKWATER, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1000.
CRAIG, JUDGE, INTERVIEW *re* YUKON IRREGULARITIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 972 (i).
CRANE ISLAND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4630 (ii).
CRATHIE POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).
CREAMERIES, BONUSES TO, &c. : in Com. of Sup. 2653.
CREDITON P.O., DECEASE OF POSTMASTER, VACANCY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 3308 (ii).
CREOSOTED TIMBER IN WHARFS, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— TIMBER PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
——— *See* 'Public Works,' &c.
CRIBBON'S POINT WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. No. 33 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 882 (i).
——— **B. No. 58** (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1438 (i).
——— **B. No. 61** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1490 (i).
——— **B. No. 108** (Mr. *Russell*) 1° m., 2567 (ii).
CRIMINAL STATISTICS, COMPILATION : in Com. of Sup., 335 (i).
CROSSEN MFG. CO. : *See* 'I.C.R. Trucks,' &c.
CROSS POINT ISOLATED PIER : in Com. of Sup., 4630.
Crown Bank of Canada incorp, B. No. 79 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1860 ; 2° m., 2021 (i) ; in Com., 2607 ; 3°*, 2608 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 57.)
CROWN PROSECUTOR IN YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 3590.
CROW'S NEST COAL FIELDS, COR. WITH U. S. A. GOVT., &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bennett*) 2471 (i).
CULBUTE CANAL, DAMAGES BY FLOODING : in Com. of Sup., 4281, 4309 (ii).
CURRENT WAGES CLAUSE AND GOVT. CONTRACTS, NUMBER AWARDED, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Puttee*) 631.
CURRY, MR., CUSTOMS OFFICER : in Com. of Sup., 2924 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. No. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4972 ; in Com., 4972 ; 1° m., 4977 ; 2°*, and in Com., 4977 ; 3° m., 4977 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.*, c. 33.)
CUSTOMS :
AMERICAN TUGS IN CAN. WATERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 441 (i).
APPRAISERS : in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
ARICHAT CUSTOM HOUSE : in Com. of Sup. 635.
BATHURST COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, ABSENCE FROM OFFICE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4124.
BEET ROOT SUGAR MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY : in Com. on Ways and Means, 4972 (ii).
CATTLE EXPORTED TO U. S. FROM 1890, VALUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 3153 (ii).
CHARLOTTETOWN PORT : in Com. of Sup., 2932.
COTTON, BLEACHED AND UNBLEACHED, DUTY RATE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Madore*) 614 (i).
CURRY, MR., CUSTOMS OFFICER : in Com. of Sup., 2924 (ii).
CUSTOMS DEPT., CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 208 (i).
——— CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
——— LABORATORY : in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2921, 4264 (ii).
——— FORFEITED GOODS, SYDNEY, N.S., SALE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 783 (i).
DRESDEN PORT : in Com. of Sup., 2925 (ii).
FLAX SEED IMPORTED FROM U.S., AMOUNT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 1682 (i).
FREE LIST, ARTICLES PLACED ON SINCE 1897 : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 244 (i).
GERMAN DUTIES ON CAN. IMPORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 156 (i).
GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM ONT. PORTS IN 1901 : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 246 (i).
IMPORTS FROM U. S. FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL VALUE : Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 782 (i).
INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2921, 3294 (ii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
LINSEED OIL, IMPORTATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2932, 3299 (ii).
'MCCORMICK' BINDER, CUSTOMS VALUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 441 (i).
MAGAZINES, &c., IMPORTED FROM G. B. and U. S., VALUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2679.
NICKEL EXPORTATIONS, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3030 (ii).
PERRY, MR. C. B., CUSTOMS OFFICER: in Com. of Sup., 2923 (ii).
PORTER, Dr., Claim: in Com, of Sup.. 5033 (ii).
PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3297 (ii).
ST. THOMAS, COLLECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 2930, 3295 (ii).
SUGAR, REFINED, IMPORTED INTO CAN. FROM 1900 TO 1901: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Madore*) 809 (i).
—— TESTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
TOBACCO DUTY, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 134 (i).
U. S. IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, 1901, TOTAL VALUE: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 782 (i).
WINDSOR, ONT., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 1154 (i).
YARN ADMITTED DUTY FREE, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 4125 (ii).

CYR, MR., CLERK OF WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 876 (i).

DAIRYING BRANCH, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2568 (ii).

DAVIES, SIR LOUIS, LETTER *re* CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 811 (i).
—— *See* 'Clayton-Bulwer,' &c.

DAWSON AND VICTORIA MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).

DAWSON, MR., INSPECTOR OF PENITENTIARIES, SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (ii).

DAY LABOUR AND CONTRACT SYSTEM ON PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 674–708, 836–880 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL: in Com. of Sup., 4327, 4342 (ii).
—— 1ST REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Holmes*) 440 (i).
—— 2ND REP.: Presented (Mr. *Charlton*) 1204; conc., M. (Mr. *Scott*) 1322 (i).
—— 3RD REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1489; conc., 1673 (i).
—— TRANSLATORS, 4TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 4121, 4241 (ii).

DEPTL. BUILDINGS, CLEANING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
—— *See* 'Pub. Works,' 'Ottawa,' &c.

Depew, Geo., Patent Relief B. No. 127 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4075; wthdn, 4692 (ii).

DEPOT HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).

DESCARY, DR. C. A., VET. SURGEON AT ST. VINCENT DE PAUL: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3831 (ii).

DESERONTO PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 728.

DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).

DESROCHERS, R. C., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4535.

DESTITUTE INDIANS, RELIEF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3056 (ii).

DEVLIN, MR. C. R., IMMIGRATION AGENT, PAR IN *Witness*: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 619 (i).
—— COR. *re* LETTERS MAKING STATEMENTS AGAINST MEMBERS: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Wilson*) 154 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 451, 634, 1204 (i).
—— *See* 'Immigration,' &c.

DIPPER HARBOUR, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).

DISMISSALS OF GOVT. EMPLOYEES FOR POLITICAL REASONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bell*) 428 (i).
—— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 429 (i).

DISTILLERY, DUTY, EXTRA: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).

DITCHING ALONG FARM LANDS IN TEMISCOUATA, DAMAGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr, *Gauvreau*) 2677 (ii).

Divorce: *See* 'Brown, Jas., Relief B.'
—— *See* 'Chipman, S. N.'

DIVORCE COURT, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).

DIVORCE, PROTEST *re* PRESENT METHOD: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 4121, 4692 (ii).

DIXON, F. A., PROMOTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4534, 4782 (ii).

DOM. BANK NOTES, CIRCULATION FROM 1892 TO 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 615 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 619 (i).
—— *See* 'Charges of Management,' &c.

DOM. BUILDINGS, CARETAKERS, ENGINEERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).
—— GENERALLY, RENEWALS: in Com. of Sup., 728.
—— LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4615 (il).
—— MAN., RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 831.
—— MAR. PROVS., RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).
—— QUE., RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).
—— RENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4615 (ii).
—— *See* 'Buildings,' &c.

Dom. Cotton Mills Co.'s B. No. 71 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII., c.* 59.)

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr. *Northrup*) 1° m., 238 (i).
—— **B. No. 27** (Mr. *Clancy*) 1°*, 734; 2° m., 1132 (i).

DOM. IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS, FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 974 (i), 4616 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 120 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3127; 2°*, 3769; in Com., 3769, 3832; 3°*, 3832; wthdn., 4970 (ii).

DOM. LANDS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4117.
—— SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4252, 4953 (ii).

DOMINION POLICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 233 (i).

DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

Dom. Ry. and Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 97 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2889 (ii).

DOM. SECURITIES CO., PAR. IN N. Y. PAPER: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4428 (ii).
—— PROSPECTUS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3466, 3533 (ii).

DOM. ST AMERS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 422,
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.
DORCHESTER COUNTY, QUE., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4934 (ii).
DORCHESTER, N.B., PENITENTIARY, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
DOUGLAS, GEO. C., P.E.I., CHICKENS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).
DOYON, THOS., POSTMASTER AT ST. ODILON, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
Drainage across Ry. Lands B. No. 4 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 121; 2° m., 626 (i).
——— **B. No. 6** (*Mr. Robinson, Elgin*) 1°m., 238; 2° m., 789 (i).
DREDGES BUILT AND OWNED BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
DREDGING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3284, 4763 (ii).
——— PLANT, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 3283.
——— ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 565.
DRESDEN PORT, *re* CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2925.
DROUIN, MR., ABSENCE FROM CENSUS STAFF: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
DRUM HEAD BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i), 4621 (ii).
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RECEIPTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
DRUMMONDVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 643 (i), 4180 (ii).
DUGAS, JUDGE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST [FROM MRS. COLLINET: Remarks in Com. of Sup, 4193 (ii).
——— MEMO. OF MR. FULLER: Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 4536.
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
DUNDAS, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 716, 863 (i).
DURHAM CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
Dyment Banking Loan and Savings Co.'s incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4123 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 60.)
EASTER ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1569 (i).
EASTERN EXTENSION, ARBITRATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup, 4340 (ii).
——— REFUNDS FOR RIGHT OF WAY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 781 (i).
EASTERN PARLIAMENT BUILDING, REPAIRS TO WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
ECUM SECUM WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4210
EDMONTON JAIL, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 849, 853.
Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s B. No. 12 (Mr. *Costigan*) 1°*, 529; 2°*, 612; in Com., and 3°*, 1107 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 61.)
EEL RIVER STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
EILBECK, R. J., APPNMT. AS SHERIFF: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).
——— ABSENCE FROM YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 745.
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).
ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1202.
ELEVATOR ATTENDANTS, DEPTL. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4615 (ii).
——— HOUSE OF COMMONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4137 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
EMPLOYEES, GOVT., AND FEDERAL ELECTIONS, GOVT. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 618 (i).
——— HOUSE OF COMMONS, TRANSPORTATION TO HOMES: Remarks (Mr. *Morin*) 5056 (ii).
——— I.C.R., SALARIES, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bell*) 440 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., NONPAYMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2457 (i).
——— Remarks (*Mr. Taylor*) 3777 (ii).
——— SALARIES, P.O. DEPT., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
——— YUKON, ALLOWANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4196 (ii).
——— MEMO. OF MR. FULLER: Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 4536.
ENGINEERS, &c., I.C.R., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4292 (ii).
——— PUBLIC WORKS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
ENGLISH BUDGET SPEECH: *See* 'Preferential Trade.'
ENUMERATORS *re* CENSUS: in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
——— *See* 'Census,' &c.
ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 2565, 4261 (ii).
Essex Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1323; 2°*, 1624 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 62.)
ESTIMATES, COMPARISONS WITH FORMER YEAR, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 507.
ESTIMATES, THE: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 120 (i).
——— SUPPL.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 785 (i).
——— FURTHER SUPPL. (1902): Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3918 (ii).
——— SUPPL. (1903): Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 4353.
——— FURTHER SUPPL.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 5030.
'EUREKA,' TUG, FURNISHING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 567 (i).
EXCHEQUER COURT: in Com. of Sup., 229 (i).
Exchequer Court Act Amt B. No. 114 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 2851; 2°*, 3511; in Com., 3511; 3°*, 3935 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.*8.)
——— **B. No. 139** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 3239; in Com. on Res., 3311; 1°* of B., 3510; wthdn., 4579 (ii).
EXCISE, INSPECTORS' SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1147 (i), 4528 (ii).
——— *See* 'Inland Revenues,' &c.
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 344 (i), 2867, 2889, 4966 (ii).
——— BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 875 (i).
——— OTTAWA, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson, Lennox*) 152 (i).
EXTRA PAYMENTS, CANALS, FOR OVERTIME: in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4312 (ii).

FAREWELL, J. C., ACCOUNT *re* NORTH ONTARIO ELECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4269 (ii).

FARM BULLETINS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION : in Com. of Sup., 345 (i).

——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.

FARM HANDS, MAN.: *See* 'Labour in Man.'

FARRAN'S POINT ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).

——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.

FENIAN RAID MEDALS, ISSUE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1109 (i).

——— *See* "Militia", &c.

FINANCE :

BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMMISSION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4339 (i).

B.N.A. ACT *re* PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, &C : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 441 (i).

BUDGET, THE : Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1279 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 962 (i).

BURLAND BANK NOTE CO., LITIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 4317 (ii).

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 171 (i), 4317, 4533 ; conc., 4342 (ii).

CHARTERED BANKS, LIST OF SHAREHOLDERS : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3128 (ii).

COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS AND TAX BY JAMAICA, &C Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 622, 781 (i).

DOM. BANK NOTES, CIRCULATION FROM 1892 TO 1901 : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 615 (i).

——— NUMBER OF SHEETS ISSUED SINCE 1892 : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 619 (i).

——— REDEMPTION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4533.

EASTERN EXTENSION, ARBITRATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4340 (ii).

ESTIMATES, COMPARISONS WITH FORMER YEAR, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).

ESTIMATES, THE : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 120, 785 (i), 3918, 4353, 5030 (ii).

FINANCE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 175 (i).

FINANCIAL SITUATION, REVIEW, &C. : Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4810 ; Neg. (Y. 41 ; N. 84) 4859 (ii).

FINANCIAL STATEMENT : *See* 'Budget.'

HICKS-BEACH, SIR MICHAEL, BUDGET SPEECH : *See* 'Preferential Trade.'

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE FOR CAN. IN LONDON : in Com. of Sup., 364 (i).

INSURANCE, GENERAL EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).

INTERAL ECONOMY COM., MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 154 (i).

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES : in Com. of Sup., 4331 (ii).

JAMAICA, REPEAL OF TAX ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 622 (i).

MAN. SCHOOL LANDS FUND, REDUCTION OF INTEREST, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 2941 (ii).

——— REP. *re* INVESTIGATION : Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3035 (ii).

MINT : *See* 'Royal.'

ONTARIO PROVINCIAL SUBSIDY, AMOUNTS PAID, &C. : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Henderson*) 2473 (i).

PAPER COMBINE, REP. OF COMMISSION : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3128 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 2733, 2942 (ii).

——— RES. FROM BOARDS OF TRADE : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3153 (ii).

PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION ACCOUNTS : in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

ROYAL MINT BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).

ST. VINCENT, W. I., RELIEF TO SUFFERERS : in Com. of Sup., 5031 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*

SHOE WORKERS UNION, QUEBEC, PET. TO GOVT., &C. : M. for Copy* (Mr. *Puttee*) 2473 (i).

TREASURY BOARD : in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).

WAYS AND MEANS : Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 120, 1279 (i) ; 4972, 5064 (ii).

FIRE INSURANCE, &C., I.C.R., LOCOMOTIVES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2854 (ii).

FISHERIES :

BOUNTY CHEQUES FOR FISHERMEN : in Com. of Sup., 553 (i).

B.C. FISHERIES, INVESTIGATION *re* REP. OF COMMISSION : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 3308 (ii).

COLD STORAGE FOR DEEP SEA FISHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).

EXHIBITS AT OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 553 (i).

FISHERIES DEPT., &C. : in Com. of Sup., 177 (i), 4222 (ii).

——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).

——— DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 129, 408 (i).

FISHERY AWARDS AND P.E.I. PREMIER'S SPEECH : Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 3859 (ii).

FISHERY AWARD : Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5015 (ii).

GEORGIAN BAY, FISH HATCHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 551 (i), 4959 (ii).

HATCHERIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4222, 4959.

——— MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 550 (i).

——— B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 4225 (ii).

——— N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 551 (i).

HERRINGS SLAUGHTERED, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 4223 (ii).

HURLEY, MR., FISHERY INSPECTOR, INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 543 (i).

——— Statement read (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 4968 (ii).

INSPECTORS, OVERSEERS, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 533 (i), 4228 (ii).

KEMP, ERNEST, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 135 (i).

MARGAREE FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENT : in Com. of Sup., 550 (i).

MUSSEL MUD *re* FISHERY REGULATIONS, 1893 : Ques. (Mr. *Farquharson*) 3307 (ii).

NOBLE BROS., AWARD *re* FISHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 4228, 4957 (ii).

——— PAPERS, *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 3926.

OYSTER CULTURE : in Com. of Sup., 555 (i).

——— FISHING IN P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 540.

——— PROTECTION REGULATIONS, P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 135 (i).

——— SHEDIAC BAY, LICENSES ISSUED, NAMES, DATES, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2473 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 746, 1444 (i).

P.E.I., SALMON AND LOBSTER HATCHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 4222 (ii).

——— FISHING GEAR, CONFISCATION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1440 (i).

——— PRINCE COUNTY FISHING LICENSES, NUMBER ISSUED : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1065 (i).

PRINCE, PROF., AND B.C. FISH CANNERS IN B.C. : Ques. (Mr. *Beland*) 449, 613 (i).

PROVINCIAL RIGHTS, PRIVY COUNCIL, JUDGMENT, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 534, 548 (i).

SEINE LICENSES ISSUED IN B. C., NUMBER, NAMES, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Earle*) 2680 (i).

SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4222 (ii).

FLAX SEED IMPORTED FROM U. S., AMOUNT, VALUE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 1682 (i).

FONTAINE, L. E., ALLOWANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4256 (ii).
FORT WILLIAM, INSPECTION OF COAL OIL: in Com. of Sup., 1148 (i).
——— *See* 'Coal Oil,' &c.
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 728 (i).
FRANCHISE ACT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4329 (ii).
FRAUDULENT SALES ACT, INSPECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Schell*) 744 (i).
FREE LIST, ARTICLES PLACED ON SINCE 1897: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 244 (i).
FREIGHT RATES ON RYS., REP. OF PROF. McLEAN: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 448 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Kemp*) 1205 (i).
FRENCH LANGUAGE IN COURT: *See* 'O'Keefe.'
FRENCH RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 574, 578 (i).
FRENCH TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH DEBATES: Remarks (Mr. *Morin*) in Com. of Sup., 4330 (ii).
FRIAR'S HEAD HARBOUR, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002.
FRUIT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 2585, 2622 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. No. 136 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 3307; 2°*, 4129; in Com., 4129; 3°*, 4136; Sen. Amts., 4702 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 10.)
FRUIT TRANSPORTATION, &c., EXCESSIVE CHARGES, RES. OF GEORGIAN BAY FRUIT GROWERS' ASS'N.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1109 (i).
FUMIGATING STATIONS FOR NURSERY STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
GALOPS CANAL, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4021, 4300 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 5020 (ii).
Game Preservation Act (unorganized territories) Amt. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 2941; 2°*, 3769; in Com., 3769; 3°*, 3769 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 12.)
GANANOQUE, DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 867 (i).
——— LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 809 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 442 (i).
GARDENERS, PROTECTION: *See* 'Market.'
GAS INSPECTION: in Com of Sup., 1201 (i).
——— *See* 'Inland Revenue.'
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); M. for Com., 4569, 4647; in Com., 4667; 3°*, 4667.
——— Ques. of Order: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 4656, 4665 (ii).
GASPÉ AS AN OCEAN PORT: *See* 'Paspebiac.'
GASPÉ PENINSULA, REMOVAL OF ROCK IN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
GATINEAU RIVER SLIDES: in Com. of Sup., 4782 (ii).
GAUDET, MR., COMPILING HISTORICAL DATA FOR ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 356 (i).
General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. No. 111 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1° m., 2849 (ii).
——— **(binder twine) B. No. 142** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1° m., 3623; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4246 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 11.)
G. O. C., INCREASE IN SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 614 (i).
——— RIGHT TO REP. TO IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 4250 (ii).
——— DIRECTOR, APPNMT., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
——— GEOLOGIST TO INT. BOUNDARY SURVEY, SALARY: in Com of Sup., 4250, 4948 (ii).
——— MAPS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 2659 (ii).
GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4298 (ii).
GEORGIAN BAY, FISH HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup. 4959 (ii).
——— POINTE AU BARIL ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
GERMAN DUTIES ON CAN. IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 156 (i).
——— TARIFF *re* NATIONS AND DEPENDENCIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 617 (i).
——— *See* 'Anglo-German,' &c.
GILBERT DREDGING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).
——— PAYMENTS TO FROM MAY TO DEC., 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2155 (ii).
——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.
GILMOUR P. O., DISMISSAL OF T. RICKETTS: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2224 (i).
GLACE BAY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
GLASGOW EXPOSITION, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 357 (i).
GODERICH HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i), 4640 (ii).
GOVT. BUILDINGS, &c., CONTRACT OR DAY LABOUR SYSTEM: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 670-734, 836-880 (i).
GOVT. BUSINESS, MORNING SESSIONS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3920 (ii).
——— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 961 (i).
——— PRECEDENCE ON WEDNESDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1278 (i), 2720 (ii).
——— *See* 'Business of the House,' 'Bills,' 'Procedure,' &c.
GOVT. CONTRACTS AND CURRENT WAGES CLAUSE, NUMBER AWARDED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Puttee*) 631 (i).
GOVT. EMPLOYEES, DISMISSALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 132 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bell*) 428 (i).
GOVT. POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 636-733, 836-880 (i).
GOVT. RY. EMPLOYEES, WAGES OF TRACKMEN, &c., prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) Neg. (Y. 33; N. 54) 3824 (ii).
GOVT. RYS., RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
——— *See* 'Railways,' 'I. C. R.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
GOV. GEN.'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 172 (i).
GOW, MR., SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
GRAIN, &C. IN ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX ELEVATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 612 (i).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.', &c.
——— IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN PORTS, QUANTITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 246, 782 (i).
Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain Bill.'
GRAIN INSPECTION ACT AMT. B.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3623 (ii).
GRAIN INSPECTION AT MONTREAL, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 450 (i).
——— INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 532, 1184 (i).
——— INSPECTION IN MAN., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2857 (ii).
——— SHIPMENTS FROM ONT. PORTS IN 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 246, 782 (i).
——— STANDARDS: in Com. of Sup., 4258 (ii).
——— TESTERS: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
GRANBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 644 (i).
GRAND ANSE BREAKWATER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
GRAND RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup. 4622 (ii).
G. T. RY. CO., RENTALS BY I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.', &c.
GRAND VALLEE PIER, QUE.: in Com of Sup., 1031 (i).
Grand Valley Traction Co.'s Change of Name B. No. 21 (Mr. *Heyd*) 1°*, 611; 2°*, 851; in Com., 1619; 3°*, 1620 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 91.)
GRAPES PURCHASED BY DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE, AMOUNTS RECEIVED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3151 (ii).
GRATUITY TO MRS. N. WHITE: in Com. of Sup., 4256 (ii).
GRAVING DOCKS, LEVIS, KINGSTON AND ESQUIMALT, WORKING EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4220 (ii).
Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 129 (Mr. *Taylor*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. No. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) M. to ref. Pet. back to Sel. Com., 2715, 3121; M. to introduce B., 3303; 1°*, 3622; on Order for 2°, 3866; 2° m., 4076; in Com., 4667; 3° m., 4690 (ii).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3125 (ii).
GRIST AND SAW MILLS FOR INDIANS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3057 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 644, 982 (i).
GUNNING COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 991.
HALF-BREED COMMISSION EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4954 (ii).
HALIFAX AND S. WESTERN RY. EXTENSION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5064 (ii).
HALIFAX, BRANCH POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).
——— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
——— HARBOUR LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (ii).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).
Halifax Industrial School Act Amt. B. No. 152 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 4036; 2°*, 4701; 3°*, 4702 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 13.)
HALIFAX, LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 2859 (ii).
——— PROVISIONAL GARRISON: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).
HAMILTON AND GUELPH MAIL CONTRACTS, TENDERS, &C.: M. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) for Copy,* 3724 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4465.
HAMILTON WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i), 4642 (ii).
——— DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).
——— FOREMEN, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 604, 1275 (i), 4642 (ii).
——— MAR. PROVS., GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 4142, 4213 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i), 4626 (ii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i), 4210, 4616 (ii).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1217, (i), 4217, 4637 (ii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i), 4211, 4625.
——— QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1031, (i), 4213, 4629 (ii).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 3283 (ii).
HARDY BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4643 (ii).
HAWBOLD'S COVE, COST OF BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 132 (i).
HAY PURCHASED FOR WAR OFFICE IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).
HEATING, LIGHTING, &C., DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4189 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
'HERALD,' 'GLOBE,' &C., AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 810 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 615 (i).
HERRING COVE BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
HERRINGS SLAUGHTERED, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4223 (ii).
HICKS-BEACH, SIR MICHAEL, BUDGET SPEECH: *See* 'Preferential Trade.'
HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 180 (i).
——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 209 (i), 4326 (ii).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 3862, 5039 (ii).
HILLHOUSE, A. P., CHICKENS PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3409 (ii).
HILTON, ST. JOSEPH'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.

HOGS AND SHEEP SLAUGHTERED, COMPENSATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4968 (ii).

HOLSTEIN, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3875, 4925, 4933 (ii).

HOPEWELL CAPE PIER, DATE OF COMPLETION, &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1444 (i).

HORNE, MR. R. T., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2068 (i).

HORSES IMPORTED IN MAN. AND N.W.T., CUSTOMS DUTY : Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1206

Debate : (Mr. *Charlton*) 1207 ; (Mr. *Scott*) 1208 ; (Mr. *Gilmour*) 1209 ; (Mr. *Osler*) 1210 ; (Mr. *Holmes*) 1211 ; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1212 ; (Mr. *Heyd*) 1212 ; (Mr. *Davis*) 1214 ; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 1216 ; (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 1216 (i).

HORSES PURCHASED IN N.W.T. FOR FOURTH CONTINGENT : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1989 (i), 2679 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS :

ADDINGTON ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 214, 560 (i), 4137 (ii).

BEAUCE ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

——— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 610 (i).

BILLS, assented to, 5083 (ii).

——— PROCEDURE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 2481 (i).

——— remarks (Mr. *Costigan*) 611 (i).

——— WITHDRAWN : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4970 (ii).

BRUCE CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

BURRARD CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

CHARLOTTE CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

CHICOUTIMI ELECTORAL DISTRICT, DISMISSAL OF PET. : (Mr. *Speaker*) 2219 (i).

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE, ACCOMMODATION, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2293 (i).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' CERTIFICATES : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——— Notification of Vacancies (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

CORNWALL CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

DURHAM CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

ELEVATORS, HOUSE OF COMMONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4137 (ii).

EMPLOYEES OF HOUSE OF COMMONS : Remarks (Mr. *Morin*) 5056 (ii).

INTERNAL ECONOMY COM. : Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 154 (i).

KINGSTON ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

LAVAL ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

LEGISLATION : in Com. of Sup., 234 (i), 4326 (ii).

LIBRARY, BOOKS, &C., RETENTION BY MEMBRRS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 4644 (ii).

——— 2ND REP. OF COM. : M. (Mr. *Scott*) to conc., 4644 (ii).

——— MESSENGERS' SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).

——— PRINTING, &C., H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 4327 (i).

——— REPORT : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 7 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

LISGAR CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——— Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 881 (i).

——— REVISING OFFICER, DATE OF APPNMT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 3152 (ii).

L'ISLET ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

MEMBERS ADDRESSING THE CHAIR : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 113 (i).

——— introduced, 3, 4, 68, 121, 610 (i).

——— NEW, CERTIFICATE OF ELECTIONS : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 785 (i), 3918, 4354, 5030 (ii).

MONTREAL (ST. JAMES) ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ONTARIO CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

OTTAWA CITY, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

OXFORD ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

PETITIONS, IRREGULARITY OF : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2145, 2218 (i)

PRIVATE BILLS, EXTENSION OF TIME : M. (Mr. *Flint*) 780 (i), 4464 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 4567-8 (ii).

PROROGATION, LETTERS FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC. : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5032 (ii).

——— Remarks, 4968, 5081 (ii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., MEETINGS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 439 (i).

——— M. to print Evidence *re* Gaudry (Mr. *Kemp*) 4343 (ii).

——— WITNESSES *re* YUKON CHARGES : in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).

QUEEN'S (P.E.I.) ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

RAILWAY COM. : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to add Name, 1278 (i).

SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED AS CIVIL SERVANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 619 (i).

STATIONERY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4326 (ii).

TERREBONNE CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

TWO MOUNTAINS CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

——— Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1323 (i).

VACANCIES : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

VENTILATION OF HOUSE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4140 (ii).

VICTORIA, B.C , CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

——— Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 65 (i).

YORK, N. B., CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3.

Hudson's Bay and North-west Ry. Co.'s B. No. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°**, 2145 ; 2°**, 2474 (i) ; in Com., and 3°**, 3150 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 63.)

HUDSON WHARF, QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).

HUMPHREY, HIRAM, POSTMASTER AT MCDONALD'S CORNERS, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2676 (ii).

HUNTSVILLE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).

HURDMAN, MAJ., ALLOWANCE *re* S. A. WAR: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (ii).

HURLEY, MR., FISHERY INSPECTOR, INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 543 (i).

——— Statement read (Mr. *Sutherland*, Oxford) 4968 (ii).

Huron and Erie Canal Co's. incorp. B. No. 80 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1902 (i); 2°*, 2676 (ii).

HUTTON–HUGHES, RET. ORDERED BY HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria, 446 (i).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS ON THE LAKES: in Com. of Sup., 527, 533 (i).

Immigration Act (medical attendance) Amt. B. No. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 2850; 2°*, 3734; in Com., 3734; 3° m., 3927; Sen. Amts., 4801 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 14.)

IMMIGRATION:
- AGENTS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2988
- AMOUNT SPENT FROM 1891 TO 1901, AGENTS EMPLOYED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 153.
- BOER IMMIGRATION, PAR. IN *Mail and Empire*: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 3407 (ii).
- BUILDINGS, DOM., FURNITURE, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974 (i).
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION, REP. OF COM., FIRST PART: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 451.
- CONTINGENCIES, PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4248 (ii).
- DEVLIN, C. R., COR. *re* LETTERS MAKING STATEMENTS AGAINST MEMBERS: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Wilson*) 154 (i).
- —— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 451, 635, 1204 (i).
- —— On M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2946 (ii).
- —— PAR. IN *Witness*: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 619 (i).
- IMMIGRATION, AMOUNT SPENT FROM 1891 TO 1901, AGENTS EMPLOYED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 153 (i).
- —— DURING 1892: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 244 (i).
- —— DURING 1902, JAN. 1 TO MAY 1: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*, Ontario) 4697 (ii).
- —— MR. PEDLEY'S EXAMINATION BEFORE COM.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 369 (i).
- —— ITALIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3927 (ii).
- JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2658 (ii).
- ORIENTAL, REP. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 444 (i).
- —— Rep. presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 451 (i).
- PEDLEY: *See* 'Immigration.'
- WELSH IMMIGRATION FROM PATAGONIA, MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S REMARKS *re* CLIMATE OF CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Ont.*) 1441 (i).
- —— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 242 (i).
- —— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 240 (i).
- —— *See* 'Interior.'

IMPERIAL BUDGET SPEECH: *See* 'Preferential Trade.'

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS IN LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).

—— *See* 'Intercolonial Conference,' &c.

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE FOR CAN. IN LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 364 (i).

—— PRIVY COUNCIL APPEALS. *See* 'Colonial.'

IMPLEMENTS, AGRICULTURAL, N.W.T. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3054 (i).

—— *See* 'Indians,' &c.

IMPORTS FROM U. S. FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL VALUE: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 782 (i).

Indian River Railway Co.'s incorp. B. No. 14 (Mr. *Béland*) 1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1624 (i); Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii). (2 *Edward*

INDIANS:
- AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, GRANTS TO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3048 (ii).
- B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (ii).
- —— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 3059 (ii).
- —— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3058, 4247 (ii).
- CORNWALL: in Com. of Sup., 3038 (ii).
- DESTITUTE, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3056.
- GOW, MR., SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
- HALF-BREED COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4954 (ii).
- INDIAN DEPT.: in Com of Sup., 3035 (ii).
- —— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 3060 (ii).
- —— PRINTING, STATIONERY: in Com. of Sup., 3060 (ii).
- —— TREATY NO. 3, AMOUNT CLAIMED BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1681 (i).
- LEDUC, MR. J. D., INSPECTOR *re* LIQUOR LICENSES AND INDIANS; in Com. of Sup., 3049, 3061.
- LIQUOR TRAFFIC, SUPPESSION, LEGAL EXPENSES *re* INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3049, 3061 (ii).
- MAN. AND N. W. T., AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3054 (ii).
- —— GRIST AND SAW MILLS: in Com. of Sup., 3057 (ii).
- MANITOULIN ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3041 (ii).
- MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST COMMISSION, REVENUE RECEIVED, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*) 481 (i).
- MUNCEY, GRANT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3048 (ii).
- N. B., MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).
- N. W. T., AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3054 (ii).
- N. S., MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3050, 3081 (ii).
- ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 3037, 3043.
- —— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3037 (ii).
- —— SCHOOLS, &C.: in Com of Sup., 3045 (ii).
- P. E. I., MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3053 (ii).
- RESTIGOUCHE, INVESTIGATION *re* COMPLAINTS, REP. OF INSPECTOR: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Fowler*) 2473 (i).
- ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 247 (i).
- SEED GRAIN FOR INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3050 (ii).
- —— N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 3056 (ii).
- SIOUX: in Com of Sup., 3056 (ii).
- TREATY, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 3057 (ii).

INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES, PRESERVATION TREATY, &C.: Par. in Newspapers (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 2146 (i).

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS. B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 3059.

INGONISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE:
- COAL OIL INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1148, 1203 (i).
- —— QUES. OF ORDER (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*): Ruling, 1170 (i).
- —— *re* N. W. T. AND MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 5055 (ii).
- —— Memorandum read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5074 (ii).
- —— PORT ARTHUR, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2931, 3300 (ii).
- DISTILLERY, DUTY, EXTRA: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
- ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1202 (i).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*

EXCISE, INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1147 (i), 4258, 4961 (ii).
GAS INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (i).
GRAIN INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 532, 1184 (i).
——— MAN., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2857 (ii).
——— MONTREAL, CERTIFICATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 450 (i).
GRAIN STANDARDS: in Com. of Sup., 4258 (ii).
——— TESTERS: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
INLAND REVENUE: in Com. of Sup., 175 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 121 (i).
INSPECTORS OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, SALE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 175 (i).
METRICAL INSTRUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (i).
METRIC SYSTEM, WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (i), 4961 (ii).
THREE RIVERS, INSPECTOR GRAVEL, AMOUNTS PAID, COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2457 (i).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, EXCISE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4961 (ii).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: in Com. of Sup., 1184.

INSURANCE, GENERAL EXPENSES; in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE WITH IMP. GOVT., COR., &c.; on M. for Com. of Sup., 4704 (ii).
Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4704; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4724; (Mr. *Brock*) 4731; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4735; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4741; (Mr. *Fisher*) 4744; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4748; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 4753; (Mr. *Lennox*) 4756 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS IN LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).
——— DESPATCHES, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4426-7 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

ACCIDENTS THROUGH CATTLE ON TRACK, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Erb*) 883 (i).
ADDITIONAL SIDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3811, 4792; conc., 5037 (ii).
AIR BRAKES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3812 (ii).
BARBOUR, JOHN, DISMISSAL, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2853 (ii).
BRIDGES, STRENGTHENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3809, 4792 (ii).
CANSO FERRY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4294 (ii).
——— *See* 'Mulgrave,' &c.
CAR COUPLERS: in Com. of Sup., 4794 (ii).
CHAUDIERE JUNCTION ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).
CLASSIFYING OF EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).
CLERGUE'S CONTRACT, STEEL RAILS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3781 (ii).
——— *See* 'Rails,' &c.
COAL PURCHASED IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 883 (i).
DITCHING ALONG FARM LANDS IN TEMISCOUATA, DAMAGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2677.
ENGINEERS, &c., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4292 (ii).
EXPENDITURE, INQUIRY BY PUB. ACCTS. COM.: Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 3251 (ii).
FIRE INSURANCE, &c., ON LOCOMOTIVES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2854 (ii).
FREIGHT RATES ON PIG IRON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 782 (i).
GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).
HALIFAX, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

HORNE, MR. R. T., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2068 (i).
JOUGHINS, MR., REP. *re* LOCOMOTIVES: in Com. of Sup., 3416 (ii).
——— *See* 'Mechanical Supt.', &c.
KING BROS., CLAIM *re* DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3307 (ii).
LEVIS, ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3810.
——— LOCAL TRAIN SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3426, 3816.
——— CONSTRUCTION, STEAMING QUALITIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 445 (i).
——— AND RY. CARS PURCHASED FROM 1896 TO 1902: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 2681 (ii).
——— *See* 'Rolling Stock,' &c.
MCMANUS, MR., LETTER *re* PURCHASE OF TIES, &c.: Remarks in Com., of Sup., 3502, 3568.
——— *See* 'Ties,' &c.
MACHINERY, TOOLS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3812, 4297 (ii).
MECHANICAL SUPERINTENDENT, REPORTS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3813 (ii).
——— *See* 'Joughins,' &c.
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE, NEW SPANS: in Com. of Sup., 3812 (ii).
MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4797 (ii).
——— SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
——— NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 614 (i).
MULGRAVE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1683 (i).
——— *See* 'Canso,' &c.
NORTH SYDNEY IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
——— *See* 'Sydney,' 'I. C. R.', &c.
OFFICIALS, NUMBER, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 132 (i).
OPERATING EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4310 (ii).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3809.
PASSES ISSUED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 810.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4120 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Clarke*) 4403 (ii).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3812.
POINT TUPPER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
P. E. I. AND I. C. R. RYS., ACCOUNTS, VOUCHERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).
——— REVENUE AND CAPITAL ACCOUNT FOR 1901, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).
PRIVATE CARS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
RAILS: in Com. of Sup., 3781; conc., 5035 (ii).
RAILS DELIVERED BY MR. F. H. CLERGUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 746, 781, 1439 (i).
RAILS, ROLLING STOCK, &c., PURCHASED IN 1901, O. Cs., CONTRACTS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 885 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barker*) 886 (i).
——— *See* 'Locomotives.'
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE, AID TO: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 5070 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
——— FREIGHT YARD: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
ROCKINGHAM, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4798 (ii).
ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 3813, 4297, 4783; conc., 5037 (ii).
——— CONDITION, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 3724 (ii).
ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX ELEVATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX ELEVATORS. AMOUNT OF GRAIN HANDLED, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 612, 883 (i).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).
STE. MONIQUE STATION, ACCOUNTS UNPAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 744 (i).
ST. OCTAVE STATION, COST, &C.: Ques.(Mr. *Monk*) 2222 (i).
SHIMS PURCHASED IN 1901, PRICE PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1438 (i).
STATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).
SUSSEX ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 3829 (ii).
SYDNEY, ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 3805, 4789 (ii).
TANTRAMAR MARSH WASHOUT, REPAIRS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1108 (i).
TEMISCOUATA RY., TRAFFIC FACILITIES, 1900-1 : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1860 (i).
TIES, PURCHASE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 444, 2065 (i).
TRACKMEN'S WAGES, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3702 ; Neg. (Y. 54 ; N. 23) 3824 (ii).
TRUCKS OF CARS, &C., PURCHASED : Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2852 (ii).
TRURO ROUNDHOUSE, REBUILDING, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii).
——— STATION, REBUILDING : Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii).
——— *See* 'Railways,' &c.

INTERIOR :
BANFF, N.W.T., MUSEUM BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).
——— NATIONAL PARK, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
BOUNDARY SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).
C. P. R., LANDS PATENTED TO MARCH, 1902, ACREAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1988 (i).
——— TAXES, EXEMPTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1988 (i).
DEASE AND LIARD MINERS, RELIEF TO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
DOM. LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 4252 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
——— SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).
FONTAINE, L. E., ALLOWANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4256 (ii).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 4250 (ii).
——— DIRECTOR, APPNMT., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
——— MAPS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 2659 (i).
INTERIOR DEPT., CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 202 (i).
——— DEPTL. OFFICIALS, DATE OF APPNMT., SALARIES, &C., 1896-1901 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 961 (i).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 3061.
——— DEPT.: Rep. presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 100.
——— ILLUSTRATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 4351 (ii).
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 4250 (ii).
LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOL LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 4252 (ii).
——— SALES, &C., COR., O. CS., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 154 (i).
MAPS, ENGRAVING, LITHOGRAPHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4954 (ii).
MILLER CREEK CONCESSIONS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4465 (ii).
——— Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4426-7 (ii).
N. W. T. GOVT., REGISTRARS : in Com. of Sup., 4251 (ii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
N.W.T. GOVT., PROV. AUTONOMY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3064-3118 (i).
——— SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 4251, 4948 (ii).
PORTER, DR., CLAIM : conc., 5033 (ii).
RAILWAY LANDS, N. W. TERS., ACREAGE PATENTED, UNPATENTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2677 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN SETTLERS, RELIEF TO : in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
SCHOOLS, &C., N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4948.
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii)
TIMBER LIMITS, SALE BY GOVT., NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1133 (i).
TOWN SITES, N.W.T., LAND GRANTS AND GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4404 (ii).
YUKON —CONCESSIONS, LEASES, &C., APPLICATIONS, O. CS. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 154.
——— TIMBER LICENSES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 2472 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 3509 (ii).
——— TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4977 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 241 (i).
——— O. Cs., PLANS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2472 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2456 (i).
——— *See* 'Immigration,' 'Man.,' 'N. W. T.' &c.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COM.: Rep. presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 154 (i).
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 4250, 4948 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 316 ; on Order for 2°, 1110 (i).
IONA WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES : in Com. of Sup., 4331.
IRREGULARITIES *re* CENSUS OF 1891 : in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
ISLE AU COUDRE WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Angers*) 3409 (ii).
ISLE AUX GRUES WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1047.
ISLE OF ORLEANS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
ITALIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3927 (ii).
JACKSON, MR. WM., DISMISSAL, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 809 (i).
——— *See* 'Red Horse.'
JACQUES CARTIER CO., DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3285 (ii).
JAMAICA, REPEAL OF TAX ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 622 (i).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59 (Mr. *McCormick*) 1°*, 1490 ; 2°*, 1680 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 65.)
JAPANESE EMPLOYMENT, YUKON : Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 242 (i).
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION : Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2658 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 1323 (i).
——— *See* 'Chinese,' 'Oriental.'

JAPAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
——— CAN. REPRESENTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2225 (i).
Joint Stock Companies incorp. B. No. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 4245; 2°*, 4803; in Com., 4803, 5056; 3°*, 5064 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 15.)
JOLIETTE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c., CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2068 (i), 2856 (ii).
JOUGHINS, MR., REP. *re* I. C. R. LOCOMOTIVES: in Com. of Sup., 3416 (ii).
'JOUGHINS TRUCK:' *See* 'I. C. R. Trucks.'
JUDGES, MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4265 (ii).
JUDGES OF COUNTY COURTS, AGE LIMIT, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Tisdale*) 418 (i).
——— LEGISLATION *re* COMPULSORY RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 131 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt B. No. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) prop. Res., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°* of B., 3510; 2°*, 3939; in Com.. 3939; 3951; 3°*, 3951 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 16.)
JUDGES' RESIDENCES, YUKON, RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4190 (ii).
JUDGES' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
——— SUPERANNUATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214.
Judges' Supreme Court: *See* 'Supreme Court.'
JUSTICE:
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i), 3583 (ii).
——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4264 (ii).
BEAUCHAMP, OSCAR, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 158 (i).
BINDER TWINE: in Com. of Sup., 3593, 4963 (ii).
——— SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 410, 618, 885, 1429 (i).
B.C., CHIEF JUSTICESHIP, APPNMT., &c.: Remarks (*Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 611 (i).
B.C. PENITENTIARY, LAND PURCHASED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3619 (ii).
C. P. R. *vs.* ROY, PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENT: M. for copy (Mr. *Lemieux*) 499 (i).
COMMUTATIONS FOR ARSON, NUMBER, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 419 (i).
COUNTY COURT JUDGES, COMPULSORY RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 131 (i).
——— *See* 'Judges,' &c.
CRAIG, JUDGE, INTERVIEW *re* YUKON IRREGULARITIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 972 (i).
DAWSON, MR., INSPECTOR OF PENITENTIARIES, SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (ii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
DUGAS, JUDGE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST FROM MRS. COLLINET: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4193 (ii).
——— MEMO. OF MR. FULLER: Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 4536 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
EILBECK, MR., APPNMT. AS SHERIFF: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 745 (i).
EXCHEQUER COURT: in Com. of Sup., 229 (i).
FAREWELL, J. C., ACCOUNT *re* NORTH ONTARIO ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4269 (ii).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
JUDGES OF COUNTY COURTS, LEGISLATION *re* COMPULSORY RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 131 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Tisdale*) 418 (i).
——— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
JUSTICE, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 121 (i).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3593.
LAW BOOKS, JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (ii).
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, JR. JUDGE, PROVISION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
——— APPNMT. OF JR. JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4701 (ii).
LEGAL AGENTS, DEPT. OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3620 (ii).
LITIGATION EXPENSES, JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3620, 4266 (ii).
LUSSIER ARBITRATION *re* PENITENTIARY LAND, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4268 (ii).
MAN. JUDGES, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4265 (ii).
MANITOBA PENITENTIARY, LAND PURCHASED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3618 (ii).
NIPISSING ELECTIONS, PAYMENTS, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).
O'REGAN, JAS., SUPREME COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4965 (ii).
PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3617, 4267 (ii).
PRINCE ALBERT JAIL, LANDS PURCHASED: in Com. of Sup., 3620 (ii).
QUEEN'S AND KING'S COUNSEL APPOINTED SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3154 (ii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i)
——— COAL SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).
——— CONDUCT OF EMPLOYEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 153, 1445 (i).
——— INDEMNITY TO MR. NANTEL: M. for Ret.*, 2471 (i).
——— LAND PURCHASES: in Com. of Sup., 3617.
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE OF WARDEN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).
——— VET. SURGEON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3831 (ii).
STATUTES, REVISION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3622.
STRONG, CHIEF JUSTICE SIR HENRY, AMOUNT PAID *re* JUDICIAL COMMITTEE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1986 (i).
SUPREME COURT ACT, AMT. *re* MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 410 (i).
——— AD HOC JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4264.
——— JUDGES, LEAVE OF ABSENCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2224 (i).
——— POWER, APPEALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214, 217 (i).
——— QUEBEC, WRITS ISSUED, &c., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 442 (i).
YUKON, CROWN PROSECUTOR: in Com. of Sup., 3590 (ii).
——— JUDGES, LIVING AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3583, 4190 (ii).
——— *See* 'Dugas,' &c.
——— LAW LIBRARY, FREIGHT ON BOOKS: in Com. of Sup., 3590 (ii).
——— LEGAL ADVISER: in Com. of Sup., 3590 (ii).
——— PRISONERS, TRANSPORT, &c.: in Com. of Sup.. 3589 (ii).
——— SHERIFF'S FEES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).
——— TERRITORIAL COURT CLERK, LIVING ALLOWANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3587 (ii).
——— WITNESS AND JURY FEES: in Com. of Sup., 3590, 4267 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 599 (i), 4563 (ii).
KAMLOOPS, B.C., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
KAMOURASKA, ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
KAULBACH, MR., POSTMASTER AT MIDDLE MUSQUODOBOIT, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).
KEITH POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF LOCATION: in Com. of Sup., 4937 (ii).
KELLY, DOUGLAS & CO.'S TENDER *re* YUKON SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 4157 (ii).
KEMP, ERNEST, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 135 (i).
KENNEDY LAKE OUTLET: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
KING'S BIRTHDAY, OFFICIAL OBSERVANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2226 (i).
KING BROS., CLAIM *re* DAMAGES BY I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Laverge*) 3307 (ii).
KINGSTON, ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
—— LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, STRIKE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 4702 (ii).
—— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
—— *See* 'Justice,' &c.
KINGSVILLE PIER, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
KINKORA RY. ACCOMMODATION, RES. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 1569; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 66.)
Knapp Tubular Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. No. 75 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2607; 3°*, 2607 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 67.)
KNAUFF, H., PROMOTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4313.
LABORATORY, CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
—— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 213.
—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Mulock*) 121 (i).
—— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).
Labour Disputes Bill: *See* 'Railway Labour.'
LABOUR DISPUTE BILL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).
LABOUR IN MAN. *re* GRAIN, &c., CABLE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 247 (i).
LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRIC PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4299 (ii).
—— LOCK REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (ii).
—— MILL ST. PAVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4307.
—— WASTE WEIR: in Com. of Sup., 4307 (ii).
LA HAVE RIVER DREDGING; in Com. of Sup., 3285, 4213 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 103 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., 3131; 3°*, 3131 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 68.)
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 55 (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 1°*, 1323; 2°*, 1624 (1); in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 69.)
LAND GRANTS TO CONTINGENTS IN S. A., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1446 (i).
—— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
LANDRY, P.: *See* 'Circular,' &c.
Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 149 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3919; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4357 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 17.)
LAPRAIRIE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF A. THOMAS, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2221 (i).
LAROSE, JOS., INDEMNITY FOR DAMAGE AT CÔTE ST. LUC: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 622 (i).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
LAW BOOKS, JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (ii).
LEDUC, MR. J. D., INSPECTOR *re* LIQUOR LICENSES AND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3049, 3061 (ii).
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, APPNMT. OF JR. JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4701 (ii).
—— PROVISION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
LEGAL AGENTS, DEPT. OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3620 (ii).
—— *See* 'Justice,' &c.
LEGISLATION, B.C., DISALLOWANCE OF ACTS, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 137 (i).
LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 234 (i), 4326 (ii).
LESUEUR, MR., SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3904 (ii).
LETHBRIDGE, IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3867 (ii).
LÉVIS, ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3810 (ii).
—— CATTLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
—— LOCAL SERVICE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4297.
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).
LEWIS, MR., POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
LIBRARY OF PARLT., COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 128 (i).
—— BOOKS, &c., RETENTION BY MEMBERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 4644 (ii).
—— MESSENGERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4966.
—— PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4327 (ii).
—— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 7 (i).
—— 2ND REP. OF COM.: M. (Mr. *Scott*) to conc., 4644 (ii).
LIFE-SAVING REWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 514 (i).
—— AT PORT CREDIT: in Com. of Sup., 544 (i).
—— *See* 'Marine,' &c.
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup. 517 (i), 4222 (ii).
—— REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4222 (ii).
LIGHTKEEPERS' SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 518.
—— *See* 'Marine,' &c.

LIME KILN CROSSING : in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).

LINDSAY AND FENELON FALLS, ROAD BUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4270 (ii).

LINGAN BEACH, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

LINSEED OIL, IMPORTATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2932, 3299 (ii).

LIQUOR TRAFFIC, SUPPRESSION, LEGAL EXPENSES, *re* INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 3049, 3061 (ii).

LISGAR, CENSUS ENUMERATORS, PAYMENT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4113, 4429-31 (ii).

——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——— Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 881 (i).

——— REVISING OFFICER, DATE OF APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 3152 (ii).

L'ISLET, ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

LITIGATION EXPENSES, INTERIOR : in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

——— JUSTICE : in Com. of Sup., 3620, 4266 (ii).

LITTLE BRAS D'OR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

LIVINGSTONE'S COVE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1004.

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 3925 ; in Com. on Res., 4127 ; 1°* of B., 4129 ; 2°*, 4357 ; in Com., 4357 ; 3°*, 4361 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 18.)

LOCKEPORT HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).

LOCOMOTIVES FOR I.C.R., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3426, 3816 (ii).

LOCOMOTIVES AND RY. CARS PURCHASED FROM 1896 TO 1902 : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2681 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1108 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 445 (i).

——— *See* 'I. C. R.,' &c.

LOG SORTING, SLIDES AND BOOMS : in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).

LONDON, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).

——— ALLOTMENT OF ARMOURIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1446 (i).

LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE. *See* 'Halifax.'

LONGUEUIL GOVT. FARM, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2455 (i).

LOWER COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

LUMBER BOUGHT FOR WHARFS, N.B.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1027 (i).

LUNENBURG, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).

——— DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).

LUSSIER ARBITRATION *re* PENITENTIARY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4268 (ii).

'MCCORMICK' BINDER, CUSTOMS VALUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 441 (i).

MCDONALD'S CORNER, N.B., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2676 (ii).

MCDOUGALL, CAPT., LIFE-SAVING REWARD, APPLICATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 533 (i).

——— Remarks *re* Report of Speech, 962 (i).

MCFARLANE, W. J., APPNMT. AS CENSUS COMMISSIONER : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).

MACKENZIE & MANN, EXCHEQUER COURT AWARD : in Com. of Sup., 4860 (ii).

MCKINNON, MR. W. A., FRUIT INSPECTOR : in Com. of Sup., 2587, 2622 (ii).

MACLEOD COURT HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).

MCMANUS, LETTER *re* I.C.R. PURCHASES : in Com. of Sup., 3502-4, 3568 (ii).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

MCNISH, DONALD, LETTER *re* ONT. POLITICS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3567 (ii).

MACPHERSON, MR. D. F., INVESTIGATION *re* CENSUS OF 1891 : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).

MCPHERSON, WM., CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4353 (ii).

MABOU TO PORT HAWKESBURY TELEGRAPH LINE : in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).

MACHINERY, TOOLS, &c., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.' &c.

MAGAZINES, &c. IMPORTED FROM G.B. AND U.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2679 (ii).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).

——— CABLE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4769 (ii).

——— POSTAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).

——— STEAM COMMUNICATION, &c., STR. 'AMELIA' : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1680 (i).

MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY : in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).

MAIL CONTRACTS : in Com. of Sup., 3881, 3910 (ii).

MAIL SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).

——— *See* 'Post Office,' &c.

MAIL STEAMERS BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B., RATE OF SPEED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 130 (i).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).

MAJOR'S HILL PARK, GREENHOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. No. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1° m., 4245 ; 2° m., 4354 ; in Com., 4355, 4486 ; 3° m., 4578 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 19.)

Manitoba and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 96 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 2146 (i) ; 2°*, 2676 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3637 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 70.)

Man. and North-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 16 (Mr. *Douglas*) 1°*, 530 ; 2°*, 851 (i) ; in Com., 2667 ; 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 11.)

MANITOBA :

BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 4613 (ii).

CENSUS, DESCRIPTION OF METIS : Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1674 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 1902 (i).

——— LISGAR CHEQUES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

——— *See* 'Lisgar,' &c.

CYR, MR., CLERK OF WORKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 877 (i).

DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).

——— VESSELS, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4763 (ii).

FARM HANDS : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 247 (i).

GRAIN INSPECTION, CHANGES IN STANDARD : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2857 (ii).

GRIST AND SAW MILLS FOR INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 3057 (ii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 604, 1275 (i), 4642 (ii).
HORSES IMPORTED IN MAN. AND N.W.T., CUSTOMS DUTY: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1206 (i).
JUDGES, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4265 (ii).
LABOUR *re* CROPS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 247 (i).
LIQUOR ACT, CONSTITUTIONALITY OF REFERENDUM, LETTERS, &C. FROM MAN. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1682 (i).
——— PET. FROM PROHIBITION ALLIANCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 785 (i).
LISGAR, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— CERTIFICATE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 881 (i).
——— REVISING OFFICER, DATE OF APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 3152 (ii).
——— CENSUS ENUMERATORS, PAYMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4113, 4429 (ii).
MANITOBA LAKE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
MAPLE CREEK P.O., CHANGE OF LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 2853 (ii).
MOSSEY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1275 (i).
——— *See* 'Winnipegosis.'
PENITENTIARY, LAND PURCHASED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3618 (ii).
ROSEAU RIVER INDIAN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 247 (i).
ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
——— AMOUNT VOTED AND SPENT, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 440 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 247 (i).
ST. BONIFACE HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 406.
ST. FRANCIS LAKE OUTLET, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
SCHOOL LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 4252 (ii).
SCHOOL LANDS FUND, REDUCTION OF INTEREST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 2941 (ii).
——— REP. *re* INVESTIGATION: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3035 (ii).
——— SALE, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 154 (i).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 4768 (ii).
SUPREME COURT ACT, AMT. *re* MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 410 (i).
TIMBER LIMITS, SALE, NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1133.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 885 (1).
WINNIPEG, BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* RY. MANAGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 2942 (ii).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 833 (i), 4616 (ii).
——— ISOLATION HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 4613 (ii).
WINNIPEG LAKE, SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 528.
WINNIPEGOSIS, MOSSY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
WINNIPEG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 3868 (ii).
——— ELECTRIC RY. MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3874 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE OFFICIALS, DATE OF APPNMT., 1896-1901: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 961 (i).

MANITOULIN ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3041.
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 131 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 72.)
MANUFACTURES OF CAN., AGGREGATE AMOUNT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 747 (i).
MAPLE CREEK P.O., CHANGE OF LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 2853 (ii).
MAPS, ENGRAVING, LITHOGRAPHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4954 (ii).
MARANDA, ALFRED, EMPLYMT. OF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
MARBLE ROCK P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 3880 (ii).
MARCONI, CONSTRUCTION OF TELEGRAPH, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3908, 4338, 4772 (ii).
——— AGREEMENT *re* P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Mackinnon*) 1684 (i).
MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. CO.'S BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 530 (i).
MARGAREE FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENT: in Com. of Sup., 550 (i).
MARIA ISOLATED WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4630 (i).
MARIA STREET BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3289 (ii).
Marine Insurance Co.: *See* 'Royal.'
MARINE:
AIDS TO NAVIGATION IN B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5024 (ii).
BIOLOGICAL MARINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 516 (i).
BRONTE HARBOUR LIGHTHOUSE, ERECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 134 (i).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, RANGE LIGHTS, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).
COASTING TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5015 (ii).
'EUREKA' TUG, FURNISHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 567 (i).
GANANOQUE LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 809 (1).
——— *See* 'Red Horse.'
GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 506 (1), 4221 (ii).
HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 527, 533 (i).
LIFE-SAVING REWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 514 (i).
——— AT PORT CREDIT: in Com. of Sup., 514 (i).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 517 (i), 4222 (ii).
MCDOUGALL, CAPT., LIFE-SAVING REWARD, APPLICATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 533 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Report of Speech, 962 (i).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 527.
MARINE ENGINEERS ASS'N., PET. *re* STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 513, 534 (i).
MARINE AND FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4957.
MASTERS AND MATES, EXAMINATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 513 (i).
METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
'NEWFIELD,' STR.: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 4221 (ii).
RED HORSE SHOAL LIGHT, KEEPER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 442 (i).
——— *See* 'Gananoque.'
REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 129 (i).
'ROTHESAY,' STR., REMOVAL OF WRECK: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION, AIDS TO: in Com. Sup., 518 (i), 5024 (ii).
SANDHILLS, P.E.I., RANGE LIGHTS, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).
SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 527.
'STANLEY,' STR., REPAIRING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 520 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT, AND PET. FROM MARINE ENGINEERS NATIONAL ASS'N.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 513, 534 (i).
STEAMERS CONSTRUCTED IN SCOTLAND, OUTFITTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
TIDAL SERVICE, BAY OF FUNDY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 515 (i).
TIDAL WATERS, DOM. AND PROVINCIAL RIGHTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Farquharson*) 1861 (i).
'TIVERTON,' SS., GROUNDING, INQUIRY *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2856 (ii).
TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 527.
TYRWHITT, MR. R. E., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
UPPER LAKES LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 519 (i).
WHARFAGE, RATES AND CHARGES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4634–5 (ii).

Maritime Stock Breeders' Association B. No. 159 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1°*, 4344; 2° m., 4612; in Com., 4612; 3°*, 4612 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 73.)

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3639; Neg. (Y. 33; N. 71) 3666 (ii).
MARTINIQUE AND ST. VINCENT, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5031 (ii).
MARYSVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
MASTERS AND MATES, EXAMINATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 513 (i).
MATHESON, MR., SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
MEAFORD HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
MEAT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture.'
MECHANICAL SUPERINTENDENT, I.C.R., REPORTS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3813 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
MEDALS *re* MILITIA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 4262.
MEDALS TO 'ROTHESAY BLUES' AND COLCHESTER REGIMENTS, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4698-9 (ii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (ii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 3051 (ii).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 3037 (ii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 3053 (ii).

Medical Council in Canada Establishment B. No. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) 1° m., 408; 2° m., 1110; ref. to Sel. Com., 1131 (i); in Com. of the Whole, 2474; (remarks) 4245; in Com., 4438; 3° m,, 4441; Agreed to (Y. 76; N. 16) 4463; Sen. Amts., 4803 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 20.)

MEDICAL COUNCIL IN CAN. ESTABLISHMENT B. No. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) 2° m., 1110 (i).
Debate: (Mr. *Macdonald, East Huron*) 1118; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1122; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 1126; (Mr. *Monk*) 1129; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1129; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1129; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1130; (Mr. *Hughes, Ontario*) 1131; (Mr. *Fisher*) 1131; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 1132 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3925 (ii).

Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 63 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 74.)

Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 88 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 1986; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 75.)

MEMBERS, ADDRESSING THE CHAIR: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 113 (i).
——— INTRODUCED, 3, 4, 68, 121, 610 (i).
——— NEW, CERTIFICATE OF ELECTIONS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
——— REMARKS CHECKED: (Mr. *Speaker*) 3924 (ii).
MESS. FROM HIS EX., 121, 154, 785 (i), 3918, 4354, 5030 (ii).
MESSENGERS, &C., H. OF C., TRANSPORTATION TO HOMES: *See* 'Employees,' &c.
METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 175 (i).
MÉTIS, DESCRIPTION IN CENSUS BULLETIN: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1674 (i).
——— *See* 'Census, &c.
METRICAL INSTRUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (i).
METRIC SYSTEM, WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: in Com. of Sup., 4961 (ii).

Metropolitan Bank incorp. B. No. 144 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 76.)

MIDDLETON, GEN., REP. *re* REBELLION OF 1885: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).
MIDLAND, HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1237 (i).
——— POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).

MILITIA:
ABRAHAM, PLAINS OF, RIGHTS RESERVED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3409 (ii).
ANNUAL CAMPS, DRILLS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2532, 4260 (ii).
ARMOURIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 861 (i), 4259.
ARMS AND AMMUNITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2532 (ii).
ARSENALS IN THE DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 2565, 4261 (ii).
BEDFORD RIFLE RANGE: conc., 5032 (ii).
CANADIAN CASUALTIES IN S.A., TELEGRAM READ (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 2191 (i).
CAN. CONTINGENT, PAR. IN 'LA PATRIE': Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1762 (i).
CARTRIDGE FACTORY, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
COLCHESTER REGIMENT, PETS. *re* MEDALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4699 (ii).
COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, CADET CORPS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 240 (i).
COLONIAL TROOPS IN DEFENCE OF THE EMPIRE: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 785 (i).
COMMISSIONS, TO CAN. OFFICERS IN BRITISH ARMY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 419 (i).
——— ON DISBURSEMENTS FOR IMP. AUTHORITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1065 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1063 (i).
——— S.A. CONSTABULARY, APPLICATIONS, SELECTIONS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 528 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 243 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

CONDUCT OF CANADIAN SOLDIERS, PAR. IN 'DAILY NEWS': Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2069, 2088 (i).

CONTINGENTS FOR S.A., EXPENSE OF EQUIPMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1684 (i).

CORONATION CONTINGENT: in Com. of Sup., 4262.

——— MILITIA APPOINTMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 4647 (ii).

——— REPRESENTATIVES, &C., ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Porter*) 3835 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2459; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 2469 (i).

COTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGE, INDEMNITY TO J. LAROSE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 622 (i).

COURTS MARTIAL IN CAN. MILITIA, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 740 (i).

DUNDAS ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 716 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 2565, 4261 (ii).

FENIAN RAID MEDALS, ISSUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1109 (i).

G.O.C., INCREASE IN SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 614 (i).

——— RIGHT TO REP. TO IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i)

HALIFAX PROVISIONAL GARRISON: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).

HORSES PURCHASED IN N.W. CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1989 (i).

——— FOURTH CONTINGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2679 (ii).

HURDMAN, MAJOR, ALLOWANCE *re* S.A. WAR: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (ii).

HUTTON-HUGHES, RET. ORDERED BY HSE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 446 (i).

LAND GRANTS TO S. A. CONTINGENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1446 (i), 3831 (ii).

LONDON DRILL SHED, ALLOTMENT OF ARMOURIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1446 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).

MEDALS *re* MILITIA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (ii).

MIDDLETON, GEN., REP. *re* REBELLION OF 1885: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).

MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 1132 (i), 4259, 4947 (ii).

——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 2562.

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 1322 (i).

——— PROPERTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2549, 4260 (ii).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 2548 (ii).

——— STORES: in Com. of Sup., 2532 (ii).

MONTREAL RIFLE RANGE, AMOUNT EXPENDED, TENDERERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).

MUSKETRY AND CLOTHING STORES: in Com. of Sup., 2532 (ii).

OFFICERS OF MILITIA, TRAINING, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2682 (ii).

PAY AND ALLOWANCE FOR MILITIA FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i), 2498 (ii).

PENSIONS TO CANADIANS *re* S. A. WAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2459 (i).

——— BRITISH ARMY: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2629.

PERMANENT FORCE AND ACTIVE MILITIA CORPS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).

——— TOTAL COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 409 (i).

"PETERS" TARGET AT LONDON CAMP, REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 446 (i).

PROMOTIONS IN MILITIA FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 1134 (i).

RECRUITING OF TROOPS, &C., COR. BETWEEN HIS EX., CAN. GOVT., AND G.B.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 137 (i).

REMOUNTS, SUPPLIES, &C. FOR MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 2559 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

RIFLE ASSOCIATION, GRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2561 (ii).

——— REGULATIONS, PAMPHLET, FRENCH TRANSLATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 2223 (i).

RIFLE PRACTICE FOR CANADIAN SCHOOL BOYS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 3155 (ii).

RIFLE RANGES, LAND PURCHASES: in Com. of Sup., 2566 (ii).

——— *See* 'Bedford,' &c.

ROSS RIFLES, FREE ENTRY, &C.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4973 (ii).

——— *See* 'Ross Rifle Bill.'

'ROTHESAY BLUES,' PETS. *re* MEDALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4698 (ii).

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 2562; conc., 5033 (ii).

——— APPLICATION *re* CORONATION CONTINGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 3637 (ii).

——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 4261 (ii).

——— GYMNASIUM, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 729.

——— REP. OF BOARD OF VISITORS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 443 (i).

SIEVERT, PRIVATE, ALLOWANCE TO FAMILY: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).

SMALL-POX OUTBREAK AMONG TROOPS IN S.A.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Ontario*) 1446 (i).

SOCKS FOR THIRD CONTINGENT IN S.A., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 3638 (ii).

STAFF COURSE AT KINGSTON: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).

SUSSEX ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 862, 866 (i).

TARGET SHOOTING: *See* 'Rifle Practice.'

TASSIE, MAJOR, RETIREMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 241 (i).

VALLEYFIELD RIOTS, MILITIA EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4260 (ii).

VANCOUVER, B.C., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4186 (ii).

VANWAGNER, LT.-COL., REMOVAL, INVESTIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 616.

WINDMILL, BATTLE, PENSIONS GRANTED FOR: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 3724 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 238 (i).

——— *See* 'S.A. War,' &c.

MILL COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).

MILLER CREEK CONCESSIONS, &C., TEL. READ (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4426-7 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4465 (ii).

MILTON POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133 (i).

MINERS, DEASE AND LIARD, RELIEF TO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).

MINISTERIAL CHANGES, EXPLANATION: Remarks on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 155 (i).

MINISTERS AT THE CORONATION: *See* 'Coronation,' &c.

MINT: *See* 'Royal.'

MINUDIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

MIRAMICHI BRIDGE, I. C. R., NEW SPANS: in Com. of Sup., 3812, 4794 (ii).

Molsons Bank Pension Fund incorp. B. No. 109 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3547; in Com., and 3°*, 4075 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 77.)

MONCTON AND CHARLOTTETOWN RY. SHOPS, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 614 (i).

——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4797 (ii).

——— SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).

——— *See* 'I. C. R.', &c.

'MONITOR,' SS., QUARANTINE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
MONTAGUE, LOWER, ATKIN'S WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
MONTGOMERY, GENERAL, ERECTION OF MONUMENT, &c. AT QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 129 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2681 (ii).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2054; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 85) 2064 (i).
——— **No. 148** (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 3919; 2°*, 4578 (ii).
MONTREAL, BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 708 (i).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 670.
——— HARBOUR BOARD, APPNMT. OF MR. DORAN: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3920 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, STE. MARY'S CURRENT: in Com. of Sup., 608 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. No. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1° m., 2714; 2°*, 2889; in Com., 3342; recom., 4412; 3°*, 4423. (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 79.)
——— P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 3869 (ii).
——— BRANCH P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4564 (ii).
——— RIFLE RANGES, AMOUNT EXPENDED, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).
——— *See* 'Coté St. Luc.'
——— ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
Montreal and St. Lawrence Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 48 (Mr. *Madore*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3637 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 78.)
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. No. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2676; in Com., 4423, 4515, 4568; 3°*, 4569 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 80.)
MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST COMMISSION, REVENUE RECEIVED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*) 481 (i).
Moosonee, Bishop of, incorp. B. No. 126 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 3407; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4124 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 81.)
MORTON P. O., ABSTRACTION FROM RPGISTERED LETTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).
MOSSEY RIVER, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1275 (i).
MULGRAVE IMPROVEMENTS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
MULGRAVE AND POINT TUPPER FERRY, SERVICE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 1683 (i).
——— *See* 'N.S.', &c.
MUNCEY INDIANS, GRANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 3048.
MURRAY BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1051 (i).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 3830, 3862, 3996, 4282, 4292, 4918]; conc., 5039 (ii).
MUSKETRY AND CLOTHING STORES; in Com. of Sup., 2532 (ii).
MUSQUODOBOIT, MIDDLE: *See* 'Kaulbach.'
MUTCH, W.: *See* Wellington.
MUTTON SHIPMENTS BY SS. HALIFAX, INDEMNITY TO MR. WHEATLEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695.
NANTEL, TREFFLÉ, INDEMNITY TO, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2471 (i).
NATIONAL ART GALLERY, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. No. 154 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 4121; 2°*, 4484; in Com., 4484; 3°*, 4484 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 23.)
NEGRO POINT, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1031.
NEIL'S HARBOUR, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 860 (i).
Nepigon Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 82 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 1985 (i).
——— **B. No. 101** (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3865 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 82.)
NEWBORO POSTMASTER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3908.
NEW BRUNSWICK:
ALMA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
BATHURST, COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4124 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, CHARGES *re* NEGLIGENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 4700 (ii).
BAXTER, GEO. E., ANDOVER, CHICKENS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).
BAY DU VIN WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i), 4178 (ii).
CAMPBELLTON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 844 (i), 4626 (ii).
CAPE TORMENTINE, CREOSOTED TIMBER WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4627 (ii).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
——— MEMORIAL *re* COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1018 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
CHANCE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1024 (i).
CHARLOTTE, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
DIPPER HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
DIVORCE COURT: in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
EEL RIVER STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
FISH HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 551 (i).
GRAND ANSE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i), 4626 (ii).
HOPEWELL CAPE PIER, DATE OF COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1444.
HUMPHREY, HIRAM, POSTMASTER AT MCDONALD'S CORNERS, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2676 (ii).
INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).
LUMBER BOUGHT FOR WHARFS: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1027 (i).
MARYSVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 636.
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SPANS: in Com. of Sup., 3812, 4794 (ii).
MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4797 (ii).
——— SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
——— NUMRER OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 614 (i).

NEW BRUNWICK—*Con.*

NEGRO POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
NORTH HEAD BREAKWATER, ESTIMATED COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1441 (i).
OROMOCTO RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4213 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1030 (i), 4628.
OYSTER CULTURE IN SHEDIAC HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 746, 1444, 2473 (i).
PARTRIDGE ISLAND PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4628.
POINT WOLFE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
RAILWAY LINES IN N.B., TRACINGS, &c.: M. for Plans* (Mr. *Costigan*) 961 (i).
RESTIGOUCHE INDIANS, INVESTIGATION *re* COMPLAINTS, REP. OF INSPECTOR: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Fowler*) 2473 (i).
RICHIBUCTO PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1026 (i).
——— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1439.
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
ROUND HILL POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1987 (i).
ST. JOHN, DOM. BUILDINGS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
——— AND HALIFAX, ELEVATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3516 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 612, 883 (i).
——— IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i), 4178 (ii).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).
ST. JOHN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4628–9 (ii).
ST. JOHN RIVER WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1030.
SALMON RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4628 (ii).
SUSSEX ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 862, 866 (i).
——— ENGINE HOUSE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3829 (ii).
WILSON BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 844 (i), 4626 (ii).

NEWCASTLE P.O., ONT., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER RICHARD: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4697 (ii).

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION WITH CAN., NEGOTIATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4698 (ii).

NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1004.

NEW LONDON BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (ii).

NEW MACHINERY, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3812.

NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 158, 615 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 810 (i).
——— POSTAGE: in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).

NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3060 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 83.)

NICKEL EXPORTATIONS, &c.: on M. for Com of Sup. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3030 (ii).

NICOLET STATION: in Com of Sup., 4796 (ii).

NIPISSING ELECTIONS, PAYMENTS, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).

Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 961; 2°*, 1241; in Com., and 3°*, 2473 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 84.)

NOBLE BROS., AWARD *re* FISHERIES: in Com of Sup., 4228, 4957 (ii).
——— PAPERS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 3926 (ii).

NORTH BAY, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).

NORTH BAY PIER, N.S., COST, &c., AMOUNT OF WORK DONE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1443.

NORTH CHANNEL DAM: in Com. of Sup., 4034 (ii).
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).
——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.

Northern Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. No. 66 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 55.)

NORTH HEAD, N. B., BREAKWATER, ESTIMATED COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1441 (i).

NORTH POLE EXPEDITION, ASSISTANCE TO CAPT. BERNIER: on M. for Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 3951 (ii).

North Shore Power Ry. and Navigation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 3131; 3°*, 3150 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 85.)

NORTH SYDNEY IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
——— *See* 'Sydney,' &c.

N. W. Mounted Police (ass't commissioner) Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Res. prop., 3308; in Com. on Res., 3510; 1°* of B., 3734, 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 4247 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 21.)
——— **Pensions B. No. 40** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) prop. Res., 779; in Com. on Res., 806; 1°* of B., 962 (i); 2°*, 2484; in Com., 2484, 3311; 3°*, 3410 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 22.)

N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 174 (i), 4247 (ii).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 212.
——— REPORT: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1063.

North-west Ter. Act (road allowances, &c.) Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3127; 2°*, 3773; in Com., 3773; 3°*, 3773 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 24.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 343 (i).
BANFF NATIONAL PARK, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
——— MUSEUM BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4953.
BELLY RIVER BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 835, 849 (i), 4185, 4613 (ii).
CARNDUFF COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 835.
COAL OIL INSPECTION *re* N.W. TER. AND MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 5055 (ii).
——— Memorandum read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5074 (ii).
COURT HOUSE, POLICE ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 849 (i).
EDMONTON JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 849, 853 (i).
INDIANS, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3054 (ii).
LETHBRIDGE IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 852.
N.W.T. GOVT., REGISTRARS: in Com. of Sup., 4251 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORY—*Con.*
POSTAL FACILITIES : in Com. of Sup., 4942 (ii).
PRINCE ALBERT JAIL, LANDS PURCHASED : in Com. of Sup., 3620 (ii).
PROV. AUTONOMY, SUBSIDIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3064-3118 (ii).
——— *See* 'Subsidy,' &c.
RAILWAY LANDS, ACREAGE PATENTED, UNPATENTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2677 (ii).
——— *See* 'Town Sites.'
RED DEER COURT HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 852 (i), 4613 (ii).
RED DEER VALLEY IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 853 (i).
ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
SASKATCHEWAN SETTLERS, RELIEF TO : in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
SASKATOON, IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4614 (ii).
SCHOOLS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
SEED GRAIN, &C. TO INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 3056 (ii).
SIOUX INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 3056 (ii).
SUBSIDY TO N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 4251, 4948 (ii).
——— *See* 'Prov.', &c.
TOWN SITES, LAND GRANTS AND GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4404 (ii).
YORKTON COURT HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4613 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA :
AMAGANDUS POND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).
ARICHAT, CUSTOM HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 635.
ARNOLD'S BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 989.
BADDECK ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
BAILEY'S BROOK BREAKWATER, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4620 (ii).
BARBOUR, JOHN, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2853 (ii).
BEAR RIVER, OBSTRUCTION, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
BEDFORD RIFLE RANGES : conc., 5032 (ii).
BIG POND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
BLACK POINT CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
BOULARDERIE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 997 (i).
BRAE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 635, 642 (i).
CANSO FERRY SERVICE, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4294 (ii).
——— *See* 'Mulgrave.'
CAPE COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4621.
CHARLESVILLE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
CHETICAMP POINT WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
CHEVERIE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4621.
CLARK'S HARBOUR, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
COLCHESTER REGIMENT, PETS. *re* MEDALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4699 (ii).
COMEAUS HILL BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
COPPER CROWN WORKS AND I.C.R. CONTRACTS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).
COW BAY BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1000.
CRIBBON'S POINT WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4621.
DRUM HEAD BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i), 4621 (ii).
EASTERN EXTENSION RY., REFUNDS FOR RIGHT OF WAY : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 781 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4340 (ii).
ECUM SECUM WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4210.
FRIAR'S HEAD HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1002.
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
GRAND RIVER CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 4622.

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*
GUNNING COVE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
HALIFAX, BRANCH POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).
——— CUSTOM HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
——— ELEVATOR : *See* 'N.B., St. John,' &c.
——— HARBOUR LIGHTHOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 4225 (ii).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).
——— LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 2859 (ii).
——— PROVISIONAL GARRISON : in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).
——— AND S. WESTERN RY. EXTENSION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5064 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 989 (i), 4210, 4616 (ii).
HAWBOLD'S COVE, COST OF BREAKWATER : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 132 (i).
HERRING COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
HERRINGS SLAUGHTERED : in Com. of Sup., 4223.
INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 3050, 3081 (ii).
INGONISH BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4211.
IONA WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
KAULBACH, MR., POSTMASTER AT MIDDLE MUSQUODOBOIT, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).
LA HAVE RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 3285, 4213 (ii).
——— *See* 'Lunenburg.'
LARRY'S RIVER, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
LINGAN BEACH : in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LITTLE BRAS D'OR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i)
LOCKEPORT HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
LOWER COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LUNENBURG BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1007.
——— DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
——— *See* 'La Have.'
MABOU TO PORT HAWKESBURY, TELEGRAPH LINE : in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
MARGAREE FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENT : in Com. of Sup., 550 (i).
MILL COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1008.
MINUDIE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
MULGRAVE, I.C.R., IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
——— POINT TUPPER FERRY SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1683 (i).
——— *See* 'Point Tupper,' 'Canso,' &c.
NEIL'S HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
NORTH BAY, N.S., COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1443 (i).
NORTH SYDNEY, I.C.R., IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
——— *See* 'Sydney.'
PARKER'S COVE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
PETIT DE GRAT HARBOUR, REMOVAL OF WRECK : in Com. of Sup., 4221 (ii).
PETIT RIVIÈRE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4210 (ii).
PICTOU, I.C.R., INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).
——— ISLAND, WHARFS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1009 (i).
POINT ST. PIERRE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

POINT TUPPER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
——— *See* 'Mulgrave.'
PORT DUFFERIN WHARF, COST OF SHED, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 132 (i).
PORTER'S LAKE, OUTLET, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
PORT GEORGE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).
PORT LÂTOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i), 4624 (ii).
PORT MOUTON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
REDHEAD, BOAT HARBOUR: on M. for Com. of Sup., 4994 (ii).
ROCKINGHAM IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4798 (ii).
'ROTHESAY BLUES' AND COLCHESTER REGIMENTS, MEDALS, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4698–9 (ii).
ROUND BAY BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).
ST. PETERS TO LOUISBOURG AND SCATARIE ISLAND TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).
STEWART, CAPT. D.C., QUARANTINE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
SYDNEY, CUSTOMS FORFEITED GOODS, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 783 (i).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3805, 3996, 4789 (ii).
——— AND LOUISBURG BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).
TANTRAMAR MARSH WASHOUT, I.C.R., REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1108 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 403 (i).
TRURO ROUNDHOUSE, I.C.R., REBUILDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii)
WASHABUCK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1009 (i).
WINDSOR BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4292 (ii).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, SHEAR DAMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).

OAKVILLE HARBOUR, CONSTRUCTION OF DOCKS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 135 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
Oaths of Office: *See* 'Administration.'
O'BRIEN, MR. S. E., SALARY, INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 4535 (ii).
OBSERVATORY, ASTRONOMICAL AT OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i),
——— METEOROLOGICAL: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 4221 (ii).
OFFICIALS I.C.R., NUMBER, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 132 (i).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.' &c.
O'KEEFE, MAGISTRATE, PET. *re* FRENCH LANGUAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 2857 (ii).
Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 23 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 632; 2°*, 851 (i).
Ontario Power Co. of Niagara Falls B. No. 57 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 1438; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 86.)
ONTARIO:
ADDINGTON ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4184 (ii).
ALLANDALE STATION, MAIL TRANSFER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 884 (i).
AMHERSTBURG, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
——— *See* 'Limekiln,' &c,
ANTEN MILLS AND HENDRIE MAIL CONTRACT, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1681.
AULTSVILLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).
AUTOMOBILES *re* POSTAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 3872 (ii).
——— *See* 'Toronto P.O.' &c.
BARRIE, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3910.
——— WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i).
BAYFIELD PIER, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i).
BELLEVILLE, HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, DISMISSALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 449 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4945 (ii).
——— NAMES, DISMISSALS, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 153 (i).
BIG BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
BLIND RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1222 (i).
BOUNDARY LINE THROUGH DETROIT RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 242 (i).
BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4182.
BRONTE HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133, 134 (i).
BRUCE CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 719 (i), 4182 (ii).
BURKE'S FALLS, MAGANETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL, BRIDGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 846, 1226 (i), 4637 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
CALLENDAR, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
CLINTON, MR. D., POSTMASTER AT WELLINGTON, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 613 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Alcorn*) 2680 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 719.
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 721 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1227 (i), 4638 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
CORNWALL, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 863 (i).
——— CANAL, REPAIRS, LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4310 (ii).
——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3038 (ii).
CORRY & LAVERDURE, MESSRS., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).
——— *See* 'Trent,' &c.
COUTTS, MR., AMOUNTS PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
CRATHIE POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).
CREDITON P.O., DECEASE OF POSTMASTER, VACANCY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 3308 (ii).
DEPOT HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).
DESERONTO PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup. 728 (i).
DRESDEN CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 2925.
DUNDAS ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 716, 863 (i).
DURHAM CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
FARRAN'S POINT ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

FISH HATCHERIES, GEORGIAN BAY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 551 (i).
FORT WILLIAM, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 728 (i).
FRENCH RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 574, 578 (i).
GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com of Sup., 4021, 4300 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 5020 (ii).
——— *See* 'Gilbert,' &c.
GANANOQUE, DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup. 867.
——— LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &c., M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 809 (i).
——— *See* 'Red Horse.'
GEORGIAN BAY, CANAL SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4298 (ii).
——— POINTE AU BARIL ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
GILBERT DREDGING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 4021.
——— *See* 'Galops,' 'North Channel,' &c.
GILMOUR P.O., DISMISSAL OF T. RICKETTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2224 (i).
GODERICH HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i), 4640 (ii).
GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN PORTS, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 246, 782.
HAMILTON AND GUELPH MAIL CONTRACTS, TENDERS, &c.: M. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) for Copy,* 3721 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4465 (ii).
HAMILTON WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4566.
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i), 4217, 4637 (ii).
HILTON, ST. JOSEPH'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— *See* 'St. Joseph.'
HOLSTEIN, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3875 (ii).
——— MEMORANDUM READ: (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
HUNTSVILLE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS ON THE LAKES: in Com. of Sup., 533 (i).
INDIANS, ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 3037 (ii).
——— SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 3043-5 (ii).
JACKSON, MR. WM., DISMISSAL, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 809 (i).
——— *See* 'Gananoque,' &c.
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 599 (i), 4563 (ii).
KINGSTON, ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
——— LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, STRIKE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 4702 (ii).
——— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
——— ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, GYMNASIUM, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).
——— REP. OF BOARD OF VISITORS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 443 (i).
——— STAFF COURSE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).
KINGSVILLE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, JR. JUDGE, PROVISION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4701 (ii).
LIFE SAVING REWARDS AT PORT CREDIT, &c: in Com. of Sup., 533, 544 (i).
LIME KILN CROSSING: in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).
LINDSAY AND FENELON ROAD BUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4270 (ii).
LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).
——— ALLOTMENT OF ARMOURIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1446 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

MCDOUGALL, CAPT.: *See* 'Life Saving,' &c.
MANITOULIN ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3041 (ii).
MARBLE ROCK P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 3880 (ii).
MEAFORD HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
MIDLAND HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1237 (i), 4641 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).
MILTON POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133 (i).
MORTON, P. O., ABSTRACTION FROM REGISTERED LETTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).
MUNCEY INDIANS, GRANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3048 (ii).
NEWBORO POSTMASTER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
NEWCASTLE P. O., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER RICKARD: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4697 (ii).
NIPISSING ELECTION, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).
NORTH BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
NORTH CHANNEL, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 4034.
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).
——— *See* "Gilbert."
OAKVILLE HARBOUR, CONSTRUCTION OF DOCKS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 135 (i).
——— PIER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 527, 560 (i).
ONTARIO CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
ONTARIO LEGISLATURE, EXTENSION OF DURATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 131 (i).
ONTARIO PROVINCIAL SUBSIDY, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Henderson*) 2473 (i).
ORILLIA WHARF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1241 (i), 4641 (ii).
OTTAWA CITY, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4188 (ii).
——— ADDITIONAL ROOM, COST, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1442 (i).
——— ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).
——— ELEVATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4137, 4615 (ii).
——— ENGINEERS' SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4138 (ii).
——— EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 152 (i).
——— GREENHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
——— GROUNDS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).
——— LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4189, 4616 (ii).
——— MARIA STREET BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3289 (ii).
——— NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).
——— RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 964 (i), 4138.
——— RIDEAU HALL, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4188, 4566 (ii).
——— TELEPHONES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 986, 989.
——— VENTILATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4140 (ii).
——— VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 564 (i).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

OTTAWA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
OWEN SOUND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: AMOUNT VOTED: Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i.)
OXFORD ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Staker*) 3 (i).
PELEE ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4217.
PENETANGUISHENE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
PETERBOROUGH DAM, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
——— *See* 'Trent,' &c.
——— POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4943.
'PETERS' TARGET AT LONDON CAMP, REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 446 (i).
PETEWAWA RIVER NARROWS, DREDGING, &C: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
PICTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, DELAY IN OPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 1490 (i).
POLLY, MR., AMOUNT PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
POONAMALIE BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4270, 4917 (ii).
PORT ARTHUR, BREAKWATER AND DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 599 (i).
——— COAL OIL INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1148 (i), 2931, 3300 (i).
PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 609 (i).
——— BUILDING, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).
——— ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4019, 4306.
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4557 (ii).
——— OBSTRUCTIONS, REMOVAL, &C,: in Com. of Sup., 4798 (ii).
——— *See* "Welland," &c.
PORT CREDIT HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i),
PORT DALHOUSIE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).
——— *See* "Welland," &c.
PORT ELGIN PIER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4611 (ii).
PORT HOPE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
PRESQU'ISLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4304 (ii).
——— GILBERT BROS.: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).
——— *See* "Galops," &c.
RED HORSE SHOAL LIGHT, KEEPER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 442 (i).
——— *See* 'Gananoque.'
RIDEAU HALL: *See* 'Ottawa.'
RIORDON PAPER CO., WATER PRIVILEGES ON WELLAND CANAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 745 (i).
——— *See* 'Welland,' &c.
ST. CATHARINES, DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 715 (i), 4567 (ii).
——— WATER SUPPLY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 883, 1860 (i).
——— *See* 'Welland,' &c.
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup, 1247 (i).
——— *See* 'Hilton.'
ST. LAWRENCE CANAL EMPLOYEES, AMOUNTS PAID, &C., 1896-1901: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2222 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE AND GREAT LAKES WATERWAYS, COMMISSION, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 886 (i).
ST. MARY'S RIVER, IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i).
ST. THOMAS CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 2930, 3295 (ii).
SARNIA, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup.. 1224.

ONTARIO—*Con.*

SAULT STE. MARIE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i), 4001, 4298, 4763 (ii).
——— P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 731 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1242 (i).
SEELEY'S BAY P. O., ABSTRACTION FROM REGISTERED LETTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).
SIMCOE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).
——— CENSUS, SIMCOE, N. AND E., COST IN 1891-1901: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2224 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1245.
SOUTH NATION RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
SPRINGBANK POST OFFICE, MAIL SERVICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).
SYDENHAM RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (i),
TAY CANAL, 1896 TO 1901, AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 2067 (i).
TEMISCAMINGUE, LAKE, DREDGING AND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
TOBERMORY HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1246 (i).
TORONTO, DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 732 (i).
——— APPNMT. OF MECHANICAL ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 884 (i).
——— DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 868 (i)
——— HARBOUR, DREDGING EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1274 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, ALTERATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).
——— P. O. BRANCH OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4182, 4565 (ii).
——— LOCOMOBILES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4186 (ii).
——— *See* 'Automobiles,' &c.
TORONTO JUNCTION, BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 733 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4004; conc., 5047 (ii).
——— *See* 'Peterborough,' &c.
——— DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4269 (ii).
TRENT VALLEY AND RICE LAKE CANALS, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).
WATERLOO, S., CENSUS ENUMERATORS, NAMES, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1066 (i).
——— COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1861 (i).
WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4306, 4798.
——— LOCK WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).
——— ST. CATHARINES WATER SUPPLY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1683, 1860 (i).
——— *See* 'St. Catharines,' &c.
——— WATER PRIVILEGES, RENTALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 745 (i).
——— *See* 'Port Colborne.'
WIARTON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT VOTED: Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
WILLIAMSTOWN POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4353 (ii).
WINDMILL, BATTLE, PENSIONS GRANTED FOR: M. for Pet.* (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 3724 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 238 (i).
WINDSOR INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 1154 (i).
WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1242.
UPPER LAKES LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 519 (i).
YORK, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3.

OPERATING EXPENSES, &C., I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 4510 (ii).

——— *See* 'I. C. R.', &c.

ORDER IN THE HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 4149 (ii).

O'REGAN, JAS., SUPREME COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4965 (ii).

Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s B. No. 10 (Mr. *Parmelee*) 1°*, 408; 2°*, 570; in Com., and 3°*, 1107 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 87.)

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION, REP. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 444 (i).

——— REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 451 (i).

——— *See* 'Chinese,' 'Japanese,' &c.

ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3809 (ii).

——— *See* 'I. C. R.', &c.

ORILLIA WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1241 (i), 4641 (ii).

OROMOCTO RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4213.

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1030 (i), 4628 (ii).

ORTHODOX GREEK CHURCH. *See* 'Greek Catholic.'

OTTAWA, ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. No. 74 (Mr. *Logan*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 88.)

OTTAWA BUILDINGS, ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4189, 4616 (ii).

——— ENGINEERS' SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4138, 4219 (ii).

——— GAS, ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).

——— RENTALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 964 (i), 4138 (ii).

——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4188 (ii).

——— TELEPHONES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 986, 989 (i).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' 'Ont. Ottawa,' &c.

OTTAWA CITY, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

Ottawa City Improvement Act Amt. B. No. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 4344; 2°*, 4604; 3°*, 4607 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 25.)

——— GOVT. GREENHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).

——— GROUNDS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 987.

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Champagne*) 1°*, 3509; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4578 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 89.)

OTTAWA POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.

OTTAWA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).

OUELLE RIVIÈRE SPUR LINE: in Com. of Sup., 4796.

OUTSIDE SERVICE, P. O. DEPT., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3867, 4940 (iii.)

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).

——— AMOUNT VOTED: Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).

OXFORD ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

OYSTER BEDS IN SHEDIAC BAY, LICENSES ISSUED, NAMES, DATES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2473 (i).

OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 555 (i).

——— CULTURE IN SHEDIAC HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 746, 1444 (i).

——— FISHING IN P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 540 (i).

——— PROTECTION REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 135 (i).

Pacific Northern and Omineca Ry. Co's incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2669; 3°*, 2670 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 90.)

PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 358 (i), 4967 (ii).

PAPER COMBINE, REP. OF COMMISSION: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3128 (ii).

PARCEL SERVICE, P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 3911 (ii).

PARIS EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4967 (ii).

PARKER'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, ADDITIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).

——— ELEVATOR ATTENDANTS: in Com. of Sup., 4137, 4615 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' 'Ont. Ottawa,' &c.

PARTISANSHIP IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS BY GOVT. EMPLOYEES: Qu s. (Mr. *Leonard*) 618 (i).

PARTRIDGE ISLAND PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4628 (ii).

PASPEBIAC, OCEAN PORT: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5000 (ii).

PASSES ISSUED ON GOVT. RYS., &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 810 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4120 (ii).

——— (Mr. *Clarke*) 4403 (ii).

PATENT ACT AMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 329 (i).

PATENTS, CLASSIFYING CAN. AND EXCHANGE WITH U. S.: in Com. of Sup., 349 (i).

'PATENT RECORD': in Com. of Sup., 329 (i).

Patent Relief: *See* 'Depew,' 'Westren.'

PAY AND ALLOWANCE FOR MILITIA FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i), 2498 (ii).

——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.

PEDLEY: *See* 'Immigration.'

PELEE ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).

Penalties: *See* 'Remission.'

PENETANGUISHENE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).

PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3617, 4267 (ii).

——— B. C., LAND PURCHASED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3619 (ii).

——— MANITOBA, LAND PURCHASED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3618 (ii).

——— *See* 'Justice,' &c.

Penny Bank incorp. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2676 (ii).

PENSIONS GRANTED IN BRITISH ARMY TO WOUNDED: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2679 (ii).

PENSIONS TO CANADIANS, *re* S. A. WAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2459 (i).

PENSIONS TO N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. on Res., 806 (i).

——— *See* 'N. W. M. P. Bill.'

PERCIVAL RIVER, P.E.I., SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).

PERIBONKA, IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).

PERMANENT FORCE AND ACTIVE MILITIA CORPS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).

—— TOTAL COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 409 (i).

—— *See* 'Militia,' &c.

PERRY, MR. C. B., CUSTOMS OFFICER: in Com. of Sup., 2923 (ii).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) *re* FIGURES QUOTED IN BUDGET SPEECH, 1763 (i).

—— *re* 'YEAR-BOOK': (Mr. *Bell*) 2731 (ii).

PETERBOROUGH DAM, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).

—— *See* 'Trent,' &c.

—— POST OFFICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4943 (ii).

'PETER JETSON,' STR., QUANTITY OF COAL CARRIED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 884 (i).

'PETERS' TARGET AT LONDON CAMP, REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 446 (i).

PETEWAWA RIVER, NARROWS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).

PETIT DE GRAT HARBOUR, REMOVAL OF WRECK: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (ii).

PETITIONS, IRREGULARITY OF, RULED OUT OF ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 2145, 2218 (i).

Petition of Right Act Amt. B. No. 135 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3306; 2°*, 3935; in Com., 3936; 3°*, 3939 (ii).

PETIT RIVIERE BREAKWATER, N.S.; in Com. of Sup., 4210 (ii).

PICTON, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, DELAY IN OPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 1490 (i).

PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).

PICTOU ISLAND WHARFS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1009.

PIG IRON, &c., FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 782 (i).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 1673 (i); 2°*, 2495; in Com., 2495; 3°*, 3309 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 27.)

PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3812 (ii).

POINT FORTUNE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).

POINT ST. PIERRE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).

POINT TUPPER, &c., I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3828.

—— *See* 'I. C. R.,' 'N.S.,' &c.

POINT WOLFE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).

POLE CONTRACT *re* YUKON TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 4154, 4162 (ii).

—— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.

POLLY, MR., AMOUNT PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).

POONAMALIE CAUSEWAY, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4270, 4917 (ii).

PORT ARTHUR, BREAKWATER AND DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 599 (i).

PORT COLBORNE, BUILDING, HEATING, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).

—— ENTRANCE, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 609 (i), 4019, 4306 (ii).

—— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4557 (ii).

—— OBSTRUCTIONS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4798 (ii).

PORT CREDIT HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i).

PORT DALHOUSIE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4306.

PORT DUFFERIN WHARF, COST OF SHED, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 132.

PORT ELGIN PIER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).

PORTER, DR. ANDREW, CLAIMS, &c.: conc., 5033 (ii).

PORTER'S LAKE, OUTLET, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4622.

PORT GEORGE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1007.

PORT HOPE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).

PORT LATOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i), 4624 (ii).

PORT MOUTON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

PORT SIMPSON TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4178, 4779 (ii).

—— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.

POSTAGE RATE *re* DROP LETTERS: in Com. of Sup., 3915 (ii).

POSTAL CONTRACTS, PET. OF RIGHT, &c. *re* CANCELLATION: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (ii).

POSTAL FACILITIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4942.

Post Office (Letter Carriers) Act Amt. B. No. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) 1° m., 2482; 2°*, 4036; in Com., 4036; 3°*, 4075 (ii). (2 *Edward VII. c.*, 28).

POST OFFICE:

ADDITIONAL CLERKSHIPS, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).

ALBERTON P. O., P.E.I., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER KEITH: in Com. of Sup., 4938 (ii).

ALLANDALE STATION, MAIL TRANSFER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 884 (i).

ANTEN MILLS AND HENDRIE MAIL CONTRACT, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1681.

AUTOMOBILES, TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 3872, 4186 (ii).

BAIN, MR., P. O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 3872 (ii).

BARRIE MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3910 (ii).

BATES, MR. E. B., ASS'T. POSTMASTER, OTTAWA, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4940 (ii).

BATHURST POSTMASTER, CHARGES *re* NEGLIGENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 4700 (ii).

BAXTER, GEO. E., ANDOVER, N.B., CHICKENS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).

BELLEVILLE POST OFFICE, REDUCTION OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4945 (ii).

—— NAMES, DISMISSALS, SUPERANNUATIONS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 153 (i).

BRANCH AND DISTRICT POST OFFICES: in Com. of Sup., 3884 (i).

B.C. MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).

CACOUNA AND RY. STATION, MAIL CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2225 (i).

CHARLOTTETOWN POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).

CRATHIE POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

CREDITON P. O., DECEASE OF POSTMASTER, VACANCY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 3308 (ii).
DAWSON AND VICTORIA MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).
DORCHESTER COUNTY POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4934 (ii).
FORT WILLIAM POST OEFICE : in Com. of Sup.,728.
GILMOUR P. O., DISMISSAL OF T. RICKETTS : Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2224 (i).
HALIFAX BRANCH POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).
HAMILTON AND GUELPH MAIL CONTRACT, TENDERS, &C. : M. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) for Copy *, 3723 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4465.
HOLSTEIN POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C. : in Com. of Sup.. 3875, 4925 (ii).
ISLE OF ORLEANS MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
JOLIETTE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C., CHARGES AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2068, 2856 (ii).
KAULBACH, MR., POSTMASTER AT MIDDLE MUSQUODOBOIT, DISMISSAL, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).
KEITH POST OFFICE, QUE., CHANGE OF LOCATION : in Com. of Sup., 4937 (ii).
KNAUF, H., PROMOTION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF A. THOMAS, &C. : M. for Cor.,* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2221 (i).
LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3867 (ii).
——— *See* 'P. O. Bill,' &c.
MCDONALD'S CORNER, N.B., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2676 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, POSTAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).
MAIL CONTRACTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3881, 3910 (ii).
——— SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Mail,' &c.
MAPLE CREEK P. O., CHANGE OF LOCATION : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 2853 (ii).
MARBLE ROCK P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 3880 (ii).
MARYSVILLE, N.B., POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
MATHESON, MR., SUPERANNUATION : in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
MIDLAND POSTMASTER : in Com. of Sup., 3916.
MILTON POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133 (i).
MONTREAL BRANCH POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 4564 (ii).
MORTON P.O., ABSTRACTION FROM REGISTERED LETTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).
MUSQUODOBOIT, MIDDLE : *See* 'Kaulbach.'
NEWBORO POSTMASTER, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
NEWCASTLE P.O., ONT., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER RICKARD : Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4697.
NEWSPAPER POSTAGE : in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).
PARCEL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3911 (ii).
PETERBOROUGH POST OFFICE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4943 (ii).
POSTAGE RATE *re* DROP LETTERS : in Com. of Sup., 3915 (ii).
POSTAL CONTRACTS, PET. OF RIGHT, &C. *re* CANCELLATION : in Com. of Sup., 3917 (ii).
——— FACILITIES, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 4942 (ii).
POSTMASTERS, RURAL, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3874.
——— SECURITIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3876.
POST OFFICE, DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 179 (i), 4313 (ii).
——— BOXES, RENTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 988 (i), 3897 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

POST OFFICE, CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Mutock*) 121.
——— EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
——— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 3867, 4940 (ii).
——— PROVISIONAL ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
RY. MAIL CLERKS, ADDITIONAL : in Com. of Sup., 4940 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).
RICKARD, MR. : *See* 'Newcastle.'
RICKETTS, MR. : *See* 'Gilmour.'
ROUND HILL POSTAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3916
——— ARMSTRONG'S CORNERS, MAIL CONTRACT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1987 (i).
ST. EUGÈNE DE GRANTHAM MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4350 (ii).
STE. HENEDINE MAIL CARRIER, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 447 (i).
ST. JEROME POSTMASTER, INTERFERENCE IN POLITICAL MEETINGS : Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159.
STE. ODILON, POSTMASTER, DORCHESTER CO., DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 4350 (ii).
SAMPLES SENT BY SAMPLE POST, NUMBER, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 617 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE P.O. : in Com. of Sup., 731.
SEELEY'S BAY P.O., ABSTRACTION FROM REGISTERED LETTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).
SHEPPARD, POSTMASTER AT JOLIETTE, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2068 (i), 2855 (ii).
SPRINGBANK MAIL SERVICE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).
STAMPERS AND SORTERS, P.O. DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 4940 (ii).
SUPERANNUATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
THEREIN, MR. H., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER FROM GRANDS PILES, PET., &C. : M. (Mr. *Ball*) for Copy,* 3724 (ii).
THOMAS, MR. : *See* 'Laprairie.'
TIGNISH AND MAIL POINT MAIL CONTRACT : in Com. of Sup., 4932 (ii).
TORONTO POST OFFICE, BRANCH OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).
——— LOCOMOBILES, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4186 (ii).
——— *See* 'Automobiles.'
VADNAIS, FRANCOIS, CONTRACTOR FOR MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4350 (ii).
WELLINGTON, POSTMASTER D. CLINTON, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 613 (i).
——— COR. &C. *re* DISMISSAL : M. for Ret.*(Mr. *Alcorn*) 2680 (ii).
WILLIAMSTOWN POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4353 (ii).
WINNIPEG P.O., ELECTRIC RY. MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3874 (ii).
——— OFFICIALS, DATE OF APPNMT., 1896-1901 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 961 (i).
WINTER MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 516.
POULTRY FATTENING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2640 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture.'
PRECEDENCE IN CAN. AT OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS : prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 429 ; wthdn., 439 (i).
PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Maclean*) 2733 (ii).
Debate : (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2739 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2743 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2746 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 2749 ; (Mr. *Northrup*) 2755 ; (Mr. *Kemp*) 2760 ; (Mr. *Sifton*) 2768 ; (Mr. *Bennett*) 2773 ; (Mr. *German*) 2776 ; (Mr. *Brock*) 2779 ; (Mr. *Flint*) 2783 ; (Mr. *Gourley*) 2786 ; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2798 ; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2802 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 2809 ; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ques. of Order (ruling) 2807, 2809 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 2942 (ii).
—— RES. FROM BOARDS OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3153 (ii).
—— *See* 'Intercolonial Conference.'
Presbyterian College (Halifax) Board B. No. 22 (Mr. *Fraser*) 1°*, 632; 2°*, 851; in Com., and 3°*, 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 92.)
PRESQU'ISLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3297 (ii).
PRINCE ALBERT JAIL, LANDS PURCHASED: in Com. of Sup., 3620 (ii).
PRINCE COUNTY FISHING LICENSES, NUMBER ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1065 (i).
PRINCE, PROF., REMARKS *re* FISH CANNERS IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Béland*) 449, 613 (i).
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
ALBERTON P.O., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER KEITH: in Com. of Sup., 4938 (ii).
—— RY. STATION, LOCATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1441 (i).
ATKINS' WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
BLACK BROOK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1023.
CANOE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3831 (ii).
CAPE TRAVERSE, MEMORIAL *re* DAILY COMMUNICATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1018 (1).
CARLETON POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1021.
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
—— RANGE LIGHTS, REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).
CHAPEL POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
CHARLOTTETOWN, CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 2932 (ii).
—— INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).
CHICKEN-FATTENING STATIONS, LOCATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1065 (i).
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS *re* TAX LEGISLATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1010 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 781 (i).
CREOSOTED TIMBER IN WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
DOUGLAS, GEO. C., CHICKENS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).
FISHERY AWARDS AND P. E. I. PREMIER'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 3859 (ii).
FISHING GEAR CONFISCATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1440 (i).
—— HATCHERIES, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4222.
—— LICENSES, PRINCE CO., NUMBER ISSUED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1065 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i), 4211, 4625 (ii).
HILLHOUSE, A. P., CHICKENS PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3409 (ii).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3862: conc., 5039 (ii).
INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3053 (ii).
KINKORA RY. ACCOMMODATIGN, RES. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).
MARCONI SYSTEM OF WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY, AGREEMENT *re* P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Mackinnon*) 1684 (i).
—— *See* 'Telegraphic.'
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*
MONTAGUE, LOWER. ATKIN'S WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY.: in Com. of Sup., 3830, 3862, 3996, 4282, 4292, 4918; conc., 5039 (ii).
—— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695.
MUTCH, W.: *See* 'Wellington.'
MUTTON SHIPMENTS: *See* 'Wheatley.'
NEW LONDON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4212.
OYSTER FISHING: in Com. of Sup., 540 (i).
—— PROTECTION REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 135 (i).
PERCIVAL RIVER, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).
P.E.I. AND MAINLAND TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3293 (ii).
—— *See* 'Tel. Lines,' &c.
P.E.I. RYS., EMPLOYEES, REVENUE AND CAPITAL ACCOUNT FOR 1901, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).
—— RYS., GOVT., EXPENDITURES *re*: M. *re* Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., 3235; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3240; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 3281 (ii).
—— RYS., ROLLING STOCK, &c., CONDITION, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 3724 (ii).
QUEEN'S ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
RAILWAYS: in Com. of Sup., 3862, 4282 (ii).
——BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
SANDHILLS RANGE LIGHTS, REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).
SOURIS ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).
SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2721 (ii).
—— *See* 'Marconi,' &c.
TIGNISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4212, 4626 (ii).
TIGNISH AND MAIL POINT MAIL CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 4932 (ii).
TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
WELLINGTON MUTCH, ELDON, PAYMENTS TO, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr *Taylor*) 3152 (ii).
WEST POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (il).
WHEATLEY, MR., INDEMNITY TO *re* MUTTON SHIPMENTS BY COLD STORAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695 (ii).
WINTER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 516 (i).
—— PETS., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 160, 170 (i).
PRINTING BUREAU PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4119, 4956 (ii).
PRINTING, STATIONERY, INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3060 (ii).
—— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: In Com. of Sup., 199.
—— PAPER, BINDING, &c.: conc., 4343 (ii).
PRINTING OF PARLT., 4TH REP. OF COM.: M. (Mr. *Flint*) to conc., 4644 (ii).
—— AMT. (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) *re* C. S. Act, 4644 (ii).
—— *See* 'Com,' &c.
PRISONERS IN THE YUKON, TRANSPORT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3589 (ii).
—— *See* 'Justice,' 'Yukon,' &c.

PRIVATE BILLS AND GOVT. BUSINESS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3920 (ii).
PRIVATE BILLS, EXTENSION OF TIME : M. (Mr. *Flint*) 780 (i), 4464 (ii).
—— Remarks, 4567-8 (ii).
—— *See* 'House of Commons.'
PRIVATE CARS, I.C.R., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3828.
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 173 (i).
PROCEDURE *re* BILLS : Remarks (Mr. *Costigan*) 611 (i).
PRODUCE CO : *See* 'Bull, Chas. A.'
PROMOTIONS IN MILITIA FORCE : in Com. of Sup., 1134 (i).
PROPERTY AND CIVIL RIGHTS, UNIFORMITY OF LAW, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1067 (i).
Debate : (Mr. *Flint*) 1083 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1089 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1092 ; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1096 ; (Mr. *Carroll*) 1100 ; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1103 ; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 1106 (i).
PROROGATION, LETTERS FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5032 (ii).
—— Remarks, 4968, 5081 (ii).
PROV. AUTONOMY, N.W.T. GOVT., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3064-3118 (ii).
—— *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.
PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES AND B.N.A. ACT : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 441 (i).
PROVISIONAL ALLOWANCE, P.O. SERVICES : in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
—— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., ABSENCE OF CHAIRMAN : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3920 (ii).
—— Inquiry (Mr. *Taylor*) for Ret., 3995 (ii).
—— MEETINGS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 439 (i).
—— M. to print Evidence *re* Gaudry (Mr. *Kemp*) 4343 (ii).
—— M. to ref. Accts. to Sel. Com. (Mr. *Fraser*) 198 (i).
—— Pub. Accts.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 121 (i).
—— REPS., 1ST AND 2ND : Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 810 (i).
—— REP., 3RD : M. to conc. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1108 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back for instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1395 (i).
Debate : (Mr. *Blair*) 1399 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1404 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 1407 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1410 ; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1413 ; (Mr. *Northrup*) 1415 ; (Mr. *Flint*) 1418 ; (Mr. *Lennox*) 1422 ; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1427 ; (Mr. *Ingram*) 1431 ; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1436 ; (Neg. Y. 56 ; N. 101) 1436 (i).
—— WITNESSES *re* YUKON CHARGES : in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).
PUBLIC HEALTH QUARANTINE IN ORGANIZED DISTRICTS : in Com. of Sup., 371 (i).
—— HEALTH ACT : in Com. of Sup., 403 (i).
—— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
PUBLIC WORKS :
ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY : in Com. of Sup., 4184 (ii).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
AMAGANDUS POND, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
AMHERSTBURG, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
—— *See* 'Limekiln'
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
ANDERSON LAKE, OUTLET : in Com. of Sup., 4642.
ANTICOSTI CABLE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4769.
—— *See* 'Bryon,' 'Telegraph,' &c.
ARCHITECTS, FEES, PLANS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 666 (i).
ARMOURIES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 872 (i).
—— CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 2549 (ii).
ARNOLD'S BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
ASHCROFT TO DAWSON, TEL. LINES : in Com. of Sup., 3293, 4151, 4781 (ii).
—— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1986 (i).
—— *See* 'Yukon,' 'Telegraph,' &c.
ASSAY OFFICE, VANCOUVER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
ATKIN'S WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
AULTSVILLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).
BADDECK ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
BAILEY'S BROOK BREAKWATER, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4620 (ii).
BARRIE WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i).
BATISCAN CHANNEL, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 4629 (ii).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i).
BAYFIELD PIER, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i).
BEAR RIVER, OBSTRUCTION, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
BELLEVILLE HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, DISMISSALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 449 (i).
BELLY RIVER BRIDGE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
BIG BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
BIG POND, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
BLACK BROOK WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
BLACK POINT CANAL, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 990.
BLIND RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1222 (i).
BOULARDERIE WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 997 (i).
BRAE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 4182.
BRONTÉ HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (i).
—— AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133 (i).
BRYON ISLAND TO ANTICOSTI CABLE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).
—— *See* 'Telegraph,' &c.
BUILDINGS, B.C., RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
—— GENERALLY : in Com. of Sup., 560, 728, 835, 849 (i), 4181, 4186, 4613 (ii).
—— CARETAKERS, ENGINEERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).
—— *See* 'Engineers,' &c.
—— IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS, FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974 (i).
—— *See* 'Immigrant,' &c.
—— LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4615 (ii).
—— RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4615 (ii).
—— *See* 'Ottawa,' 'Yukon,' &c.
—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 4613 (ii).
—— MAR. PROVS., RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i), 4178 (ii).
—— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4185, 4613 (ii).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 719 (i), 4182 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

BUILDINGS, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup.,642 (i), 4179.
——— RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 4536 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
BURKE'S FALLS, MAGANETAWAN RIVER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL, BRIDGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 846, 1226 (i), 4637 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
CALLENDAR WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
CAMPBELLTON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4626.
CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
——— *See* 'Wilson's Beach,' &c.
CANOE COVE BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
——— AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3831 (ii).
CAPE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621.
CAPE TORMENTINE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (i).
——— CREOSOTED TIMBER WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4627 (ii).
——— *See* 'Creosoted,' &c.
——— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
CARAQUET WHARF, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1023.
CARLETON POINT WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1021 (i).
CARNDUFF COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 835.
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
CEMENTS, CANADIAN AND FOREIGN, TESTS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 1442, 1444 (i).
CHAMBLY CANAL, WHARF, &c., MAINTENANCE BY G.T.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) 2068.
CHANCE HARBOUR, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1024.
CHAPEL POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
CHARLESVILLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
CHARLOTTE, N.B., TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
CHETICAMP POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1000.
CHEVERIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621.
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
CIRCULAR *re* PUBLIC WORKS ISSUED BY MR. MULOCK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 843 (i).
CLARK'S HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
CLEGG, SAMUEL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4699 (ii).
CLERKS OF WORKS ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 876 (i), 4186 (ii).
CLINTON, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 719.
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 721 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1227 (i), 4638 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
COLUMBIA RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i).
COMEAUS HILL BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
CORNWALL ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 863 (i).
COURT HOUSES, N.W.T., POLICE ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 849 (i).
COW BAY BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
CRANE ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4630 (ii).
CREOSOTED TIMBER PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 4779.
——— *See* 'Cape Tormentine,' &c.
CREOSOTED TIMBER IN WHARFS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
CRIBBON'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

CROSS POINT, ISOLATED PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4630 (ii).
CYR, MR., CLERK OF WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 877 (i).
——— *See* 'Clerks,' &c.
DAY LABOUR AND CONTRACT SYSTEM ON PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 674–708, 836–880.
DEPOT HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).
DESERONTO PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 728 (i).
DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).
DESROCHERS, R. C., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4535 (ii).
DIPPER HARBOUR, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
DREDGES BUILT AND OWNED BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
DREDGING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
——— GENERAL VOTE, PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 3283 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
——— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4763 (ii).
——— *See* 'Snag-boat.'
——— ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).
DRUM HEAD BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i), 4621 (ii).
DRUMMONDVILLE, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 643 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4180.
DUNDAS ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 863 (i).
ECUM SECUM WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4210, 4211 (ii).
EDMONTON JAIL, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 849, 853 (i).
ENGINEERS, &c., PUBLIC WORKS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).
——— *See* 'Caretakers,' 'Ottawa,' &c.
EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 875 (i).
FRENCH RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 574, 578 (i).
FRIAR'S HEAD HARBOUR, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
GANANOQUE DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 867.
GASPÉ PENINSULA, REMOVAL OF ROCK IN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
GATINEAU RIVER SLIDES: in Com. of Sup., 4782.
GEORGIAN BAY, POINTE AU BARIL ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
GODERICH HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i), 4640 (ii).
GOVT. POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 636–733, 836–880 (i).
GRANBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 644 (i).
GRAND ANSE BREAKWATER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
GRAND RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4622.
GRAND VALLEE PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1031.
GRAVING DOCKS, LEVIS, KINGSTON AND ESQUIMALT, WORKING EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4220 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE, QUARANTINE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).
GUNNING COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
HALIFAX CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 635.
HAMILTON WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4566.
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i), 4642 (ii).
——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).
——— FOREMEN, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 604, 1275 (i), 4642 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 4142, 4213 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i), 4626 (ii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i), 4210, 4616.
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i), 4217, 4637 (ii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i), 4211, 4625 (ii).
——— QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i), 4213, 4629 (ii).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 3283 (ii).
HARDY BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4643 (ii).
HAWBOLD'S COVE, COST OF BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 132 (i).
HEATING, LIGHTING, &C., DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4189 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
HERRING COVE BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
HILTON, ST. JOSEPH'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— *See* 'St. Joseph.'
HOPEWELL CAPE PIER, DATE OF COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1444.
HOUSE OF COMMONS, ADDITION TO CENTRAL BLOCK, &c., COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1442 (i).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
HUDSON WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).
HUNTSVILLE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).
——— *See* 'Buildings,' &c.
INGONISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4211.
IONA WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
ISLE AU COUDRE WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Angers*) 3409 (ii).
ISLE AUX GRUES WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
JACQUES CARTIER CO., DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3285 (ii).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 599 (i), 4563 (ii).
KAMLOOPS, B.C., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
KENNEDY LAKE OUTLET: in Com. of Sup., 4642.
KINGSVILLE PIER, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1236.
LA HAVE RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3285, 4213 (ii).
——— *See* 'Lunenburg.'
LAKE ST. JOHN DISTRICT, IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).
LETHBRIDGE, IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 669.
LEVIS CATTLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
LIME KILN CROSSING, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).
LINGAN BEACH, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LITTLE BRAS D'OR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LOCKEPORT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
LOG SORTING, SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).
LOWER COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1004.
LUMBER BOUGHT FOR WHARFS, N.B.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1027 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

LUNENBURG, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
——— *See* 'La Have.'
MABOU TO PORT HAWKESBURY TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup, 852.
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
——— CABLE SERVICE; in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4769 (ii).
——— *See* 'Bryon,' &c.
MAJOR'S HILL PARK, GREENHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
MANITOBA LAKE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
MARCONI CONSTRUCTION OF TELEGRAPH, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4338 (ii).
——— *See* 'Marconi.'
MARIA ISOLATED WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4630.
MARIA STREET BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3289.
——— *See* 'Ottawa, &c.'
MEAFORD HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
MIDLAND HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1237 (i), 4641 (ii).
MILL COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1008.
MINUDIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
MONTAGUE, LOWER, ATKIN'S WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
MONTREAL, BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 708 (i).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 670 (i).
——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 3869 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, ST. MARIE'S CURRENT; in Com. Sup., 608 (i).
MOSSEY RIVER, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1275 (i).
MURRAY BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1051 (i).
NEGRO POINT, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
NEIL'S HARBOUR, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 860 (i).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
NEW LONDON BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (ii).
NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
NORTH BAY N.S., PIER, COST, &C., AMOUNT OF WORK DONE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1443 (i).
NORTH BAY, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
NORTH HEAD, N.B., BREAKWATER, ESTIMATED COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1441 (i).
OAKVILLE HARBOUR, CONSTRUCTION OF DOCKS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 135 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
ORILLIA WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1241 (i), 4641 (ii).
OROMOCTO RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4213 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1030 (i), 4628 (ii).
OTTAWA, GOVT. BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 987 (i), 4188 (ii).
——— ADDITIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).
——— ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).
——— CLEANING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
——— EASTERN BUILDING, REPAIRS TO WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR ATTENDANTS. in Com. of Sup., 4615 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

OTTAWA, GOVT. BUILDINGS, &c., ENGINEERS' SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4138 (ii).
——— GREENHOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
——— GROUNDS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 987 (i), 4188 (ii).
——— LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4189, 4616.
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).
——— RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 964 (i), 4138 (ii).
——— TELEPHONES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
——— VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 564 (i).
——— *See* 'Architects,' 'Buildings,' 'House,' 'Heating,' 'Maria St. Bridge,' 'Rideau Hall.'
OTTAWA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
OWEN SOUND HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1239.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
PARKER'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
PARTRIDGE ISLAND PIER : in Com. of Sup., 4628.
PELEE ISLAND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).
PENETANGUISHENE, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
PERCIVAL RIVER, P.E.I., SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).
PERIBONKA, IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).
PETEWAWA NARROWS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
PETIT DE GRAT HARBOUR, REMOVAL OF WRECK : in Com. of Sup., 4221 (ii).
PETIT RIVIÈRE BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (ii).
PICTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, DELAY IN OPENING : Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 1490 (i).
PICTOU ISLAND WHARFS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1009 (i).
POINT FORTUNE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4631.
POINT ST. PIERRE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
POINT WOLFE, N.B., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
PORT ARTHUR, BREAKWATER AND DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 599 (i).
PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 609 (i), 4557 (ii).
——— OBSTRUCTIONS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4798 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ont', &c.
——— BUILDING, HEATING, &c.: in Com of Sup., 4616 (ii).
PORT CREDIT HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i).
PORT DUFFERIN WHARF, COST OF SHED, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 132 (i).
PORT ELGIN PIER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
PORTER'S LAKE, OUTLET, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
PORT GEORGE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).
PORT HOPE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup. 1239 (i).
PORT LATOUR BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 990 (i), 4624 (ii).
PORT MOUTON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 990.
PORT SIMPSON TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4178 (ii).
——— TO ABERDEEN TEL. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
PRESQU'ISLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
P. E. I. AND MAINLAND TEL. LINES : in Com. of Sup., 3293 (ii).
——— TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2721 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 178, 635, 964, 1217 (i), 4535 (ii).
——— CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 4136 (ii).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Tarte*) 121.
——— EMPLOYEES, NON-PAYMENT OF : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2457 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 3777 (ii).
——— PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 209 (i).
——— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (ii).
QUARANTINE STATION BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
——— *See* 'Levis'
QUEBEC, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 4549 (ii).
——— IMMIGRANT SHED : in Com. of Sup., 709 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 709.
QUESNELLE TO ATLIN TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii).
——— AND HORSEFLY TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 852 (i), 4613 (ii).
——— IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 853 (i).
REDHEAD, N.S., BOAT HARBOUR : on M. for Com. of Sup., 4994 (ii).
RICHIBUCTO PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup , 1026 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1439 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, DRAIN, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4565.
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4188.
RIVIÉRE AUX RENARDS PIER : in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 3289 (ii).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
ROBERVAL IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
ROSSLAND PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup. 861.
ROUND BAY, BEACH PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).
ST. ALEXIS BAY, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).
ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRiviére*) 440 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviére*) 247 (i).
STE. ANNE RIVER WORKS, TIMBER USED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2858 (ii).
ST. BONIFACE HOSPITALS : in Com. of Sup., 406.
ST. CATHARINES, DRILL HALL : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 715 (i), 4567 (ii).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, OUTLET, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
ST. FRANÇOIS BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4 32 (ii).
STE. GENEVIEVE PIERS, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4215 (ii).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 710 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4564.
ST. IRÉNÉE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).
ST. JEROME, IMMIGRANT BUILDING, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
ST. JOHN DE CHAILLONS, HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).
ST. JOHN, DOM. BUILDINGS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
——— IMMIGRANT SHED : in Com. of Sup., 641 (i), 4178 (ii).
——— RIVER, WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1030 (i), 4628 (ii).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON : in Com. of Sup., 1247 (i).
——— *See* 'Hilton,' &c.
ST. LAURENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con*,

ST. LAWRENCE, GULF TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
——— *See* 'Bryon,' 'Telegraphs,' &c.
——— LOWER CHANNEL, REMOVAL OF ROCK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).
ST. MARY'S RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i).
ST. MAURICE, DREDGING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i), 4782 (ii).
——— SLIDES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3287, 4218, 4220, (ii).
——— *See* 'Slides,' &c.
ST. PETERS TO LOUISBOURG AND SCATARIE ISLAND TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
——— *See* 'Telegraphs,' &c.
STE. THERÈSE ISLAND DAM, PETS. AGAINST: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) 3724 (ii).
SALMON RIVER, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4628 (ii).
SARNIA, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1224.
SASKATOON, IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4614 (ii).
SAULT STE. MARIE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i), 4763 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 731.
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1242 (i).
'SCOTIA,' STR., CONTRACT PRICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1440 (i).
SHAWINIGAN BOOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4218.
SHEWEN, MR., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 449 (i).
SIMCOE ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).
'SIR HECTOR' DREDGE, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
SKEENA RIVER, DREDGING AND IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1277 (i).
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 3287, 4142, 4218, 4782 (ii).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 4768 (ii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).
——— ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 1062 (i).
——— GOVT. WORKSHOPS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 674 (i).
——— AND MONTREAL WHARF, CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).
SOURIS, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).
SOURIS, KNIGHTS POINT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1245.
SOUTH NATION RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup, 4780.
SYDENHAM RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (i).
TELEGRAPH LINES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4779.
——— B.C. AND TERS., AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).
——— AND CABLE LINES, PUBLIC WORKS OR P.O. CONTROL: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
——— GOVT. CONTROL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3293, 4770 (ii).
——— GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 3291, 4143 (ii).
TELEPHONE COS. OF CANADA, MILEAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3150 (ii).
TEMISCAMINGUE, LAKE, DREDGING AND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
THETFORD MINES ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 716 (i).
TIDAL WATERS, ST. JOHN RIVER, WHARFS: In Com. of Sup., 4629 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

TIGNISH HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4212, 4626 (ii).
TOBERMORY HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1246 (i).
TORONTO, DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 732.
——— APPNMT. OF MECHANICAL ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 884 (i).
——— DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
——— HARBOUR, DREDGING EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1274 (i).
——— POST OFFICE ALTERATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).
——— BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4182.
TORONTO JUNCTION, BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 733 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 403 (i).
TRANSPORTATION ON ST. LAWRENCE, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 565-604 (i).
'TYRIAN,' SS., CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4143, 4219 (ii).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i), 4216 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 717 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4564.
VANCOUVER, DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 876.
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
VICTORIA HARBOUR, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3286.
WALES, PRINCE OF, ILLUMINATIONS IN OTTAWA, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 615 (i).
WASHABUCK WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup,, 1009 (i).
WEST POINT PIER, P.E.I,: in Com. of Sup., 4211.
WIARTON, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT VOTED: Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
WILLIAM'S HEAD QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4614 (ii).
WILSON BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 844 (i), 4626 (ii).
WINDSOR, N.S., HARBOUR, SHEAR DAMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).
WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 833 (i), 4616 (ii),
——— ISOLATION HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 4613 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 3868 (ii).
WINNIPEG LAKE SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 528.
WINNIPEGOSIS, MOSSY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1242.
YORKTON COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4613 (ii).
YUKON, BUILDINGS, RENTALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4542, 4949 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS AND CIVIL SERVANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4152 (ii).
——— COURT HOUSE, ALLOWANCE TO MATRON. &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4193 (ii).
——— EMPLOYEES, CHARGES, &C., MEMO. OF MR. FULLER: Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 4536 (ii).
——— JUDGES' RESIDENCES, RENTALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4190 (ii).
——— POLE CONTRACT *re* TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 4154, 4162 (ii).
——— ROCHESTER'S CONTRACT *re* TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 4152 (ii),
——— SUPPLIES *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4538-9, (ii).
——— TELEGRAPH SYSTEM: in Com. of Sup., 4781 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 2859 (i).
——— WAGON ROADS, REFUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4147 (ii).
——— WOOD, &C. FOR YUKON BUILDINGS, PAR. IN DAWSON PAPER: Read (Mr. *Sproule*) 4540.

PULLMAN CARS, REPAIRS IN U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2459 (i).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2899 (i).
—— PHYSICIANS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 372 (i).
—— PUBLIC HEALTH: in Com. of Sup., 4967 (ii).
—— SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 371 (i); conc., 5033 (ii).
—— STATION BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
—— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.

Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. No. 26 (Mr. *Malouin*) 1°*, 734; 2°*, 882; in Com., 1622; 3°*, 1623 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 93.)

Quebec Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 87 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 1986; 2°*, 2201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 94.)

QUEBEC:
ABRAHAM, PLAINS OF, RIGHTS RESERVED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3409 (ii).
ANTICOSTI CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).
—— *See* 'Telegraph,' &c.
AUGER, I. A.. CONTRACT *re* SPRUCE PLANKS, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2483, 2676 (ii).
BATISCAN CHANNEL, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4629 (ii).
BEAUCE ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
BEAUCHAMP, OSCAR, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., &c.: (Mr. *Leonard*) 158 (i).
—— *See* 'St. Vincent,' &c.
BEAUHARNOIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
—— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 610.
BOUILLON, DR. ALFRED, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2854 (ii).
BRYON ISLAND TO ANTICOSTI, CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i), 4179 (ii).
CACOUNA AND RY. STATION, MAIL CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2225 (i).
CANALS, QUEBEC, BOUNDARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (ii).
CARILLON CANAL, GUIDE PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (ii).
CHAMBLY CANAL, WHARF, &c., MAINTENANCE BY G.T.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 2068.
CHAUDIÉRE JUNCTION, I.C.R. ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI ELECTORAL DISTRICT, DISMISSAL OF PET. (Mr. *Speaker*) 2219 (i).
COTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGE, INDEMNITY TO J. LAROSE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 622 (i).
—— *See* 'Montreal,' &c.
CRANE ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4630.
CROSS POINT, ISOLATED PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4630 (ii).
CULBUTE CANAL, DAMAGES BY FLOODING: in Com. of Sup., 4281, 4309 (ii).
DESCARY, DR. C. A., VET. SURGEON AT ST. VINCENT DE PAUL: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3831 (ii).
DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).
DORCHESTER COUNTY POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4934 (ii).
DRUMMOND CO. RY., RECEIPTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
DRUMMONDVILLE, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 643 (i).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4180.
GASPÉ PENINSULA, REMOVAL OF ROCK IN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
GATINEAU RIVER SLIDES: in Com. of Sup., 4782.
GRANBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 644 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*
GRAND VALLEE PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
GROSSE ISLE, QUARANTINE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 644, 982 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i), 4213, 4629 (ii).
HAY PURCHASED FOR WAR OFFICE IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).
HUDSON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).
INDIANS, ONT. AND QUE., MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3037 (ii).
ISLE AUX COUDRES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1046.
—— Ques. (Mr. *Angers*) 3409 (ii).
ISLE AUX GRUES, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1047.
ISLE OF ORLEANS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3285 (ii).
JOLIETTE P.O., DISMISSAL OF J. J. SHEPPARD: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2068 (i), 2856 (ii).
KAMOURASKA ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
KEITH POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF LOCATION: in Com. of Sup., 4937 (ii).
LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRIC PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4299 (ii).
—— LOCK REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4035.
—— MILL ST. PAVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4307 (ii).
—— WASTE WEIR: in Com. of Sup., 4307 (ii).
LAKE ST. JOHN DISTRICT, IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF A. THOMAS, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2221 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).
LAVAL ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
—— BALLOT PAPERS, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).
LEVIS, CATTLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
—— I.C.R. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3810 (ii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 669.
L'ISLET ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
LONGUEUIL GOVT. FARM, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2455 (i).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
—— CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4769 (ii).
—— POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).
—— STEAM COMMUNICATION, &c., STR. 'AMELIA': Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1680 (i).
MARANDA, ALFRED, EMPLYMT. OF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
MARIA, ISOLATED WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4630 (ii).
MONTREAL, BRANCH POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4564 (ii).
—— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 670 (i).
—— GRAIN INSPECTION, CERTIFICATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 450 (i).
—— HARBOUR, STE. MARIE'S CURRENT: in Com. of Sup., 608 (i).
—— HARBOUR BOARD, APPNMT. OF MR. DORAN: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3920 (ii).
—— P. O.: in Com. of Supply., 3869, 4564 (ii).
—— RIFLE RANGES, AMOUNT EXPENDED, TENDERERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).
—— *See* 'Cote St. Luc,' &c.
—— ST. JAMES, ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES DIVISION, BALLOTS, PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).
——— TURNPIKE TRUST COMMISSION, REVENUE RECEIVED, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*) 481 (i).
MURRAY BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1051 (i).
NICOLET STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
OUELLE RIVIERE, I.C.R. SPUR LINE: in Com. of Sup.. 4796 (ii).
PASPEBIAC, OCEAN PORT: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5000.
PERIBONKA, IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).
POINT FORTUNE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4631.
QUEBEC, CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com, of Sup., 4180 (ii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4549 (ii).
——— IMMIGRANT SHED: in Com. of Sup., 709 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup.,709.
——— MONTGOMERY, GENL., ERECTION OF MONUMENT, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 2681 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 129 (i).
——— SHOE WORKERS' UNION, PET. TO GOVT., &C.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Puttee*) 2473 (i).
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE, I. C. R., AID TO: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 5070 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE SHOPS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
——— FREIGHT YARD: in Com. of Sup.,3828 (ii).
——— *See* "Temiscouata."
RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
ROBERVAL IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
ST. ALEXIS BAY PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).
STE. ANNE RIVER WORKS, TIMBER USED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2858 (ii).
ST. EUGÈNE DE GRANTHAM, MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4350 (ii).
ST. FRANCOIS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4632 (ii).
STE. GENEVIEVE PIERS, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4215 (ii).
STE. HENEDINE MAIL CARRIER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 447 (i).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 710 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4564.
ST. IRENEE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).
ST. JEROME, IMMIGRANT BUILDING, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, INTERFERENCE IN POLITICAL MEETINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).
ST. JOHN DE CHAILLONS, HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).
ST. LAURENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE, GULF TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
——— *See* 'Telegraph,' &c.
——— LIGHTS, BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 518.
——— LOWER CHANNEL, REMOVAL OF ROCK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).
——— TRANSPORTATION ON ST. LAWRENCE, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 565-604.
——— M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3674-5 (ii).
ST. MAURICE DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i), 4782 (ii).
——— SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 3287, 4218, 4220 (ii).
STE. MONIQUE STATION, &C., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 744 (i).
ST. OCTAVE STATION, I. C. R., COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2222 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*
STE. ODILON, POSTMASTER, DORCHESTER CO., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 4350 (ii).
STE. THÉRÈSE ISLAND DAM, PETS. AGAINST: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 3724 (ii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).
——— COAL SUPPLIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).
——— EMPLOYEES ORGANIZING POLITICAL MEETINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 158 (i).
——— INDEMNITY TO TREFFLÉ NANTEL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2471 (i).
——— LAND PURCHASES: in Com. of Sup., 3617.
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE OF WARDEN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).
——— LETTER *re* MISCONDUCT OF OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 1445 (i).
——— LUSSIER ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 4268 (ii).
——— RELATIONS BETWEEN WARDEN AND DEP. WARDEN: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 1445 (i).
——— VET. SURGEON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3831 (ii).
ST. VINCENT, W.I., RELIEF TO SUFFERERS: in Com. of Sup., 5031 (ii).
SHAWINIGAN BOOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4218.
SHEPPARD, J. J., CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2855 (ii).
——— *See* 'Joliette,' &c.
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).
——— ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 1062 (i).
——— GOVT. WORKSHOPS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 674 (i).
——— AND MONTREAL WHARF CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4019, 4304 (ii).
——— WATER POWERS, &C., REPS. OF ENGINEERS, LEASES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bennett*) 631.
SUPERIOR COURT, QUEBEC, WRITS ISSUED, &C., NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 442 (i).
TELEGRAPH SERVICE, GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 4143 (ii).
——— *See* 'St. Lawrence,' &c.
TEMISCOUATA FARM LANDS, DAMAGES *re* I.C.R. DITCHING: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2677 (ii).
TEMISCOUATA RY. AND I. C. R., TRAFFIC FACILITIES, PRICES PAID 1900-1: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1860 (i).
TERREBONNE CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
THEREIN, MR. H., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER FROM GRANDES PILES, PET., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ball*) for Copy*, 3724 (ii).
THETFORD MINES, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 716 (i).
THREE RIVERS, INSPECTOR GRAVEL, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2457 (i).
TWO MOUNTAINS CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— CERTIFICATE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1323 (i).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i), 4216 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 717 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4564.
——— RIOTS, MILITIA EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4260 (ii).
QUEEN'S AND KING'S COUNSEL, APPOINTED SINCE 1896; Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3154 (ii).
QUEEN'S (P.E.I.) ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

QUESNEL FORKS AND HORSEFLY TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
QUESNELLE TO ATLIN TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii).
——— *See* 'Telegraphs,' &c.
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1° m., 68; 2° m., 451; ref. to Sel. Com. on Rys., agreed to (Y. 90; N. 50) 481 (i); M. for Com., 3158; in Com., 3164 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2480 (i).
——— **(drainage) Amt. B. No. 4** (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 121; 2° m., 626 (i).
——— **(drainage) Act Amt. B. No. 6** (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1° m., 238; 2° m., 789 (i).
——— **B. No. 25** (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1° m., 632 (i).
——— **B. No. 42** (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 1063 (i).
——— **(fire damages) Amt. B. No. 56** (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1°*, 1323 (i).
——— **(safety of employees) Amt. B. No. 92** (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1°*, 2064 (i).
——— **Consolidation B. No. 104** (Mr. *Blair*) 1° m., 2431 (i); wthdn., 4970 (ii).
——— **Incorporation Companies B. No. 110** (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1° m., 2847 (ii).
——— **Labour Disputes Settlement B. No. 146** (Mr. *Mulock*) 1° m., 3725; wthdn., 4970 (ii).
——— **(expropriation) Amt. B. No. 155** (Mr. *Blair*) 1° m., 4126; 2°*, 4580; in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4604 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 29.)
——— Remarks (Mr. *Blair*) 4404 (ii).
RAILWAYS:
ACCIDENTS THROUGH CATTLE ON TRACK, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Erb*) 883 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Erb*) 2472 (i).
——— *See* 'Employees.'
ADDITIONAL SIDINGS, &C., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3811, 4792; conc., 5037 (ii).
AIR BRAKES, &C., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3812.
ALBERTON RY. STATION, LOCATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1441 (i).
BRIDGES, STRENGTHENING, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3809, 4792 (ii).
——— P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
BRITISH YUKON RY.: *See* 'Yukon.'
C.P.R., INCREASE IN CAPITAL STOCK: Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 129 (i).
——— LANDS TAXATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 5055 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 5070 (ii).
——— *See* 'N.W.T.'
CAR COUPLERS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4794 (ii).
CEMENTS, PORTLAND, TESTS, &C. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 1442, 1444 (i).
CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I., INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
COAL PURCHASED IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 883 (i).
COPPER CROWN WORKS AND I.C.R. CONTRACTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).
CROSSEN MFG. CO.: *See* 'Trucks,' &c.
DITCHING: *See* 'Temiscouata.'
DIXON, F. A., PROMOTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4534, 4782 (ii).
DOM. SECURITIES CO., PROSPECTUS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3466, 3533 (ii).
——— PAR. IN N.Y. PAPER: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4428 (ii).
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RECEIPTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
RAILWAYS—*Con.*
EASTERN EXTENSION, ARBITRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4340 (ii).
——— REFUNDS FOR RIGHT OF WAY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 781 (i).
EEL RIVER STATION: In Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
EMPLOYEES, CAN. RYS., KILLED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 410 (i).
——— *See* 'Accidents,' &c.
EMPLOYEES, I.C.R., NUMBER, SALARIES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bell*) 440 (i).
——— CLASSIFYING OF EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).
ENGINEERS, &C., I.C.R., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4292 (ii).
EXPENDITURES *re* GOVT. RYS.: M. *re* Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., 3235; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3240; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 3281 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Haggart*) 3126 (ii).
FIRE INSURANCE ON LOCOMOTIVES, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2854 (ii).
FREIGHT RATES, I.C.R., ON PIG IRON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 782 (i).
FREIGHT RATES, REP. OF PROF. MCLEAN: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 448 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Kemp*) 1205 (i).
GENERAL STATEMENT (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. of Sup., 2866, 3411 (ii).
GOVT. POLICY: Amt. to Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (Mr. *Bourassa*) 65, 68; wthdn., 119 (i).
G.T. RY., RENTALS BY I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
HALIFAX AND S. WESTERN RY. EXTENSION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5064 (ii).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 3862; conc., 5039 (ii).
HORNE, MR. R. T., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2068 (i).
I.C.R.: IN COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 3410 (ii).
I.C.R. AND P.E.I. RYS., ACCOUNTS, VOUCHERS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).
JOUGHINS, MR., REP. *re* I.C.R. LOCOMOTIVES: in Com. of Sup., 3416 (ii).
——— *See* 'Mechanical,' &c.
JOUGHINS TRUCK: *See* 'Truck.'
KINKORA RY. ACCOMMODATION, RES. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).
LÉVIS LOCAL SERVICE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES FOR I.C.R., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3426, 3816 (ii).
——— BOUGHT, RENTED, &C. BY GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1108 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 2681 (i).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 445 (i).
MACKENZIE & MANN, EXCHEQUER COURT AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 4860 (ii).
MCMANUS LETTER *re* I.C.R. TIES: in Com. of Sup., 3502-4 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ties,' &c.
MACHINERY, TOOLS, &C., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3812, 4297 (ii).
MECHANICAL SUPERINTENDENT, REPORTS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3813 (ii).
——— *See* 'Joughins.'
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SPANS: in Com. of Sup., 4794 (ii).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 3862, 3996, 4282, 4292, 4918; conc., 5039 (ii).
——— SOUTHPORT TO MURRAY HARBOUR, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695 (ii).
N.B., RAILWAY LINES, TRACINGS, &C.: M. for Plans* (Mr. *Costigan*) 961 (i).
NICOLET STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

N.W.T., LANDS PATENTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2677 (ii).
——— *See* 'C.P.R.,' &c.
OPERATING EXPENSES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4310 (ii).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3809 (ii).
OUELLE RIVIÈRE SPUR LINE: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
PASSES ISSUED ON GOVT. RYS. &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 810 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4120 (ii).
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup. 3812 (ii).
P.E.I. RYS.: in Com. of Sup., 3862, 3996, 4282.
PRIVATE CARS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
PULLMAN CARS, REPAIRS IN U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2459 (i).
RAILS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3781; conc., 5035.
——— QUANTITY PURCHASED, CLERGUE'S CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 746, 781, 1439 (i).
——— RAILS, ROLLING STOCK, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 885 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS—CIVIL GOVT., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3779, 4782 (ii).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 129.
——— DEPTL. VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4534 (ii).
RAILWAY COMMISSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4305.
——— APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 131 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 883 (i).
——— BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Blair*) 4404 (ii).
——— COM.: M. to add Names (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1278 (i).
——— SUBSIDIES PAID SINCE 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 448 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4970, 4972.
REVENUE AND CAPITAL ACCOUNT FOR 1901, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).
ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3813, 4297, 4783; conc., 5037 (ii).
——— ROLLING STOCK, &c., CONDITION, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 3724 (ii).
——— *See* 'Rails,' 'Rolling Stock,' &c.
ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX ELEVATORS, GRAIN, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).
——— QUANTITY OF GRAIN, REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 612 (i).
ST. OCTAVE STATION, I.C.R., TENDERER, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2222 (i).
SHIMS PURCHASED IN 1901, PRICES PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1438 (i).
STATION EXPENSES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3496.
SUBSIDIES TO RYS.: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
SYDNEY, ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3805, 3996, 4789, 4796 (ii).
SYDNEY AND LOUISBURG BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).
TEMISCOUATA AND I.C.R., TRAFFIC FACILITIES, PRICES PAID, 1900-1: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1860 (i).
——— DITCHING: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2677 (ii).
TIES, I.C.R., PURCHASES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 444, 2065 (i).
TRACKMEN'S WAGES, GOVT. RYS.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3702; neg. (Y. 54; N. 23) 3824.
TRANSPORTATION, DISTANCES, COST, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 578 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 135 (i).
TRUCKS, I.C.R., PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2852 (ii).
TRURO ROUNDHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352.
TRURO STATION, &c., REBUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

WEBB AND SUNDAY TRAVELLING OVER P.E.I. RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4700 (ii).
WINDSOR BRANCH RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4292.
YUKON, BRITISH, RY., TOLLS AND CHARGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3638 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.', &c.
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4304 (ii).
——— GILBERT BROS.: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).
——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.
RECIPROCITY IN TRADE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 248.
RED DEER, COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 852 (i), 4613 (ii).
——— IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 853.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2201 (i); M. to ref. back to Sel Com., 3202; agreed to (Y. 87; N. 53) 3254 (ii).
REDHEAD, N.S., BOAT HARBOUR: on M. for Com. of Sup., 4994 (ii).
RED HORSE SHOAL LIGHT, KEEPER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 442 (i).
——— *See* 'Gananoque.'
REFERENDUM: *See* 'Manitoba Liquor Act.'
Regina Law Library B. No. 19 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 530; 2°m., 1205; in Com., and 3°*, 1205 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 30.)
REGISTRARS, N.W.T. GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 4251. (ii)
RELIGIOUS PRECEDENCE IN CAN.: *See* 'Precedence.'
Remission of Penalties B. No. 151 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 4036; 2°*, 4579; in Com., 4579; 3°*, 4579 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 26.)
REMOUNTS, SUPPLIES, &c. FOR MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 2559 (ii).
——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
REPRESENTATION IN HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVS. *re* CENSUS, 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2677 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2854 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon Bill 134.'
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE, I.C.R., AID TO: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 5070 (ii).
RESTIGOUCHE INDIANS, INVESTIGATION *re* COMPLAINTS, REP. OF INSPECTOR: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Fowler*) 2473 (i).
RETURNS, Inquiry for (Mr. *Bell*) 3239, 4036 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3862, 4120 (ii).
RICHIBUCTO, PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1026 (i).
——— TENDERERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1439 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
RICKARD, WM., RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4697 (ii).
RICKETTS, T., POSTMASTER AT GILMOUR, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2224 (i).
RIDEAU CANAL, POONAMALIE BRIDGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4270, 4917 (ii).
——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.
RIDEAU HALL, DRAIN, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4565.
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4188.
RIFLE ASSOCIATION, GRANTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2561 (ii).

RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS' REGULATIONS, PAMPHLET, FRENCH TRANSLATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 2223 (i).

RIFLE PRACTICE FOR CANADIAN SCHOOL BOYS : prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 3155 (ii).

RIFLE RANGE, BEDFORD : conc., 5032 (ii).

RIFLE RANGES, LAND PURCHASES : in Com. of Sup., 2566 (i).

RIORDON PAPER CO. AND WATER PRIVILEGES ON WELLAND CANAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 745.

——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.

RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS PIER : in Com. of Sup., 4631.

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE SHOPS : in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).

——— FREIGHT YARD, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i).

ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 3289 (ii).

——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).

ROBERVAL IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).

ROCHESTER'S CONTRACT *re* YUKON TELEGRAPHS : in Com. of Sup., 4152 (ii).

——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.

ROCKINGHAM IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 4798.

Rocky Mountain Park Act (extension) Amt. B. No. 133 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3305 ; 2°*, 3774 ; in Com., 3774 ; 3°*, 3774 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 31.)

ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3813, 4297, 4783 ; conc., 5037 (ii).

ROSEAU RIVER INDIAN RESERVE : Ques. (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 247 (i).

ROSSLAND MINERS' UNION AND ALIEN LABOUR ACT' LETTERS, &c., *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Smith Vancouver*) 2471 (i).

ROSSLAND PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 861.

Ross Rifle Co.'s B. No. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 1673 ; 2°*, 2024 (i) ; in Com., 2671 ; 3°*, 2675 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 96.)

ROSS RIFLES, FREE ENTRY, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4973 (ii).

'ROTHESAY BLUES,' MEDALS, PETS. *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4698 (ii).

'ROTHESAY,' STR., REMOVAL OF WRECK : in Com. of Sup., 4221 (ii).

ROUND BAY BEACH PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).

ROUND HILL TO ARMSTRONG'S CORNERS, MAIL CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1987 (i).

ROUND HILL POSTAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).

Royal Marine Insurance Co.'s B. No. 167 (Mr. *Marcil*, *Bonaventure*) 1°*, 4568 ; 2°*, 4578 ; in Com., and 3°*, 4623 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 97.)

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 2562 ; conc., 5033 (ii).

——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING : in Com. of Sup., 4261.

——— GYMNASIUM, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).

——— REP. OF BOARD OF VISITORS : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 443 (i).

ROYAL MINT BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).

ROYAL VISIT : *See* 'Wales.'

ROY VS. C.P.R., PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENT : M. for Copy (Mr. *Lemieux*) 499 (i).

RURAL POSTMASTERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3874 (ii).

Russo-Greek Church : *See* 'Greek Catholic.'

ST. ALEXIS BAY PIER : in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).

ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, AMOUNT VOTED AND SPENT, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 440 (i).

——— EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 247

——— IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).

STE. ANNE RIVER WORKS, TIMBER USED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2858 (ii).

ST. BONIFACE HOSPITALS : in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).

ST. CATHARINES, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 715 (i), 4567 (ii).

——— WATER SUPPLY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 883, 1860 (i).

——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 52 (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1°*, 1278 ; 2°*, 1438 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2201 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 98.)

St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 15 (Mr. *Ingram*) 1°*, 530 ; 2°* 779 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII* *c.* 95.)

ST. EUGÈNE DE GRANTHAM MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4350 (ii).

ST. FRANCIS LAKE, OUTLET, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).

ST. FRANCOIS BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4632.

STE. GENEVIEVE PIERS, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4215 (ii).

STE. HENEDINE MAIL CARRIER, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 447 (i).

ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 710.

——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4564 (ii).

ST. IRENÉE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).

ST. JEROME, IMMIGRANT BUILDING, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).

——— POSTMASTER, INTERFERENCE IN POLITICAL MEETINGS : Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).

ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX ELEVATORS, QUANTITY OF GRAIN, REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 612, 883 (i).

——— remarks in Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).

——— *See* "I. C. R." &c.

——— BUILDINGS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

——— IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 641 (i), 4178 (ii).

——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).

ST. JOHN DES CHAILLONS, HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).

ST. JOHN LAKE DISTRICT, IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).

ST. JOHN RIVER WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1030 (i), 4628 (ii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Lake Huron: in Com. of Sup., 1247 (i).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.

St. Laurent, Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).

——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s B. No. 153 (Mr. *Pringle*) 1°*, 4121 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Great Lakes Waterways, Commission, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 886 (i).

St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) 1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; in Com., 2193; 3°*, 2194 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 99.)

St. Lawrence, Canal Employees, Amounts paid, collected, &c.: 1896-1901: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2222 (i).

——— Gulf Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).

——— Lower Channel, Removal of Rock, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

——— Navigation, Aids to: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5024 (ii).

——— Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).

——— Transportation between Quebec and Montreal: M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3674-5 (ii).

St. Louis and Japan Expositions: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).

St. Mary's River Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i).

St. Maurice District Slides, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3287, 4218, 4220 (ii).

——— Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1053, 4782 (ii).

Ste. Monique Station, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 744.

St. Octave Station, I.C.R., Tenderer, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2222 (i).

Ste. Odilon, Postmaster, Dorchester Co., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 4350 (ii).

——— *See* "Dorchester."

St. Peters to Louisbourg and Scatari Island Telegraph: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).

Ste. Thérèse Island Dam, Pets. against: M. for for Copies* (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 3724 (ii).

St. Thomas, Customs Collector: in Com. of Sup., 2930, 3295 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul, Appnmt. of Physician: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).

——— Coal Supplies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159.

——— Employees organizing Political Meetings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 158 (i).

——— Indemnity to Trefflé Nantel: M. for Ret.* 2471 (i).

——— Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).

——— Leave of Absence of Warden: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).

——— Letter *re* Misconduct of Officials: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 1445 (i).

——— Lussier Arbitration: in Com. of Sup., 4268 (ii).

——— Vet. Surgeon, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3831.

St. Vincent, W.I., Relief to Sufferers: in Com. of Sup., 5031 (ii).

Sabbath Observance *re* Military Parades: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 4646 (ii).

Salmon and Lobster Hatcheries, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4222 (ii).

Salmon River Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 4628.

Samples sent by Sample Post, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 617 (i).

Sandhills, P.E.I., Range Lights, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).

Sarnia Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1224 (i).

Saskatchewan Settlers, Relief: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).

Saskatoon Immigrant Building: in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4614 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie, Canal: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i), 4001, 4298, 4763 (ii).

——— Post Office, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 731 (i).

——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1242 (i).

School Lands, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4252 (ii).

——— Sale, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 154.

Schools, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).

——— Ont., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3045 (i).

School Teachers for South Africa, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 962 (i).

Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).

'Scotia,' Str., Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1440 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE:

Civil Service Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii),

Printing Bureau, Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4119, 4956 (ii).

Printing and Stationery: in Com. of Sup., 174 (i).

——— Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).

Sec. of State, Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 173 (i).

——— Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 451 (i).

Securities Bank of Can. B. No. 166 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 4464; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 100.)

Securities, Postmasters, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3876.

Seed Grain for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 3050, 3056 (ii).

Seeley's Bay P.O., Abstraction from Registered Letters: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).

Seine Licenses issued in B.C., Number, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Earle*) 2680 (ii).

Sessional Clerks employed as Civil Servants: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 619 (i).

Shawinigan Booms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).

Sheppard, Mr., Postmaster at Joliette, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2068 (i), 2855 (ii).

Sheriff's Fees, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).

Shewen, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 449 (i).

Shims purchased in 1901, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1438 (i).

SHIPPING COMBINE (ATLANTIC), PAR. IN 'CITIZEN': on M. for Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).

SHOE WORKERS' UNION, QUEBEC, PET. TO GOVT., &C.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Puttee*) 2473 (i).

SIDINGS, ADDITIONAL, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4792 (ii).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

SIEVERT, PRIVATE, ALLOWANCE TO FAMILY: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).

SIMCOE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).

SIOUX INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3056 (ii).

'SIR HECTOR,' DREDGE, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).

SKEENA RIVER, DREDGING AND IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1277 (i).

SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 3287, 4782 (ii).

——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).

——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4142 (ii).

SMALLPOX, ON SCHR. 'JEANIE MYRTLE': Remarks (Mr, *Kaulbach*) 5015 (ii).

——— OUTBREAK AMONG TROOPS IN S. A.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1446 (i).

SNAG-BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 4768 (ii).

SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1053.

——— ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 1062 (i).

——— GOVT. WORKSHOPS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 674 (i).

——— AND MONTREAL WHARF CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4019, 4304 (ii).

——— WATER POWERS, &C., REPS. OF ENGINEERS, LEASES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bennett*) 631 (i).

SOURIS, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).

——— KNIGHT'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR:

CANADIAN BEEF EXCLUSION FROM IMP. CONTRACTS: Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3840; neg. (Y. 51; N. 98) 3857 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 746 (i).

CONDUCT OF CANADIAN SOLDIERS, PAR. IN 'DAILY NEWS': Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2069, 2088 (i).

CONSTABULARY, APPLICATIONS, SELECTIONS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 528 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Mouk*) 243 (i).

CONTINGENTS, EXPENSE OF EQUIPMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1684 (i).

——— COR. BETWEEN HIS EX., CAN. GOVT., AND G. B., *re* RECRUITING TROOPS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 137 (i).

——— PAR. IN 'LA PATRIE': Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1762 (i).

HORSES PURCHASED IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1989 (i), 2679 (ii).

LAND GRANTS TO S. A. CONTINGENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1446 (i), 3831 (ii).

PENSIONS TO CANADIANS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2459 (i).

SCHOOL TEACHERS, IMFORMATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 962 (i).

SMALL-POX OUTBREAK AMONG TROOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1446 (i).

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—*Con.*

SOCKS FOR THIRD CONTINGENT, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 3638 (i).

VOLUNTEERS, LAND GRANTS TO, MEMORIALS FROM N. W. TER.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3831 (ii).

See 'Militia,' &c.

SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1245 (i).

SOUTH NATION RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).

SOUTHPORT TO MURRAY HARBOUR, P. E. I. RY., TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695 (ii).

——— *See* 'Murray Harbour,' &c.

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 85 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2473 (i); in Com., 4569; 3°*, 4569 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 101.)

Sovereign Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 781; 2°*, 882; in Com., and 3°*, 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 102.)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s Limited incorp. B. No. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; in Com., 1675, 2021, 2192; 3°*, 2193 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 103.)

SPRINGBANK POST OFFICE, MAIL SERVICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).

SPRUCE PLANKS FOR TIES, &C., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).

STAFF COURSE AT KINGSTON: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).

——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.

STAMPERS AND SORTERS, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4940 (ii).

'STANLEY' STR., REPAIRING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 520 (i).

STATIONERY, HOUSE OF COMMONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4326 (ii).

——— *See* 'H. of C.,' &c.

STATION EXPENSES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).

STATISTICS, GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 339 (i), 2827.

STATUTES, REVISION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3622 (ii).

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT, AND PET. FROM MARINE ENGINEERS' NATIONAL ASS'N.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 513, 534 (i).

STR. 'NEWFIELD': in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).

——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.

SS. COMPANIES, SUBSIDIES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4466 (ii).

STEAMSHIPS CONSTRUCTED IN SCOTLAND, OUTFITTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).

STEAMSHIPS FITTED WITH COOLING FANS, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 616, 882 (i).

——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.

STEEL RAILS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3781; conc., 5035.

——— Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 746, 781, 1439 (i).

——— I.C.R., ROLLING STOCK, &C., PURCHASED IN 1901, O. C's. CONTRACTS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 885, 886 (i).

——— *See* 'I. C. R.,' 'Rys.,' &c.

STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).

STEWART, CAPT. D. C., QUARANTINE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 2845, 2909 (ii).

Stock Breeders : *See* 'Maritime.'

Strait of Canso Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) 1°*, 1204 ; 2°*, 1438 ; in Com., 2194, 2219 ; 3°*, 2220 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 104.)

STRONG, CHIEF JUSTICE SIR HENRY, AMOUNT PAID *re* JUDICIAL COMMITTEE : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1986 (i).

SUBSIDIES TO RYS : *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'

SUBSIDY TO N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 4251, 4298 (ii).

SUGAR, REFINED, IMPORTED INTO CAN. FROM 1900 TO 1901 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Madore*) 809 (i).

——— TESTING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER, P. E. I. : in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).

SUPERANNUATIONS, POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

SUPERIOR COURT, QUEBEC, WRITS ISSUED, &C., NUMBER, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 442 (i).

SUPPLIES *re* TELEGRAPH SERVICE, YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 4157 (ii).

——— BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 4538-9 (ii).

——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.

Supply B. No. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 5073 ; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5074 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 1.)

SUPPLY :

(Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head).

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM. : Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Letter from Sir L. H. Davies (read) 811 ; Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) Official Report of Speech, 962 ; Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) Horses, Duty on, imported into the N. W. T., 1206 ; Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) Telegraphic Communication with P. E. I. and Mainland, 2721 ; Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bell*) *re* Blue Books Statistics, 2731 ; Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) Preferential Trade with the Empire, 2733, 2942 ; Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) Halifax Longshoremen, Strike, &c., 2859 ; Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) Immigration, Agents, &c., 2946 ; Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), Nickel Exports, 3030 ; Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) Man. School Lands, 3035 ; Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) Public Accounts Com., I. C. R. Expenditures, &c., 3240 ; Neg. (Y. 43 ; N. 91) 3281 ; Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) S. A. War, Terms of Peace with Boers, &c., 3316, 3343 ; Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Atlantic Shipping Combine, 3513 ; Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) Public Works Employees, Delay in Payments to, 3777 ; Remarks (Mr. *Porter*) Coronation Contingent of Militia, 3835 ; Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) Canadian Beef excluded from Imperial Contracts, 3840 ; Neg. (Y. 51 ; N. 98) 3857 ; Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) Fishery Awards, Statement of P. E. I. Premier, 3859 ; Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) North Pole Expedition, &c., 3951 ; Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) Cattle Embargo by G. B., 3980 ; Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) Transportation Problem, 4361 ; Neg. (Y. 43 ; N. 93) 4402 ; Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) N. W. Town Sites, 4404 ; Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Intercolonial Conference, 4427 ; Miller Creek, Concessions, 4427 ; Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Dom. Securities Co., Par. in New York paper, 4428 ; Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) Kingston Locomotive Works, Strike, &c., 4702 ; Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Intercolonial Conference, Cor., &c., with Hon. Jos. Chamberlain, 4704 ; Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) Bull, Charles A., Produce Co., *re* Letter from High Commissioner's Office, 4805 ; Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Financial Review, 4810 ; Neg. (Y. 41 ; N. 84) 4859 ; Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Treadgold Concessions, &c., 4977 ; Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) Paspebiac as an Ocean Port, 5000 ; Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Small-pox Outbreak on SS. 'Jeanie Myrtle,' 5015 ; Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Fishery Award, 5015 ; Coasting Trade, 5015 ; Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) *re* Galops Rapids, 5020 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Transmitting Estimates for 1903, 120 ; Suppl , 785 (i), 3918, 4353, 5030 (ii).

COMMITTEE :

Administration of Justice : *See* 'Justice.'

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics :

Aid to Agricultural Societies, 343 (i).
Archives, 321 (i).
Census, 3365, 4076, 4429 (ii).
Cold Storage, &c., 2568, 2622 (ii).
Compiling Historical Data of Acadian Families, 356 (i).
Criminal Statistics, 335 (i).
Dairying Interests, Promotion of, 2657 (ii).
Experimental Farms, 344 (i), 2867, 2889, 4966 (ii).
Farm Bulletins, Printing and Distribution, 345 (i).
Fumigating Stations, 353 (i).
General Statistics, 339 (i), 2827 (ii).
Imperial Institute, London, Improving Can. Exhibit, 364 (i).
Japan, Osaka Exposition, 4966 (ii).
Pan-American Exposition, 4967 (ii).
Paris Exposition, 4967 (ii).
Patents, Classifying Canadian, 349 (i).
Patent Record, 329 (i).
St. Louis Exposition, 4966 (ii).
Year Book, 336 (i), 2814 (ii).

Charges of Management, 171 (i).
Additional Amount for Dom. Notes, 4317 (ii).
Clerical Assistance *re* Redemption of Notes, 4324, 4533 (ii).

Civil Government :

Agriculture, 177 (i).
Chittick, F. C., First Class Clerkship, 4964 (ii).
Auditor General's Office, 175 (i).
Contingencies :
Agriculture, 205 (i).
Auditor General's Office, 204 (i), 4535 (ii).
Board of C. S. Examiners, 4315 (ii).
Customs, 208 (i), 4264 (ii).
Finance, 204 (i), 3303 (ii).
High Commissioner's Office, 209 (i), 4326 (ii).
Indian Affairs, 3037 (ii).
Inland Revenue, 207 (i).
Interior, 202 (i), 3062, 4248 (ii).
Justice, 4264 (ii).
Labour, 213 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 204 (i).
N. W. M. P., 212 (i).
Post Office, 211 (i).
Printing and Stationery, 199 (i).
Public Works, 209 (i), 4136 (ii).
Cleaning Deptl. Buildings, &c., 214 (i).
Secretary of State, 199 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 532 (i).
Finance, 175 (i).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 172 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 180 (i).
Indian Dept., 3035 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Civil Government—Con,
Inland Revenue, 175 (i).
Interior, 3061 (ii).
Labour Gazette, 181 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 177 (i).
Tyrwhitt, R. E., Salary, 4958 (ii).
North-west Mounted Police, 174 (i).
Post Office, 179 (i), 4313 (ii).
Employees, Inside Service, Salaries, 4925 (ii).
Provisional Allowance, Clerk, Victoria, B.C., 4925 (ii).
Second Class Clerkships, Salaries, 4925 (ii).
Privy Council Office, 173 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 174 (i).
Public Works, 178 (i), 4535 (ii).
Railways and Canals, 3779, 4534, 4782 (ii).
Secretary of State, 173 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 530 (i), 4534 (ii).
Customs:
Laboratory Expenses, &c., 2927 (ii).
Miscellaneous, 3296 (ii).
Preventive Service, 3297 (ii).
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 2921, 3295 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital:
Fontaine, L. E., Amount *re* Injuries, 4256 (ii).
Surveys, 4252, 4953 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Income:
General Vote, 4117 (ii).
Dominion Police, 233 (i).
Excise:
Expenses, &c., 4258 (ii).
Further Amounts, 4961 (ii).
Salaries, &c., 1147 (i).
To provide for Extra Duty Pay at Distilleries, &c., 1184 (i).
Weights and Measures:
Metrical System, &c., 4961 (ii).
Fisheries:
Can. Fishery Exhibit, 553 (i).
Cold Storage for Bait for Deep-sea Fishermen, 556 (i).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 550 (i), 4222, 4959 (ii).
Fisheries Protection Service, B.C., &c., 552 (i).
Fishing Bounty Cheques, 553 (i).
Noble Bros., Award, &c., 4228 (ii).
Oyster Culture, 555 (i).
Salaries, &c., of Fishery Officers, 533 (i), 4228 (ii).
Geological Survey:
General Vote, 4116 (ii).
Maps, Printing, &c., 4948 (ii).
Salary of Geologist to International Boundary Survey, 4250, 4948 (ii).
Govt. of North-west Territories:
General Vote, 3064 (ii).
Registrars, Additional Amount, 4251 (ii).
Schools, &c., Additional Amount, 4251, 4948.
Govt. of Yukon Territory:
Rents, Heating, &c , 4949 (ii).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B. and Foreign Countries, 2988 (ii).
Contingencies, Agencies, &c., 3029 (ii).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Industrial Schools, &c., 3059 (ii).
Medical Attendance, 3058, 4247 (ii).
Generally:
Inspector of Agencies, &c., 3060 (ii).
Printing, &c., 3060 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—Con.
Manitoba and N. W. T.:
Agricultural Implements, 3054 (ii).
Field and Garden Seeds, 3056 (ii).
General Expenses, 3057 (ii).
Grist and Saw Mills, 3057 (ii).
Sioux, 3056 (ii).
Supplies, &c., 3056 (ii).
New Brunswick:
Medical Attendance, 3052 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 3050 (ii).
Ontario and Quebec:
Liquor Traffic, Suppression, 3049 (ii).
Medical Attendance, 3037, 3041 (ii).
Munceys, Agricultural Grant, 3048 (ii).
Schools, Generally, 3043 (ii).
Prince Edward Island:
Medical Attendance, 3053 (ii).
Inspection of Staples:
Binder Twine, Inspection, 4963 (ii).
Insurance:
General Vote, 4117 (ii).
Justice, Administration of:
Divorce Court Judge, N.B., 217 (i).
Exchequer Court, 229 (i).
To pay L. A. Audette, 231 (i).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 214 (i), 4266.
Jr. Judge, Leeds and Grenville, Salary, 4965.
Travelling Allowances to Man. Judges, 4265.
Supreme Court:
Reporter's Salary, 217 (i).
Salary of J. O'Regan, Increase, 4965 (ii).
To pay ad hoc Judges, 4264 (ii).
Yukon:
Additional Salary of Judge, 233 (i), 3583 (ii).
Clerk of Court, Salary, 3587 (ii).
Law Books, Freight Charges, &c., 3590, 4267.
Living Allowances of Judges, 3584 (ii).
Maintenance of Prisoners, 3589 (ii).
Miscellaneous Expenses, 3590 (ii).
Salary of Additional Judge, 3584 (ii).
Sheriff's Salary, 3586 (ii).
Surgeon's Salary, 3588 (ii).
Transport of Prisoners, 3589 (ii).
Witness and Jury Fees, 3590, 4267 (ii).
Legislation:
General:
Printing, Binding and distributing the Laws, 237 (i).
Printing Paper and Binding, 237 (i).
Voters' Lists, 237 (i).
House of Commons:
Ballot Designs, Gratuities *re*, 4330 (ii).
Expenses of Coms., Sessional Clerks, &c., 235 (i).
Franchise Act, 4329 (ii).
Printing Generally, 4327 (ii).
Publishing Debates, 4327, 4341 (ii).
Salaries, 234 (i).
Stationery, 4326 (ii).
Library:
Books, Binding, &c., 237 (i).
Messengers' Salaries, 4327, 4966 (ii).
Salaries, 236 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Maintenance and Repairs to Lighthouses, &c., 526 (i), 4222 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 517 (i).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Canada and France, 4332 (ii).
Victoria, Vancouver, &c., to Skagway, 4964.
Militia—Capital:
General Vote, 4947 (ii).
Rifle Ranges, 2566 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Militia—Income :
Annual Drill, &c., 2532, 4259 (ii).
Contingencies, 2562, 4260 (ii).
Coronation Contingent, 4262 (ii).
Defences at Esquimalt, 2565, 4261 (ii).
Dominion Arsenal, 2565, 4261 (ii).
Grants to Associations, 2561 (ii).
Halifax Provisional Garrison, 4947 (ii).
Hurdman, Major, Allowance *re* S. A. War, 4262 (ii).
Medals, 4262 (ii).
Military Properties, 2549, 4260 (ii).
Pay and Allowances, 1133 (i), 2498 (ii).
Provisions, Supplies aud Remounts, 2559 (ii).
Royal Military College, 2562, 4261 (ii).
Salaries, &c., 2548, 4259 (ii).

Miscellaneous :
Arbitration *re* Ont. and Que. Accts., 4119 (ii).
Assay Office, B.C., 4117 (ii).
Banff, Maintenance of Roads, &c., 4118 (ii).
Museum Building, 4953 (ii).
Bank of Commerce, Services in Yukon, 4339.
Boundary Surveys, Further Amount, 4953 (ii).
Browning and Senkler, Costs *re* Nipissing Election, 4339 (ii).
Butcher, N.R., Evidence *re* Klock *vs.* Paring, 4339 (ii).
Cabinet Ministers' Expenses to London, 4332.
Chinese and Japanese Commission, 4340 (ii).
Consolidation of Statutes, 3622 (ii).
Destitute Miners, Dease and Liard Rivers, 4257 (ii).
Destitute Settlers in Saskatchewan District, 4257 (ii).
Eastern Extension Arbitration, 4340 (ii).
Farewell, J. F., K.C., Costs *re* North Ont. Recount, 4269 (ii).
Half-breed Claims Commission, Salaries, &c., 4954 (ii).
Labour Dept., 4119 (ii).
Litigation of Interior Dept., 4119 (ii).
Litigation of Justice Dept., 3620 (ii).
Marconi System of Telegraphy, 4338 (ii).
Prime Minister's Expenses to Coronation, 4332 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Additional Plant, 4119, 4956.
Printing Maps, &c., 4954 (ii).
St. Vincent, W.I., &c., Aid *re* Volcanic Eruption, 5031 (ii).
To pay Estate of late Capt. W. H. Smith. R.N.R., 4240 (ii).
To pay Gratuity to Widow, late Nathan White, 4256 (ii).
York, Duke of, Expenses *re* Visit, 4331 (ii).

Mounted Police :
General Vote, 4247 (ii).

Ocean and River Service :
Cattle Inspection, 517 (i).
Furnishing Crews to bring out New Steamers, 4958 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs, 506 (i), 4221 (ii).
Marine Biological Station, 516 (i).
Masters and Mates, Examination, 513 (i).
Removal of Wrecked Schooner, Petit de Grat Harbour, 4221 (ii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 514 (i).
St. Lawrence Navigation, Aid, &c., 5024 (ii).
Steamer to replace the *Newfield*, 4958 (ii).
Tidal Service, &c., 515 (i).
Winter Mail Service, 516 (i).

Penitentiaries :
B. C., 3619 (ii).
Dorchester, 3617 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Penitentiaries—Con.
Generally, 3593 (ii).
Lussier Arbitration, 4268 (ii).
To pay G. W. Dawson, 4267 (ii).
Kingston, 3593 (ii).
Manitoba, 3618 (ii).
Prince Albert Jail, 3620 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 3617 (ii),

Post Office :
Additional Sorters, Letter Carriers, &c., 4940.
Bates, E. B., Salary Increase, 4940 (ii).
General Vote, 3867, 4314 (ii).
Gingras, J. N. A., Salary, 4313 (ii).
Mail Service, 3911 (ii).
For Second Class Ry. Mail Clerkship, 4940.
Outside Service, Salaries, Increases, 4940 (ii).

Public Works—Capital :
Buildings :
Ottawa, Astronomical Observatory, 560 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Addition, &c., 560 (i), 4137 (ii).
Royal Mint, 560 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 564 (i).
Yukon, Govt. Buildings, 4144, 4536 (ii).
Roads and Bridges, 4147 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, Quesnelle-Atlin, 4150 (ii).
Port Simpson-Hazelton, 4178 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers :
Port Arthur, Breakwater, 599 (i).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 609 (i), 4557 (ii).
Quebec, Harbour Improvements, 4549 (ii).
River Kaministiquia, 599 (i), 4563 (ii).
St. Andrews Rapids, 604 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 565 (i).
Ste. Marie's Current, Montreal Harbour, &c., 608 (i).

Public Works—Collection of Revenue :
Graving Docks, 4220 (ii).
Slides and Booms, 4142, 4220, 4782 (ii).
Telegraph Lines :
Ashcroft to Dawson, 3293, 4781 (ii).
Gulf of St. Lawrence, &c., 4143 (ii).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 3293 (ii).
SS. *Tyrian*, Marconi System, &c., 4219 (ii).

Public Works—Income :
Buildings :
British Columbia :
General Repairs, 857 (i).
Kamloops, Public Building, 4185 (ii).
Nelson, Public Building, 860 (i).
New Westminster, Public Building, 4185.
Rossland, Public Building, 861 (i).
Vancouver, Drill Hall, 4186 (ii).
William's Head, Quarantine Station, 4614.
Generally :
Construction of Armouries, 861 (i).
Experimental Farms, Generally, 875 (i).
Public Buildings, Generally, 876 (i), 4186.
Salaries to Resident Clerks of Works, &c., 876 (i), 4186 (ii).
Manitoba :
General Repairs, 831 (i).
Winnipeg, Immigrant Building, 4613 (ii).
Maritime Provinces :
Dom. Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 642.
New Brunswick :
Marysville, Public Building, 636 (i).
Richibucto, Public Building, 641 (i).
St. John, Public Building, 641 (i).
Immigrant Building, 641 (i), 4178 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
North-west Territories:
Carnduff, Court House, 835 (i).
Court-houses, Police Accommodation, &c., 849 (i).
Edmonton Jail, 849 (i).
General Repairs, 849 (i).
Lethbridge, Immigrant Building, 4185 (ii).
Macleod, Court-house, &c., 852 (i).
Red Deer, Court-house, &c., 852 (i), 4613.
Red Deer Valley, Immigrant Building, 853 (i).
Saskatoon, Immigrant Building, 856 (i), 4614 (ii).
Yorkton, Court-house, &c., 856 (i), 4613 (ii).
Nova Scotia:
Arichat, Public Building, 635 (i).
Halifax, New Public Building, 635 (i).
Ontario
Alexandria, Reformatory, 4184 (ii).
Brockville, Drill Hall, 4182 (ii).
Clinton, Public Building, 719 (i).
Cobourg, Armoury, 721 (i).
Deseronto, Public Building, 728 (i).
Fort William, Public Building, 728 (i).
General Repairs, 728 (i), 4181 (ii).
Hamilton, Examining Warehouse Extension, 4566 (ii).
Kingston, Royal Military College, 729 (i).
London, Drill Hall, &c., 729 (i).
Ottawa, Major's Hill Park, Greenhouse, 4180 (ii).
P. O., and Custom House, 4565 (ii).
Public Buildings, Repairs to Walls, 4565.
Rideau Hall, Drains, 4565 (ii).
St. Catharines, Drill Hall, 4567 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Public Building, 731 (i).
Toronto, Dom. Public Buildings, 732 (i).
Post Office, 4566 (ii).
P. O. Branch Office, 4182, 4565 (ii).
Toronto Junction, Public Building, 733 (i), 4566 (ii).
Quebec:
Drummondville, Public Buildings, 643 (i), 4180 (ii).
General Vote, 642 (i).
Granby, Public Building, 644 (i).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 644 (i).
L'Assomption, Public Building, 656 (i).
Lévis, Cattle Quarantine Station, 667 (i).
Public Building, 669 (i).
Montreal, Examining Warehouse, 670 (i).
P. O., Branch Office, 4564 (ii).
Public Building, 708 (i).
Peribonka, Immigrant Building, 4179 (ii).
Quebec, Immigrant Building, 709 (i).
Military Buildings, 709 (i), 4180 (ii).
Roberval, Immigrant Building, 4180 (ii).
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall, 710 (i).
Public Building, 4564 (ii).
St. Jerôme, Public Building, 4180 (ii).
Thetford Mines, Public Building, 716 (i).
Valleyfield, Public Building, 717 (i), 4564.
Rents, repairs, &c.:
Dom. Immigration Buildings, 974 (i), 4616.
Dom. Public Buildings, Caretakers, &c., 987 (i), 4615 (ii).
Lighting, 4189, 4615 (ii).
Dom. Quarantine Stations, 980 (i).
Ottawa:
Dom. Public Buildings, Rents, 964 (i), 4615 (ii).
Furniture, Heating, &c., 4138 (ii).
Grounds, 987 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, repairs, &c.—*Con.*
Ottawa—*Con.*
Lighting, 4189, 4616 (ii).
Rideau Hall, Maintenance, &c., 4188.
Telephones, 986 (i).
Port Colborne, Heating Apparatus, Pub. Building, 4616 (ii).
Toronto, P.O., Locomobiles, 4186 (ii).
Winnipeg, Immigrant Building, Heating, 4616 (ii).
Yukon, 967 (i).
Rents, Heating, &c., 4190 (ii).
Dredging, 3283 (ii).
B. C., 3286 (ii).
Man., Repairs, &c., 4763 (ii).
Self-propelling Snag Boat, 4768 (ii).
Repairs, 1277 (i).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Anderson and Kennedy Lakes, Clearing Outlets, 4642 (ii).
Columbia River, Improvements, &c. between Upper and Lower Arrow Lakes, 1276 (i).
Hardy Bay, Wharf, 4643 (ii).
Skeena River, 1277 (i).
Manitoba:
General Repairs, 1275 (i).
Lake St. Francis Outlet, Guide Piers, &c., 4642 (ii).
Winnipegosis, Dredging Mossy River Mouth, 4642 (ii).
Maritime Provinces:
General Repairs, &c., 4142, 4213 (ii).
New Brunswick:
Anderson's Hollow, Wharf Repairs, 4626.
Bay du Vin, Wharf, 1022 (i).
Black Brook, Wharf, 1023 (i).
Campbellton, Wharf, 4625 (ii).
Campobello, Breakwater Repairs, &c., 4626 (ii).
Cape Tormentine, Creosoted Timber Crib-work, 4627 (ii).
Repairs to Breakwater, 1023 (i).
Caraquet, Wharf, 1023 (i).
Chance, Breakwater, 1024 (i).
Dipper Harbour, Breakwater, 1025 (i).
Grand Anse, Breakwater Extension, 1025 (i).
Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater, 4628 (ii).
Little Salmon River, Beach Protection Works, 4628 (ii).
Partridge Island, Eastern Pier Repairs, 4628 (ii).
Point Wolfe, Breakwater, 1025 (i).
Richibucto, North Piers, &c., 1026 (i).
River St. John, Oromocto Wharf, 1030 (i), 4628 (ii).
Wharfs on Tidal Waters, &c., 4629 (ii).
St. John Harbour, Negro Point Harbour, 1031 (i).
Upper Salmon River, Alma Pier, 1031 (i).
Nova Scotia:
Amagandus Pond, Wharf, 4616 (ii).
Arnold's Point, Breakwater, 989 (i).
Bailey's Brook, Breakwater Wharf, 4620.
Bear River, Removal of Obstructions, &c., 4621 (ii).
Big Pond, Wharf, 4621 (ii).
Boularderie Centre, Wharf, 997 (i).
Burlington, Wharf, 999 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Cape Cove, Restoration of Breakwater, 4621 (ii).
Charlesville, Breakwater, 4621 (ii).
Cheticamp Point, Wharf, 1000 (i).
Cheverie, Breakwater Extension, 4621 (ii).
Church Point, Breakwater Repairs, 4621.
Comeaus Hill, Breakwater Repairs, &c., 4621 (ii).
Cow Bay, Breakwater, 1000 (i).
Cribbon's Point, Wharf Repairs, 4621 (ii).
Drumhead, Breakwater, 1001 (i), 4621 (ii).
Ecum Secum, Wharf, 4210 (ii).
Friar's Head, Boat Harbour, 1002 (i).
Gabarus Bay, Breakwater, 4210 (ii).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements, 4622.
Grand River, Channel, 4622 (ii).
Herring Cove, Breakwater, 1002 (i).
Ingonish, Breakwater Strengthening, 4211.
Iona, Wharf, 1002 (i).
Larry's River, Breakwater, 1002 (i).
Lingan, Beach Protection, 1004 (i).
Little Bras d'Or, Wharf, 1004 (i).
Livingstone's Cove, Wharf, 1004 (i).
Lower Cove, Breakwater, 1004 (i).
Lunenburg, Dredging, 4622 (ii).
Minudie, Wharf, 1004 (i).
Neil's Harbour, Breakwater, 1004 (i).
New Harbour, Breakwater, &c., 1004 (i).
Parker's Cove, Pier Extension, 1006 (i).
Porter's Lake, Completion of Outlet, 4622.
Port George, Breakwater, 1007 (i).
Port La Tour, Breakwater Additions, 4624.
Round Bay, Beach Protection, 4624 (ii).
Washabuck Centre, Wharf, 1009 (i).
Windsor Harbour, Shear Dams, &c., 4624.
Ontario :
Amherstburg, Dredging, 4637 (ii).
Barrie Wharf, Construction, 1217 (i).
Bayfield, Extension of South Pier, 1217 (i).
Big Bay, North Keppel, Wharf Repairs, 4637 (ii).
Blind River, Wharf, 1222 (i).
Bronte, Harbour Improv ments, 1226 (i).
Burke's Falls, Maganetawan River, 4637 (ii).
Burlington Channel, Repairs to Piers, 1226 (i), 4637 (ii).
Callander, Wharf Repairs, 4638 (ii).
Cobourg, Pier, Repairs and Dredging, 4638.
Collingwood, Dredging, 4638 (ii).
Harbour Improvements, 1227 (i).
Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 1231 (i).
Georgian Bay, Point au Baril Route, Improvements, 4640 (ii).
Goderich, Harbour, 1232 (i), 4640 (ii).
Hilton, St. Joseph's Island, Wharf Repairs, 1247 (i), 4640 (ii).
Huntsville, New Wharf, 4641 (ii).
Kingsville, Wharf Repairs, &c., 1236 (i).
Meaford Harbour, Dredging, &c., 1236 (i).
Midland Harbour, Dredging, 1237 (i).
Wharf, 4641 (ii).
Oakville, East Pier Repairs, 1239 (i).
Orillia, New Wharf, 4641 (ii).
Owen Sound Harbour, Dredging, &c., 1239.
Penetanguishene, Repairs and Dredging, 4641 (ii).
Port Elgin, Repairs, Dredging, &c., 4641.
Port Hope, Pier Repairs, 1239 (i).
Presqu' Isle, Purchase of Wharf, 1239 (i).
River Ottawa, Petawawa Narrows, Improvement, 1239 (i).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers- *Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
River St. Lawrence, Channel Dredging at Wolfe Island, 1242 (i).
St. Joseph, Wharf, 1247 (i), 4640 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour Improvements, 1242 (i).
Southampton, Harbour Improvements, 1245 (i).
South Nation River, Improvements at the Pitch-off, 4642 (ii).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, &c., 1274 (i).
Prince Edward Island :
Brae Breakwater, Repairs, &c., 4625 (ii).
Canoe Cove, Breakwater, 1010 (i).
Cascumpec Harbour, Closing Breach, 1013.
Chapel Point Pier, Repairs, 4625 (ii).
Creosoted Timber for General Wharf Repairs, 1015 (i).
Lower Montague, 4625 (ii).
New London, Breakwater Repairs, 4212.
Point Pelee Island Wharf, 4217 (ii).
Souris, Knight's Point, Breakwater, 1017.
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 1017.
Tignish Harbour, Rebuilding Northern Breakwater, 4626 (ii).
Repairs to Breakwater, 4212 (i).
West Point, Pier Extension, 4211 (ii).
Quebec :
Batiscan River, Dredging at Mouth, 4629.
Crane Island, South Side, Wharf Repairs, 4630 (ii).
Cross Point, Isolated Landing Pier, 4630.
Grand Vallée, Pier, 1046 (i).
Hudson, Wharf, 1046 (i).
Isle aux Coudres, Wharf, 1046 (i).
Isle aux Grues, Wharf Repairs on South Side, 1047 (i).
Lake Temiscamingue, Improvements, 1047.
Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 1047 (i).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, 4631 (ii).
Maria, Isolated Block, 4630 (ii).
Murray Bay, Wharf, 1051 (i).
Point Fortune, Wharf, 4631 (ii).
Point St. Pierre, Breakwater, 4631 (ii).
River St. Maurice, Dredging, 1053 (i).
Rivière aux Renards, Pier, 4631 (ii).
St. Alexis, Pier, 1053 (i).
St. Francois, Breakwater Wharf, South Side Island of Orleans, 4632 (ii).
St. Geneviève, Pier Protection, 4215 (ii).
St. Irenée, Wharf, &c., 4634 (ii).
St. John des Chaillons, Harbour Improvements, 4624 (ii).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans, 4634 (ii).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 1053 (i).
Valleyfield, Dredging Channel in Bay, 1061 (i), 4216 (ii).
Yukon :
Lewes and Yukon, River Improvements, 3283 (ii).
Miscellaneous :
C.P.R., Freight Charges, 4219 (ii).
Chief Engineer's Office, Salaries, &c., 4219.
Creosoting Plant, 4779 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Ottawa, 3292 (ii).
Surveys and Inspections, 3292, 4780 (ii).
Roads and Bridges :
Belly River, Pace's Crossing, Bridge, 4218.
Des Joachins, Bridge, 4219 (ii).
Ottawa :
Maria St., Bridge, 3289 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Slides and Booms:
St. Maurice River, 3287, 4218 (ii).
Shawinigan Works, 4218 (ii).
Telegraph Lines:
B.C., 3292, 4779 (ii).
Bryon Island to Anticosti, Cable, &c., 4769.
Bryon Island to Magdalen Islands, 4769 (ii).
Gulf of St. Lawrence, &c., 3291 (ii).
Mabou to Port Hawkesbury, 4770 (ii).
St. Peter's to Louisbourg, &c., 4770 (ii).
Quarantine:
Cattle Quarantine, 2919 (ii).
Public Health, &c., Salaries, &c., 371 (i), 2899, 4967 (ii).
Public Works Health Act, 403 (i).
Slaughter of Hogs, Sheep, &c., Compensation &c., 4968 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 403 (i).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals, 406 (i).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Carillon and Grenville, 4280 (ii).
Cornwall, 4310 (ii).
Culbute, Damages by Flooding, 4281, 4309 (ii).
Farran's Point, Enlargement, 4300 (ii).
Galop's Deepening Rapids, 4300 (ii).
Enlargement, 4021 (ii).
Generally, Operating Expenses, 4294 (ii).
Sunday Service, 4294, 4312 (ii).
Lachine, Electrical Installation, 4299 (ii).
Mill St., Paving, 4307 (ii).
Rebuilding Waste Weir Walls, 4307 (ii).
To repair Locks 1 and 2, 4035 (ii).
North Channel, Forming, &c., 4034, 4300 (ii).
Quebec Canals, Boundary Surveys, 4281 (ii).
Rapide Plat, Enlargement, 4021, 4304 (ii).
Rideau, 4917 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Entrance Deepening, &c., 4001, 4298 (ii).
Soulanges, Construction, &c., 4018, 4304 (ii).
Trent, Construction, 4004 (ii).
Lindsay to Fenelon Falls Road, Building, 4270 (ii).
Peterborough, Dam, 4918 (ii).
To Dredge Shoals in Otonabee River, &c., 4269 (ii).
Welland, Complete West Docking, Port Dalhousie, 4306 (ii).
Deepening Long Level, Port Colborne to Thorold, 4798 (ii).
Drainage at Port Colborne, 4306 (ii).
Montrose Bridge, Steel Swing Span, &c., 4800 (ii).
Port Colborne, Entrance Improvements, 4019 (ii).
Removing Obstructions, Port Colborne to Welland, 4798 (ii).
Strengthening wall at Head of Locks, 4306.
Miscellaneous:
Gathering Information *re* Ry. Commission, 4305 (ii).
Salaries of Engineers, Draughtsmen, &c., 4292 (ii).
Railways:
Grand Trunk Ry., Rental, 3515, 3548 (ii).
Intercolonial Ry.:
Additional Sidings, 3811, 4792 (ii).
Car Couplers, 4794 (ii).
Chaudière Junction, Engine-house, 4786.
Draw-bars on Freight Cars, 3812 (ii).
Eel River, Station, &c., 4796 (ii).
Ferry Service. Strait of Canso, 4294 (ii).
General Vote, 2866, 3411, 3556, 4310 (ii).
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, 4790.

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—Con.
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Ry.—*Con.*
Lévis, Accommodation, 3810 (ii).
Miramichi Bridge, 3812, 3828, 4794 (ii).
Moncton, Increased Accommodation, 4797.
Shops, 3828 (ii).
Mulgrave, Improvements, 4297 (ii).
New Machinery for Shops, 3812, 4297 (ii).
Nicolet, Station, 4796 (ii).
Original Construction, 3809 (ii).
Ouelle River, Spur Line, 4796 (ii).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, 4795.
Pintsch Gas, &c., 3812 (ii).
Point Tupper Improvements, 3828 (ii).
Restigouche Bridge, 3828 (ii).
Rivière du Loup, Shops, 3828 (ii).
Yard, 3828 (ii).
Rockingham, Improvements, 4798 (ii).
Rolling Stock, 3813, 4297, 4783 (ii).
St. John, Accommodation, 4786 (ii).
Steel Rails, 3781 (ii).
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation, 4788 (ii).
Strengthening Bridges, 3809, 4792 (ii).
Sydney Accommodation, 3805, 4789, 4796.
Raising Ry. Bridge, 4795 (ii).
Prince Edward Island Railway:
Charlottetown, Accommodation, 4918 (ii).
General Vote, 3583, 3996, 4292 (ii).
Murray Bay Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, 3830, 3862 (ii).
Yukon:
Mackenzie and Mann Award, 4860 (ii).
Scientific Institutions:
Hydrographic Surveys, 528 (i).
Meteorological Service, 527 (i).
Toronto Observatory, 527 (i).
Superannuation:
Extra Allowance to Mr. Wallace, 3303 (ii).
Trade and Commerce:
Expenditure *re* Iron and Steel Bounties Act, 4331 (ii).
Expenses *re* Commercial Agencies, &c., 4963.
Unprovided Items:
As per Aud. Gen's. Rep., 4341 (ii).
Weights and Measures, Gas, &c.:
Metrical Instruments. 1201 (i), 4961 (ii).
Salaries of Inspectors of Electric Light, &c., 1201 (i).
Salaries of Officers, Inspectors of Weights, &c., 1184 (i), 4961 (ii).
CONCURRENCE:
Additional Accommodation, I.C.R., 5037 (ii).
Charges of Management, 4342 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch, &c., P.E.I. Ry., 5039.
Printing, Paper, and Binding, 4343 (ii).
Quarantine, Salaries in Organized Districts, &c., 5033 (ii).
Rifle Ranges, 5032 (ii).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R., 5037 (ii).
Royal Military College, 5033 (ii).
Steel Rails, &c., 5035 (ii).
Trent Canal, Construction, 5047 (ii).

SUPREME COURT ACT, AMT. *re* MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 410 (i).

SUPREME COURT, AD HOC JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4264 (ii).

Supreme Court Assistant Judges Appnmt. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 1673 (i); wthdn., 5064 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. No. 41 (Mr. *Demers, St. Jean and Iberville*) 1° m., 1063 (i).

SUPREME COURT, JUDGES, LEAVE OF ABSENCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2224 (i).

——— POWER, APPEALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214, 217 (i).

SURGEON, N. W. M. POLICE, ADDITIONAL SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3588 (ii).

SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3292, 4780 (ii).

SUSSEX, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 862, 866 (i).

——— ENGINE HOUSE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3829.

SYDENHAM RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1226.

SYDNEY, ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3805, 3996, 4789, 4796 (ii).

Sydney Land and Loan Co.'s Limited incorp. B. No. 30 (Mr. *Kendall*) 1°*, 781; 2°*, 882 (i).

SYDNEY AND LOUISBURG BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).

TANTRAMAR MARSH, I.C.R., WASHOUT, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1108 (i).

TARGET SHOOTING: *See* 'Rifle Practice.'

TASSIE, MAJOR, RETIREMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 241 (i).

TAX ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, LEGISLATION *re* P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 781 (i).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1010 (i).

TAY CANAL, 1896 TO 1901, AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 2067 (i).

TELEGRAPH AND CABLE LINES, PUB. WORKS OR P. O. CONTROL: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2721 (ii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3292, 4150, 4779 (ii).

——— B.C. AND TERS., AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).

——— GOVT. CONTROL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3293, 4770 (ii).

——— GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 3291, 4143 (ii).

——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii).

——— OPERATORS, PAY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4154, 4172 (ii).

——— TELEGRAPH RATES: in Com. of Sup., 4175 (ii).

Telephone Co.'s B. No. 2 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 66; on order for 2°, 625; 2° m., 786 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 734; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 1206 (i); wthdn., 4970 (ii).

TELEPHONE COS. OF CAN., MILEAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3150 (ii).

TELEPHONES IN OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.

TÉMISCAMINGUE LAKE, DREDGING AND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

TÉMISCOUATA FARM LANDS, DAMAGES *re* I.C.R. DITCHING: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2677 (ii).

TÉMISCOUATA RY. AND I.C.R., TRAFFIC FACILITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1860 (i).

TERREBONNE, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

TERRITORIAL COURT CLERK, YUKON, LIVING ALLOWANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3587 (ii).

——— *See* 'Yukon.'

THERIEN, MR. H., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER FROM GRANDES PILES, PET., &c.: M. (Mr. *Ball*) for Copy*, 3724 (ii).

THETFORD MINES ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 716 (i).

THOMAS, ALPH., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER OF LA PRAIRIE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2221 (i).

THREE RIVERS, INSPECTOR GRAVEL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2457 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, BAY OF FUNDY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 515 (i).

TIDAL WATERS, DOM. AND PROVINCIAL RIGHTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Farquharson*) 1861 (i),

——— ST. JOHN RIVER, WHARFS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4629 (ii).

TIES, I.C.R., PURCHASES, &c.: in Com, of Sup., 3496.

——— QUANTITY PURCHASED: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 444, 2065 (i).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.'

TIGNISH, BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4212, 4626 (ii).

——— AND MAIL POINT MAIL CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 4932 (ii).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 44 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°*, 2201 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 105.)

Timagami Ry. Co.'s B. No. 91 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 2064; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 106.)

TIMBER LIMITS, SALE, NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 885 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1133 (i).

TITLES FOR PROPERTY, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 1042 (i).

'TIVERTON,' SS., GROUNDING, INQUIRY *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2856 (ii).

TOBACCO DUTY, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 134 (i).

TOBERMORY HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1246 (i).

Toronto and Niagara Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2889; in Com., 3623; 3° m., 3636; agreed to (Y. 74; N. 18) 3637 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 107.)

TORONTO, DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 732 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF MECHANICAL ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 884 (i).

——— DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).

——— HARBOUR, DREDGING EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1274 (i).

——— POST OFFICE ALTERATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).

TORONTO, P. O., BRANCH OFFICE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4182, 4565 (ii).
—— LOCOMOBILES, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4186 (ii).
—— *See* 'Automobiles.'
TORONTO JUNCTION, BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).
—— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 733 (i).
TOWN SITES, N.W.T., LAND GRANTS AND GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4404 (ii).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 403 (i).
TRACINGS, &c., RAILWAY LINES IN N.B. : M. for Plans* (Mr. *Costigan*) 961 (i).
TRACKMEN'S WAGES, I.C.R.: *See* 'Govt. Rys.'

TRADE AND COMMERCE :
AGENTS OF CAN. IN ENG., INCOME TAX : Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5054 (ii).
ANGLO-GERMAN COMMERCIAL TREATIES : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 790, neg. (Y. 56 ; N. 107) 804 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 617 (i).
ATLANTIC COMBINE : *See* 'Shipping Combine.'
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4549 (ii).
AUSTRALIA, CAN. AND NEW ZEALAND, COR. *re* TRADE TRANSPORTATION : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Campbell*) 154 (i).
CAN. AND FRANCE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).
CHINESE COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4340 (ii).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES, *re* TREATIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).
CONSULAR AGENCIES, FLAGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 132 (i).
GERMAN TARIFF *re* NATIONS AND DEPENDENCIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 617 (i).
—— *See* 'Anglo-German.'
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, STEAM COMMUNICATION, &c., STR. 'AMELIA' : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1680 (i).
MAIL STEAMERS BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B., RATE OF SPEED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 130 (i).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).
P.E.I., TAX ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, LEGISLATION *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 781 (i).
—— *See* 'Tax,' &c.
SHIPPING COMBINE (ATLANTIC) PAR. IN 'CITIZEN' : on M. for Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
SS. COMPANIES, SUBSIDIES : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4466 (ii).
—— *See* 'Trans-Atlantic,' &c.
TAX LEGISLATION *re* COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) in Com. of Sup., 1010.
—— *See* 'P.E.I.'
TRADE AND COMMERCE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 4331, 4534 (ii).
—— PRINTING, STATIONERY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 532 (i).
—— REP. : Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 122 (i).
—— SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 530 (i).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS : Presented (Mr. *Paterson*) 122 (i).
TRANS-ATLANTIC MAILS VIA U.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 447 (i).
TRANS-ATLANTIC, TRANS-PACIFIC OR WEST INDIA TRADE, CONTRACTS, SUBSIDIES, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 632 (i).
—— *See* 'SS. Cos.'
TREATIES, NEGOTIATION, EXPENSES *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
VICTORIA AND VANCOUVER STEAM SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).
TRANS-ATLANTIC, TRANS-PACIFIC OR WEST INDIA TRADE, CONTRACTS, SUBSIDIES, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 632 (i).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. No. 78 (Mr. *Talbot*) 1°*, 1763 ; 2°*, 2024 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3060 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 108.)
TRANSPORTATION, DISTANCES, COST, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 578 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 135 (i).
—— FACILITIES : in Com. of Sup., 576 (i).
—— QUESTION : Amt. (Mr. *Maclaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4361 ; neg. (Y. 43 ; N. 93) 4402 (ii).
—— ST. LAWRENCE, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 565–604 (i).
—— *re* WESTERN PRODUCTS : Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. of Sup., 4554 (ii).
See 'Marine,' 'St. Lawrence,' &c., 'Wheat,' &c.
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, EXCISE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4961 (ii).
TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).
—— INTERPRETATION OF O.C's., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2456 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2472 (i).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4977 (ii).
—— CONCESSIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 241 (i).
TREASURY BOARD : in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).
TREATIES, NEGOTIATION, EXPENSES *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).
TREATY EXPENSES *re* INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 3057 (ii).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 4004 ; conc., 5047 (ii).
—— DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4269 (ii).
—— REBUILDING DAM AT PETERBOROUGH : in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
—— AND RICE LAKE CANALS, REP. OF ENGINEER : Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).
TRUCKS PURCHASED : Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2852 (ii).
TRURO, ROUNDHOUSE, I.C.R., REBUILDING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii).
—— STATION, REBUILDING : Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii).
TUBERCULAR TEST, RES. BY SHORTHORN BREEDERS ASS'N. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 130 (i).
TWO MOUNTAINS CONTROVERTED ELECTION. JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
—— ELECTORAL DISTRICT : Certificates, Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1323 (i).
'TYRIAN,' SS., CABLE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4143, 4219 (ii).
TYRWHITT, MR. R. E., SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).

United Gold Fields of B.C., Limited, Co.'s B. No. 9 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 408; 2°*, 611; (i) in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 110.)

U.S. Imports for Home Consumption, 1901, Total Value: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 782 (i).

Union Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 158 (Mr. *Ingram*) 1°*, 4241; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 109.)

Unorganized Districts, Quarantine: in Com. of Sup., 2902 (ii).

Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 4341 (ii).

Upper Lakes Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 519 (i).

Vacancies: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

Vadnais, François, Contractor for Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4350 (ii).

Valleyfield, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i), 4216 (ii).

——— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 717 (i), 4564 (ii).

——— Riots, Militia Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 4260 (ii).

Vancouver, B.C., Drill Hall: in Com, of Sup., 876 (i), 4186 (ii).

——— Post Office, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. Navigation Co.'s B. No. 43 (Mr *Maxwell*) 1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 111.)

Van Wagner, Lt.-Col., Removal, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 616 (i).

Vegetables imported into the U.S., Quantity, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 171 (i).

Velvet (Rossland) Mine Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 18 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 112.)

Venoit, Mr. P. J., Collector of Customs, Bathurst, Absence from Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4124 (ii).

Ventilation, House of Commons: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4140 (ii).

Victoria, B.C., Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 65 (1).

——— Judges' Certificate: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

Victoria and Vancouver Steam Service: in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).

Victoria Harbour, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (il).

Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 564.

Wales, Prince of, Illuminations in Ottawa, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 615 (i).

Washabuck Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1009 (i).

Washington, Mr., Collector of Statistics: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 339 (i), 2827 (ii).

Ways and Means: Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 120.

——— Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1279 (i).

——— Debate: *See* 'Budget.'

——— M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com., 4972, 5071 (ii).

Webb and Sunday Travelling over P.E.I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4700 (ii).

——— *See* 'Dom. Securities,' &c.

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 150 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 4036 (ii).

Weights and Measures, Inspectors of, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).

Welland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 4306, 4798 (ii).

——— Depth, Quantity, &c. of Water: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1683, 1860 (i).

——— Lock Walls: in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).

——— Port Colborne Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 4019 (ii).

——— Water Privileges, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 409, 745 (i).

Wellington Mutch, Eldon, P.E.I., Paymts. to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3152 (ii).

Wellington, PostmasterDavid Clinton, Cor., &c., *re* Dismissal: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Alcorn*) 2680 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 613 (i).

Welsh Immigration from Patagonia: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 242 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 240 (i).

——— Mr. Chamberlain's Remarks *re* Climate of Canada: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Ont.*) 1441 (i).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 145 (Mr. *Copp*) 2°*, 4075 (ii).

West Point Pier, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (ii).

Westren, John, Patent Relief B. No. 49 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°*, 2221 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 113.)

Wharfage, Rates and Charges, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4634-5 (ii).

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, &c.: M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 888 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Paterson*) 895, 899; (Mr. *Davis*) 900; (Mr. *McCreary*) 903, 915, 960; (Mr. *Clarke*) 905, 940; (Mr. *Boyd*) 908, 960; (Mr. *Heyd*) 910, 914; (Mr. *Talbot*) 912; (Mr. *Edwards*) 912, 920; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 916, 941; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 916; (Mr. *Scott*) 919; (Mr. *Sproule*) 928; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 932; (Mr. *Tarte*) 933; (Mr. *Brock*) 942; (Mr. *Oliver*) 946, 960; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 953; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 956 (i).

Wheatley, Mr., Indemnity *re* Mutton Shipments by Cold Storage: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695 (ii).

White, Mrs., Gratuity: in Com. of Sup., 4256 (ii).

Wiarton Harbour Improvements, Amount voted: Ques., (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).

William's Head Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 4614 (ii).

Williamstown Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4353 (ii).

Wilson Beach Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 844 (i), 4626 (ii).

Windmill, Battle, Pensions granted: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 3724 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 238 (i).

Windsor, N.S., Branch Ry., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4292 (ii).

——— Harbour, Shear Dams, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 632; 2°*, 851; in Com., 1620; 3°*, 1622 (i); Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 114.)

WINDSOR, ONT., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 1154.

WINNIPEG, BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* RY. MANAGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 2942 (ii).

——— ELECTRIC RY. MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3874 (ii).

——— HOSPITALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).

——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 833 (i), 4613, 4616 (ii).

WINNIPEG LAKE SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 528 (i).

WINNIPEGOSIS, MOSSY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).

WINNIPEG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 3868 (ii).

——— OFFICIALS, DATE OF APPMNT., 1896-1901: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 961 (i).

WINTER COMMUNICATION, P.E.I., PETS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 160, 170 (i).

WINTER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 516 (i).

WIRELESS TELEGRAPH: *See* 'Marconi.'

WITNESS AND JURY FEES: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (ii).

——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.

WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1242 (i).

WOOD, &C. FOR YUKON BUILDINGS, PAR. IN DAWSON PAPER: Read (Mr. *Sproule*) 4540 (ii).

YARN ADMITTED DUTY FREE, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 4125 (ii).

'YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 336 (i), 2814 (ii).

——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.

YORK, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

YORKTON COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4613 (ii).

Yukon Coast Ry. Co.'s B. No. 67 (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1°*, 1569; 2°*, 1680 (i).

Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 65 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343; Sen. Amts., 4570 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 115.)

Yukon Territory Act (appeal) Amt. B. No. 113 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 2851; 2°*, 3776; in Com., 3°*, 3777 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 35).

——— **(Council) Amt. B. No. 119** (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3126; 2°*, 3832; in Com., 3832, 4484, 4529; 3°*, 4533 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 34.)

——— **Representation in H. of C., B. No. 134** (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3306; 2°*, 3774; in Com., 3774, 4466, 4578: 3°*, 4579; Sen. Amts., 4971 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 37.)

——— **Territory Act (Judges) Amt. B. No. 137** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) M. to introduce, 2850; Res. prop., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°* of B., 3509; 2°*, 3939; in Com., 3939; 3°*, 3939. (2 *Edward VII*, c. 36.)

YUKON:

ASHCROFT TO DAWSON, TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3293, 4151, 4781 (ii).

——— *See* 'Telegraph.'

BANK OF COMMERCE, COMMISSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).

BRITISH YUKON RY., TOLLS AND CHARGES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3638 (ii).

BUILDINGS: RENTALS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i), 4536, 4542, 4949 (ii).

——— SUPPLIES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4538-9 (ii).

CLERK TERRITORIAL COURT, LIVING ALLOWANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3587 (ii).

COLLINET, MRS., MATRON, COURT HOUSE: LETTER *re* ALLOWANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4193 (ii).

——— CHARGES AGAINST JUDGE DUGAS: Memo. of Mr. Fuller read, 4536 (ii).

CONCESSIONS, LEASES, &C., APPLICATIONS, O. Cs.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 154 (i).

CONTRACTS AND CIVIL SERVANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4152 (ii).

COURT HOUSE, ALLOWANCES TO MATRON, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4193 (ii).

CRAIG, JUDGE, INTERVIEW *re* IRREGULARITIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Bennett*) 972 (i).

CROWN PROSECUTOR: in Com. of Sup., 3590 (ii).

DAWSON AND VICTORIA MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).

DUGAS, JUDGE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST FROM MRS. COLLINET: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4198.

——— *See* 'Collinet, Mrs.,' &c.

EILBECK, SHERIFF, LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).

——— *See* 'Sheriff,' &c.

——— APPNMT. AS SHERIFF: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).

——— ABSENCE FROM YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 745 (i).

EMPLOYEES, ALLOWANCES, &C.: in Com of Sup., 4196 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 3283.

JAPANESE EMPLOYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 242.

JUDGES, LIVING AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES; in Com. of Sup., 3583 (ii).

——— RESIDENCES, RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4190 (ii).

KELLY, DOUGLAS & CO.'S TENDER *re* SUPPLIES in Com. of Sup., 4157 (ii).

LAW LIBRARY, FREIGHT ON BOOKS: in Com. o Sup., 3590 (ii).

LEGAL ADVISER: in Com. of Sup., 3590 (ii).

MACKENZIE & MANN, EXCHEQUER COURT AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 4860 (ii).

MILLER CREEK CONCESSIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4465 (ii).

——— Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4426 (ii).

POLE CONTRACT *re* TELEGRAPH: In Com. of Sup., 4154, 4162 (ii).

PRISONERS, MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3589 (ii).

——— TRANSPORT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3589 (ii).

REPRESENTATION IN PARLT., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2069 (i).

ROCHESTER'S CONTRACT *re* TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4152 (ii).

——— *See* 'Telegraph,' &c.

SHERIFF'S FEES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).

——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 745 (i).

——— *See* 'Eilbeck.'

TELEGRAPH SYSTEM: in Com. of Sup., 4150, 4781 (ii).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2859 (ii).

——— OPERATORS, PAY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4154, 4172 (ii).

YUKON—*Con.*

TELEGRAPH, RATES: in Com. of Sup., 4175 (ii).
——— SUPPLIES *re* TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4157 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ashcroft,' &c.
TIMBER LICENSES OR LEASES ISSUED SINCE 1899, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 2472.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 3509 (ii).
TREADGOLD CONCESSION: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4977 (ii).
——— REMARKS: in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).

YUKON—*Con.*

TREADGOLD O. CS., PLANS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2472 (i).
——— CONCESSION, INTERPRETATION OF O. CS., &C.: Ques. *Borden, Halifax*) 2456 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 241 (i).
WAGON ROADS, REFUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4147 (ii).
WITNESS AND JURY FEES: in Com. of Sup., 3590, 4267 (ii).
WOOD, &C. FOR BUILDINGS, PAR IN DAWSON PAPER: Read (Mr. *Sproule*), 4540 (ii).